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## ABSTRACT

The plan of this thesis le to examine the dramatic treatment of evil as deception or false appearance in a repres sentative selection of pourteentho and fifteenthecentury morality plays. The structurel core of these plays is based on the Psychomachia, or conflict between good and evil in man ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ soul, which forms the dominant theme of medieval allegory. In the moraliey plays, this conflict is most characteristically presented as a plot of deception in which Vice masquerading as Virtue tempts Mankind by sophistical argument into belleving that evil is good. Theologically, this theatrical metaphor of disguise is rooted in the Medieval concept of Saten as the archo deceiver and rather of $12 e 8$ who can take many Protean shapes in his efforts to ensnare man's sould Psychologically, the metaphor also embodies a simple but profound description of man efforts to "rationalize" his om wrongodoings and to dress them in a more palatable name and guise. In this contezt the plays may also be incerpreted as allegories of selfodelusion within the soul of man.

This archetypal disguise of evil offers a supreme oppore cunity for a drams of intrigue and deception based on the elemental human problem of recognizing evil in its true nature. The central dramatic problem of the morality plays is therefore twofold: to make the plot lively enough to hold the interest of the audience, and at the same time to matre the nature of the decoption clear to them even fhile the victim on stage remains deluded. Such claripication 18 vital to the homiletic intent of the pleys.
for the apectarors must not be deceived along with the hero but must be constantly reminded of the moral leason.

The dramatic methods arising from this problem may be summarized in three general categories to be eramined in the courge of this study. First, recognition is indirectiy enforced by conventional devices reflecting the traditionally deceptive nature of evil: lis theatrical mode of disguise and its "diac bolically" clever mode of argument. These conventions, which will be discuesed in the first two chapters, would be familiar to the Tudor and the Elizabethan audience through the widespread appearance of this theme in nonodramitic as woll as dramatic Ilterature of the time. Seconds the original theological allegory becomes overiaid with apparently secular warnings against social and polistical fraud and pretense. This surface move toward seculariention mey also reinforce the theological recognition of evil by placing it in a ramiliar everyday setilng; and the morality plays share in a general Tudor preoccupation with fraud and hypocriay which 18 rooted in Medieval conceptions of the nature of evil. Third, the authors continuelly exploit the ironic contrast between appearance and reality within the plays, alo Lowing the informed audience to triumph over the deluded victim without forgetting the moral behind the deception. This two dimensional relationshlp between actors and audience imparts a distinctive atmosphere to the morelity plays, based on the use of arametc lrong for moral onds.

It will be suggested that these dramatic methods may largely account for the continued vitality and popularity of
the worality plays over a period of more than 150 years merging into the age of the major Elizabethan playwrights and providing them with important native examples of a drama based on intrigue。 In the moralities, these methods give rise to a lively and flexibio form of theatrical presentation exploiting dynamic relation ship between the audience and the characters on stage, and pose sessing both artistic and psychological validity in reflecting the original alidegory of evil disguised as good.
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A NOTE ON TEXTS, QUOTATIONS, AND DATES

All quotations from the moralities and related plays are taken from the editions Iisted under works Consulted. AIl quotations from works by Shakespeare are taken from the Globe Edition.

For greater consistency of reference, I have standardized the speiling of play titles and characters names within the body of the thesis, elthough I hawe followed the original speling when such names appear within quoted material. When quoting from facsimile texts. I have standardized the speech prefixes. I have also normalized standard contractions and Medleval sorts, and have silently corrected obvious typographical errors. Apart from these exceptions, the orieinal speling and punctuation has been followed.

Dates of composition, in most cases only approximate. are taken from Alfred Harbage ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ Annals of English Drama.

## PREFACE

The war between good and evil in man's soul, which forms the dominant theme of medieval allegory, is in the morality plays most characteristically presented as a plot of deception. Vice masquerading as Virtue tempts Mankind by sophistical argument into belleving that evil is good. Theologically the theatrical metaphor of disguise and deception 18 rooted in the Medieval concept of satan as the archodecelver and father of lies who can take many shapes in his efforts to lure men from the true faith and make them substitute an mappearance of good for its ${ }^{\infty}$ reality。" St. Augustine, ottacking neooplatonic philosophy with its emphasis on magic and metampsychosis forcefuliy exo presses the theological horror of false appearances which 18 enacted time after time in the moralities:

As to those who perfora these filthy cleansings by sacrilegious rites, and see in their initiated state. - certain wonderfully lovely appearances of angels or gods, this is what the apostle refers to when he speaks of msatan transforming himseif into an angel of ifght [II Corori. 14 ]. For these are the delusive apo pearances of that spirit who longs to entangle wretched souis in the deceptive worship of many and false gods, and to turn them aside from the true worship of the true God, by whom alone they are cleansed and healed, and who as was said of Proteus, witns nimseli into all shapes ${ }^{\text {n }}$ [Virgil, Georgics; iv, 41] equally hurtful, whether he assaults us as an enemy, or assume the disguise of a Priend. 1

Besides its theological connotations, the metaphor also embodies a simple but profound psychological description of human nature. Man endowed with free will, nonetheless seldom chooses ev11 with full consciousness but seeks ways to wationalizem his wrongodotngs and to dress them in a more palatable name and guise.

Gregory the Great puts the matter with considerable shrewdness:

And there are some vices which present an appearance of rectitude, but which proceed from the weakness of sin. For the malice of our enemy clokes itself mith such art, as irequently to make faults appear as virtues before the eyes of the deluded mind. . . For cruelity is frequently ezercised with punishing sins, and it is counted justice; and smoderate aneer is believed to be the meritoriousness of righteous eeal.。。. Frequently negligent remissness is regarded as gentleness and forbearance.... Levishness is sometimes belleved to be compassion... . When a fault then appears like a virtue, we must needs consider that the mind abandoris its fault the more slowly. in proportion as it does not blush at what it is doingo 2

This statement, as will become evident, foreshadows with almost uncanny egactness the most typical devices of the morality plot. In this context, the plays mey also be interpreted as allegories of selfodelusion within the soul of man.

These two passages, representative of many Medieval stateo ments on the same theme, indicate the background of ideas essential to this study. Tuming to literary history, a brief definition of terms may give further perspective by way of introduction. ${ }^{3}$ The metaphorical war within man ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ soul has for convenience been called the psychomachla, after a fourthocentury allegorical poem of the same name by Prudentius in mhich the open conflict between Vice and Virtue receives the full epic treatment complete with boasts and challenges, alarums and ercursions. This popular and widely imitated work is the prototype for the major form of Mediee val dramatic and nonهdramatic allegory which in the morality plays soon ecilpaes its subsidiaries: the Coming of Death, the Debate of the Heavenly Graces, and the Debate of the Soul and Body. The firstonamed rorm is selferplanatory. In the second Mercy,

Peace, Justice, and Truth debate before God whether Man ${ }^{\circ}$ sinful goul shall be saved or damed. In the third, the soul rebukeg the Body for leading it astray (Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ}$ s sonnet, *Poor soulg the centre of my sinful earth ${ }^{\circ \prime}$ might be cited as an outatanding Renalssance expression of this theme).

By comparison, the playnrigntso preference for the paychoo machia 18 obvious and perhaps inevicable since in the Aristotelian sense "confleter is indispensable to dramitic structure. Only in Everyman (c. 1495 ) and the fragmentary pride of Life (before [400) is the Coming of Death the major topic: and even here it 18 possible to argue that the psychomachia conflict is implied throughout and Death $1 s$ simply its final earthly outcome. Only the carliest extant complete morality, The castle of perseverance (e. $140501425 \%$ contains all of these themes. The Debate of the Soul and Body and the Heavenfy Parilament disappear altogether In subsequent moralities ercept for a late comic version of the Latter in Respublica (2553).

Two facts about The Cestle of Perseverance make it of major importance as an introdiction to future dramatic developments. Firste in contrast to Erudentius poem and to the contio nental morality plays, Mankind nimself is the central heroo ${ }^{4} \mathrm{As}$ Bernard Spivack points out, to present Man as a character in his orn allegory is metaphorical inconsistency since whe is placed In the position, absurd from the viewpoint of allegory, of fre ternizing with his personified attributes." But, he goes on to say, this paradoz is vital for the progress of English drama, and Man 18 whe inget of the three groups of characters to be
replaced by a concretely individualized person. ${ }^{5}$. Thus it would seem that the English morality, though less formally correct than the continental, contains within its incorrect structure a greater dramatic potentiality.

Second, and of even greater significance for the present study, is the fact that although this is the only morality play depicting in full scale the Psychomachia as open warfare, even here deception wins where open assault has falled. Prudentius makes this theological and psychological point in a minor but significant episode when Avaritia disguises herself as her opponent Thrift and sows discord among the ranks of Virtue until "unmasked" and put to death. But deception is far more interesting dramaticaliy if Mankind himself is the victim. In two scenes from Perseverance, to be discussed later in more detail. the powers of evil bring about the hero ${ }^{\circ}$ s first and second downfall by means of deceptive argument, false promises, and the talents of Vice for "acting the part of friendship.

These two scenes present in embryo the typical methods of deception to be elaborated in neariy all later moralities. Remo nants of the soocalled military Psychomachia" survive in many later plays, primarily as farcical episodes of open violence and insult between Vice and Virtue or among the vices themselves; but the general shift is from open war to deception. As Spivack points out, such a change is partiy due to the greater theatrical convenience of portraying intriguers rather than warring armies. and to the superior dramatic possibilities of intrigue; but a deeper justification lies in the traditional view of evil itself. ${ }^{6}$

Given a ploc of deception (whych by its very nature must be based on felse appearances), the central dramatic problem of the morality plays is twofold: to make the plot ilvely and realistic enough to hold the interest of the audience, and at the same time to make the nature of the deception clear to them even while the victim on stage remains deluded. The homiletic nature of the plays requires such clarification, for the spectators must not at any point be deceived along with the hero, but must be constantly reminded of the moral lesson. The drametic problem thus mirrors the moral problem, which is to impel recognition of evil: to reveal the reality behind the fair or misleading appeare ance.

It will be the aim of this thesis to examine the dramatic methods which arise out of this tworold problem and to suggest that they may largely account for the continued vitality and popularity of the morality plays over a period of more than 150 years starting in the early firteenth century and merging into the age of Elizabethan drama. The study will be selective rather than exhaustive, discussing representative moralities and mybrid" plays from the early, intermediate, and later years of the genre.? Occasional reference wll be made to the laage of evil as deception In the works of Shakespeare and other sirteenthocentury writers: the purpose here is not to attempt a complete survey of this widespread idea outside the morality genre, but to suggest the position of the morality plays against aroad segment of Renaiso sance thought which did not die with the decilne of extemal alo legory. Two further limitations should be mentioned. Ploralities
surviving into the period of the major Elizabethan and Jacobean drama (such as the plays of Robert Wilson, Defker's old Fortunatus. and Tomkis ${ }^{\circ}$ Lingua) will not be discussed since, as Madeleine Doran points out, by this elme the heyday of the morality as a separate form has passed and it has moved out of the dramatic main stream. ${ }^{8}$ Second, since the problem of recognizing evil is inextricably linked with the tragic possibilities inherent in the major moralities, those plays which seem to point exclusively toward farcical comedy or romance will be omitted (The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom and Comin Conditions are two outstanding examples)。

Briefly, the dramatic methods which will be examined in the following chapters may be summarized in three general categories. First, recognition is indirectly enforced by conventional devices reflecting the traditionally deceptive nature of evil: its theatrical mode of disguise and its adiabolically" clever mode of argument. These conventions, since they form the major substance of the dramatic action, will be discussed in the first two chapters. The fact that they are based on popular stereotype may increase their theatrical effectiveness. Discussions of the function of dramatic convention by such critics as Elmer Stoll. Theodore Spencer, and M.C. Bradbrook suggest that the element of familiarity is a vital aspect of audienceoresponse in Elizabethan drama, while studies by T. W. Craik and David M. Bevington have performed a similar service for Tudor drama. ${ }^{9}$ If visualized as part of an actual stage performance, these conventions take on considerable dramatic vitality.

Second, the original pure allegory becomes overlaid with apparently secular warnings against fraud and pretense at all social and political levels. It mill be suggeared that such mecularization may be more apparent than real and may in fact tend to reinforce the theological recognition of evil by setting it in familiar everyday context. If Man 18 gelfodeceived by Vice masquerading as Virtue within his own soul, he may be equally gulled by external evils in a period of bewildering social, poli* tical. and religious upheavals which, to the conservative morality playwrights, must have seemed like devices of Satan to destroy the wellwordered Medieval universe.

Third, the quthors continually exploit the ironic contrast between appearance and reality within the plays, allowing the informed audience to triumph over the deceived victim. mithout Porgetting the moral behind the deception. The crude comedy of the vices is set against their friendy or pious beguilements. Vice, Virtue, or Mankind himself may address the audience directly in moral warning, but the situations in which they do so give added spice to the irony particularly when the Vice himself acts as sardonic preacher. This twoodimensional relationship betmeen actors and audience imparts a distinctive atmosphere to the morallty plays. in which Mankind as a spectator of his own alo legory learns to recognize evil at the expense of his deluded : counterpart on the stage...

## FOOTNOTES Preface

${ }^{1}$ St Augustine, The City of God, trans. M. Dods (Edinburgh, 1871). I. 397. Cited 1n To McAlindon, "Classical Mythology and Christian Tradition in Marlowe s Doctor Faustus, " PMLA, LXXXI (June 1966), 217. Although he does not discuss the morality plays. McAlindon ( $p$ 。216) points out thet this passage is mby no means unusual ${ }^{\text {n }}$ in expressing the Medieval wtheological pres occupation with false appearances.。. .
${ }^{2}$ Gregory the Great, Morals on the Book of Job (Oxford, 18440 50). III, 54406. Cited in Bernard Spivack Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil (Nem York, 1958), po 156. Splvack (ppo 155-6) also stresses the fact that such a statement is widely represen tative of the Medieval and Tudor way of looking at evil.

This thesis, in general approach and many specific points to be acknowledged as they arise, is deeply indebted to Spivack ${ }^{\circ}$ study which traces in detail the emergence and history of the Vice, the development of the intrigue plot, and the Vice ${ }^{\circ} s$ mybrid" image in Elizabethan stage villains, particularly Iago. what I have attempted to do is to relate the plays more specifically to the theme of appearance and reality, using Spivack. s approach as a point of departure.

All references to Spivack throughout this thesis will be to the above work.

3Extended discussions of the material summarized in the next four paragraphs may be found in the following works: Spivack, pp. 63-95: E. No S. Thompon, "The English Moral Plays ${ }^{\text {n }}$. Transactions Conn. Aced. Arts and Sciences, XIV (1910), 320-59: Robert L. Ramsay, edog Magny fycence by John Skelton, Early English Text Society (London, 1906). Intro.s ppocxivileclvili.
${ }^{4}$ Hardin Craigg English Religious Drama of the Mldale Ages ( Oxiord, 1955), pp. $352=3$, notes the fact that the continentall plays contain no clear erample of a central Mankind heros Dutch moralities (if one excepts the debatable case of EverymanoElckerlijc) were usually written for prizes on set subjects such as, what is the greatest service that God has brought forth for the hape piness of man? At least one French morality presents the Psychoo machia conflict, but the Mankind hero is absent.

5pp. 93-4.
6p. 95 and passim.
${ }^{7}$ For greater ease of reference. I shall follow Spivack's erample in using the terms morality ${ }^{\circ \prime}$ and mybrid" play (the lato ter to designate a work in which the allegorical plot is grafted onto a ilteral story), rather than attempting the oftenomisleading distinction between morality, "moral interlude. "interlude, ${ }^{\text {m }}$ and "moral play. As other critics have pointed out, the latter terms were often used interchangeably during the Tudor period:
see for instance：Charlea Ho Gayley odo Representative English Comedies（Nem York， 1903 ［1907］．Introog ppo 1\％olvif E。K。 Chambers．The Mediaeval Stage（Oxford．1903）．II．181．03．
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Endearors of Art：A scudy of form in Ellzabethan drama （Madison。 W1scoo 1954 ［1964］），ppo 110－11。
${ }^{9}$ The following morks may be cited as examples：Elaer Edgar Stoll．Are and Axtipsce in Shatrespeare（Combridge and New York． 2933 ［1951］），and＂SIEnder in Drama，SQ。 IV（1953）。433－50： Theodore Spencer：Death and Elizabethan Tragedy：A Study of Convention and Opinlon in the Elizabethan Drama（Cambridge．Mass．o （936）；M．C．Bradbrook，Themes \＆Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy（Cambridge． 1935 ［1960］）．
 1958）and David M．Bevington，From mankind to Mariowe：Growth of Stmucture in the Populax Drama of Tudor England（Cambridge， Mass．1962）will be cited more specifically in the following chapters．

## CHAPTER I

THE VICE AS MACTOR

By the midosixteenth century, the Psychomachia plot of deception develops into a mature dramatic form centered around a single leading Vice as chief intriguer, master of moral and psychological persuasion and star actor in the literal as well as the metaphorical sense. This process of development has been thoroughly documented by Bernard Spivack, who also outilnes the specific conventions which come to be associated with the plot. ${ }^{1}$ Many of these conventions crystallize around an implied theatrical metaphor of eacting a part which is at once particularly appropo riate to the stage and powerfully reflects the original allegory of evil masquerading as good. Reauced to their essentials, these conventions may be described as the three fundamentals of the actor ${ }^{\theta}$ role: costume (physical disguise), false name, and false face (the metaphorical mask ${ }^{(1)}$. Not all of these devices appear In each play: but from them arise a whole complex of playaacting associations which enrich and intensify the original metaphor.

The theological ideas behind this metaphor would still retain a powerful meaning for the Tudor-Elizabethan adience. L. Go Salingar, who parallels Spivack's approach by tracing the morality influence in three plays of the Jacobean period, sugs gests its firm hold on popular thought:

Symbolic disguising - - was a stock convention of the Moralities; sometimes there is a change of dress, sometimes only of name. This was not merely a convention of the stage; it embodied
popular beliefs about the methode of the Deceiver - whe devil hath power To assume pleasing shapeo ${ }_{2}$

On the other hand, it also reflects the psychological truth earlier expounded by Pope Gregory. As Spivack puts it. the "dramatic image of the Vice, particularly in his assumption of a euphemistic relse name but implied in all aspects of his deceptions also reflects Man $s$ infinite capacity for self-deception:

-     - he is at bottom a personification of a fault in human nature. He dissembles his name and quality because it is an obvious trait of frall humanity to disguise under a fair semblance the moral evil to which life is prone. . . This characteristic effort of human nature to miscall by a palatable name the evils to which it is addicted is a constant theme of the morelities

The habit of expressing these ideas in theatrical terms (perhaps all the moxe powerful because thes are popular stereotypes and stereotypes usually depend on elemental facts of human nature) pervades the thought of the time both in ilterary and none literary forms. There would hardly be spece here for a detalled demonstration. But before going on to specific manifestations of the theatrical metaphor in the moralities, it might be instructive to glance at a few smples outside the eenre, in order to suggest that the plays were not merely monstructed from the cobwebs of theoretical divinitym often by amateur well-meaning clergymen, as one influential critic has claimed. ${ }^{4}$ but that they shared in a widespread imaginative way of looking at evil which would strike an immediate response in their audiences.

An illustration reproduced by T. w . Crait of The Triumph of pecunia (by Ph. Gaile, 1563) unites the areas of the graphic
arts and the allegorical pageant. Becunia is shown as a queen In gorgeous robes standing in the traditional chariot: with one hand she casts her cloak over a crouching ruffian whose label reads, Latrocinium (wrobbery with violencen)。 The Latin text, es translated by cralk, reads:

Deady Peril and anxious Fear, yoked together in thy chariot. 0 Queen Money. But because thou dost cloak Folly. Theft. and bloody Murder, therefore the strong hope of all these rests in thee.

As Craik coments, Pecunia's gesture milustrates the relationship between metaphor and action so often seen in the interludes. 5

The following pascage from 2 non-literary prose work makes even more explicit the theological as well as the thearrical image:

For then Sathan being a disguised person amongst the French, in the likenesse of merry leaster [i,e. Rabelals] acted a comoedie. but shortly ensued a wofull Tragedie. When our countriemens minds were sick, and corrupted with these pestilent diseases. then came forth the boois of Machiavell. a most pernicious writer. which began not in secret and stealing manner (as did those former vices) but by open meanes, and asit were a continuall assault, utteriy destroged, not this or that vertue, but even all vertues at once

Ironically, this extract from Simon Patericke's Epistle Dedicatory ${ }^{m}$ to his translation of Innocent Gentillet's attack on Machiavelli (1577) is cited by Tucker Brooke in the course of discussing the revolutionary influence of the machiavelilan vilo lain on Ellzabethan dreme. 6 He does not appeer to notice that patericke, by framing his argument in terms of what might be called a miniature morality play plot, may also demonstrate the influence of the theological idea behind the morality plays in Iraming the Elizabethan opinion of Machiavelli.

In the field of non-dramatic poetry, the most obvious example which comes to mind is Spenser's The Faerle queene. Here too one might say that the Psychomachia as open conflict. represented by the Red Cross Knightos battles with such obvious antagonists as monsters and giants, is in its long-lasting effects less morally destructive than the evil wrought by Duessa dise guised as the fair Fidessa, or Archimago disguised as a pious hermit. Spenser sums up the issue in the following verse:

> What man so wise, what earthly wit so ware. As to descry the crafty cunning traine. By which deceipt doth maske in visour iaire, And cast her colours dyed deepe in graineg To seem like Truth, whose shape she well can fainesi

The same point, in virtualiy the same words, is made in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, although in a setting far removed from theological allegory. Bassanio, debating before the caskets, delivers his famous speech on the deceptiveness of appearances, alternating in language between literal statement, metaphor based on symbolism, and metaphor based on persondflcation:

> So may the outward shows be least themselves: The world is still deceived with ornament.
> There is no vice so simple but assumes Some mark of virtue on his outward parts: Thus ornament is but the guiled shore To a most dangerous sea; the beauteous scarf Veiling an Indian beauty; in a word, The seeming truth which cunning times put on To entrap the wisest.
(III.11.73-101)

Spivack cites part of the above passage, pointing out its metaphorical association with the Vice ${ }^{0}$ s role in personifying

# - . the habitual selfadeception or bilndness of mankind to the real nature of the temptations to which it succumbs a subject which receives nowhere more searching ereatment than in the plays of Shakespeare, with their continual emphasis on appearance and reality:。. 8 

Ernest Strathmann points out the general relevance of this idea to the literature of the time, although he does not specifically mention the morality plays:


#### Abstract

In Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ}$ plays, as in the poems of Spenser and piltong falsehood has a goodiy outside which is not so readily penetrated by frail mortals. . . From the deceptions practiced by Spen. $\operatorname{ser}^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ Archimago and Duessa to the temptation of Eve by Milton ${ }^{\circ}$ s Satan, evil presented as a ${ }^{\text {afair appearing good }}$ is a recurrent theme of Elizabethan poets, dramatists, and tellers of talesa 9


The probability that the Elizabethan audience would recognize the moral and theological associations of such imagery is suggested in Madeleine Doran's general discussion of the influence of the morality plays in establishing an allegorical attitude of mind ${ }^{m}$ in playwrights and audiences allke. Even when the external devices of allegory have disappeared for survive only in late and degenerate examples), the habit of allegarical interpretation and use of language remains. This in turn paves the way for the more sophisticated use by the major Elizabethan dramatists of moral allegory submerged in poetic imagery. Doran goes on to suggest that the moral reference of the imagery would probably be spotted at once by the Elizabethan audience already alert to allegorical implications. 10
${ }^{m}$ The seeming truth which cunning times put on ${ }^{\circ}$ : Satan as * "disguised person" Money cloaking Murder: the obvious concrete correlative for these metaphorical expressions is costume, or
physical disguise. This device is not used in all the morality plays, but appears often enough to rank as a convention Lucifer in Wisdom Who Is Christ (c. 1450-1500), the earliest morality to make use of physical disguise best enacts and explains the reason why mithe devil hath power/ To assume a pleasing shape. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ First entering to the adience wearing a devilos dress over the costume of a galiant ${ }^{\text {m }}$ he explains in stark terms the theologio cal purpose behind his subsequent disguising, namely the damnation of man ${ }^{\circ}$ s souls a statement often not made explicitly in the later plays. although the implication is seldom absents

```
- . to tempte man in my lyknes.
yt wolde brynge him to grett feerfuliness.
I wyll change me inoto bryghtnes.
    \& so hym to beagy [1e].
Sen I rall schew hym perfyghtnes.
And wertu provyt yt wykkydnes:
Thus wndyr colors all thynge perverse;
    I mall neuer rest tyll the soule I defyle.
                                    (373080)
```

(Even here one may note the association of mbryghtnes and ${ }^{m}$ colors ${ }^{\infty}$ with disguised evil. a theme reiterated and expanded in later plays.) Lucifer then removes the devilos array he has worn to lecture the audience and reappears as a goodly gallantm to his victims.

Garments of dissuise are not used in any subsequent fifo teenthe or early sixteenthocentury moralities until Skelton ${ }^{\circ}$ Magnificence (c. 1515), although the same allegorical meaning lies behind the crude stratagems of the devil Titivillus in fankind. who makes himseli invisible and tempts the hero with false dreams. ${ }^{11}$ In Skelton's play, however, the use of disguise gives rise to a brief passage of satirical comedy which is a long way
from its stark allegorical setting in Wisdom. When the courtiero vice Cloaked Collusion first enters, his fellow-conspirators Fancy, Counterfeit Countenance, and Crafty Conveyance mock at h1m and pretend not to recognize him because he is dressed in priestes robes:

Cr. Conv. What is this he wereth a cope
Cl. Coll. Cappe syr I say you be to bolde. Fancy Se howe he is wrapped for the colde Is it not a vestment
Cl. Coll. A ye wante a rope

Cft. Count. Tushe it is syr Iohn double cloke
[sig. $\mathrm{B4}$ ]
${ }^{m}$ Sir John" is of course the contemptuous term for the illiterate。 roistering village priest mocked by Catholics and Protestants alike in a wide range of Tudor plays. But although this particular scene seems purely comic. the more sinister aspects of Cloaked Collusion ${ }^{\circ} s$ guise of piety soon become apparent, in an extended playmacting scene to be discussed later.

John Bale also uses clerical disguise for a satirical purpose which in this case is the polemical support of the Reformation. In one scene rrom King John (1538-1562) the device beo comes, as Craik describes it, mhighly dramatic, as well as a sharp instrument of satire. ${ }^{12}$ The leading Vice Sedition, who has been insolently explaining his true purpose to the mproteso tant mertyr King John whom he does not bother to deceive, 13 hurries away at the approach of his intended dupe. Nobility, despite the Kinges repeated efforts to detain him:

[^0]I shuld neuer elles, accomplych my dysyre
$\dot{I}$ wold no $\dot{\circ}$ be sene, as $I^{\circ}$ an, for fortye pence whan I am Relygyovse, I wyll returne agayne
(297-303)
Bale's use of morality devices for polemical purposes sometimes seems a shade forced. In the total context of this scene one rather suspects that the king, who has been previously ordering the knave out of his sight, now is made to restrain him primarily so that the playwright can fit in an extra stab at his enemies. But there is no doubt that Sedition's impudent escape, when acted, would be amusing and "good theatre. 14

In another "estates morality" of the Reformation, Sir
David Lindsay's Satire of the Three Estates ( $1540-1554$ ), the vices Flatterie, Falset and Dissait assume clerical disguises for the same satirical purpose. Lindsay, perhaps even more than the average Tudor dramatist, exploits every chance to draw the audience into the play: and the change of garments, in which the vices apparently receive their disguises from a confederate in the audience, involves a lively interplay between actors and spectators. "Hes na man Clarkis cleathing to len vs:" begs Flatterie (line 722), and later asks for the loan of a "portouns" (portable breviary) as stage property for his own disguise as a friar. Falset appeals to "sum gude fallow" for the loan of a hood (line 728). Dissait struts and admires himself in his clerkes garb; almost as it were automatically using the term "buskit" (or "dressed for a partm):

Now am I buskit and quha can spy,
The Deuill stik me gif this be I:
If this be I or not. I can not welli say. Or hes the Feind or Farle folk borne me away?
(729-32)

As in the scene already discussed in Magnificence, the initial effect seems purely comic. But its more sinister implications soon emerge at the approach of Hez Humanitas. their intended dupe, whose words in two closely following speeches demonstrate vividly the ironic interplay between deluded victim and conscious audience:

Ye ar welcum gude freindis be the Rude. Appeirandlie ye seime sum men of gude:
(841-2)
Ye ar richt welcum be the Rude, Ye seime to be thrie men of gude.
(926-7)
Lindsay carefully stresses Man ${ }^{\circ} s$ capacity to be gulled by outward "seeming ${ }^{*}$ : a matter of particular importance when the gull is also a king.

A third mestates morality ${ }^{m}$ of the Reformation, Respublica (1553), is unusual in being the only extant play which presents the Catholic side of the argument. Its overall tone of sharp but refined and relatively genial comedy sets it apart both from the savagery of Bale's satire and the more earthy humor of the morality plays in general. 15 But its use of the disguise convention fits in with a general trend of increasing theatrical elaboration. Avarice, the chief vice who continually scolds, instructs. and "stage-manages" his blundering colleagues, tells them that they must have "other garmentes" (which unfortunately are never described) and more than once frantically reminds them of their disguises:

All folke wyll take youe if theye plepe vnder your gome for the veriest catif in countrey or towne. (431-2)
hem, sirs, hem there, kepe your gownes close afore I saie have ye forgotten nowe whet I tolde youe one daye? (578-9)

Avarice himself does not change his apparel, but announces that he will turn his gown inside out and instructs Adulation, under his alias of Honesty, to help him. A scene of comic horseplay follows in which, as Leonard Magnus suggests, Adulation apparently tries to pick his pocket and, when indignantly told off impus dently "acts up to his new part" by retorting. "I counterfaicte honestie ${ }^{\text {m }}($ line 424$) .^{16}$

This scene is one of many in which Avarice demonstrates his nature by a constant and passionate concem for his purses of gold. which he drags about the stage, chides and croons over ( ${ }^{m p}$ Come on swete bags of golde. . . / I on youe soo tendre; and ye soo frowarde styll ${ }^{\omega}$ - 751-2), and anxiously defends from real and imagined thieves, including his om colleagues. These hints of a forerunner of Shylock might be supported by Craikos suggestion that Avarice wears the traditional usurer ${ }^{\circ}$ furred gown with moneybags attached Pront and back while he carries others in his arms. He turns his gown, as he himself explains, to hide the purses. ${ }^{17}$

The Vice Infidelity in Lewis Wager 8 The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene (c. 1558) demonstrates his own nature by having a "conuenient" disguise (and a name) for every purpose "Accordyng to my worke and operation (line 921). In this hybrid play which skillfully blends literal Scriptural story with a double Psychomachia plot against Mary and against the Jews, In* fidelity disguises himself for the latter in the robes of a

Pharisee, and for the former in ma gown and a cap" (line 404) which is not otherwise described but which, as Craik points out, would suggest me secular costume of a man of wealth and dignity 0 m8

Clothing the Vice in garments of middleoclass respecta bility is also a lively dramatic episode in wo Wageros Enough Is as Good as a Peast (c. 1560). On hearing that the Worldy Man has forsaken him, the Vice Covetous exclaims in alarm:

Body of me Precipitation, fetch me my gown: My Cap, and my Chain, I wil to the Town.
(sig. B3V)
Craikos sugeestion that these properties are meant to convey the 1dea of a wealthy burgessm 19 is borne out in the elaborate sequence which follows. Precipitation, true to the tradition which has by now developed of the blundering associate-vice, mistakenly brings him a cloak which as we have seen would have a thoroughly sinister association and is cursed for his stupidity. Later, after the traditional quarrel between the vices in which Covetous forces the others to acknowledge him as leader, he drives home his victory by making them help him on with his costume: mand then I wil see what curtsie you can maken (sig. C) o Like Dissait. and like Infidelity in Lewis Wager ${ }^{0} s$ play, he struts and admires himself in his costume, with a suggestion of the star "actor" rehearsing his part, and evokes Inconsideration's admiring exclamation:

[^1]$$
(\operatorname{sig}, C)
$$

Disguise in later plays, where for the most part literal translated or adopted storles are less skillfully grafted onto the Psychomachla plot, seems less effectively used, although the idea continues of cloaking wickedness in the dress of middeclass respectability. Tyranny in The Conflict of Conscience (c. 1572) changes his costume to an unspecified "graue Apparell" (11ne 733). but the device leads to no dramatic action. The Vice Ill Report in Virtuous and Godly Susanne (c. 1569) after the execution of the judges steals one of their scarlet robes in an artempt to escape defection. Haphazard in Appius and Virginia (c. 1564) does not need to disguise himself since his victim is already inclined to evil. but his introductory monologue is interesting in its references to socially acceptable garments and the suggestion that he can play many parts as occasion demands:

```
Who dippes with the Divel, he had neede haue a long spoone,
Yet a proper Gentileman i ari of truthe
Yea that may yee see by my long side gowne
Yea but what am I; a scholer, or a scholemaister, or els
    some youth,
A Lawier, a studient or els a countrie cloune
By the Gods, " I know not how best to deuise.
My name or my property, well to disgulse:
                                    (sig.[A4V]-B)
```

Discussing the dominance of stage disguise in Elizabethan dirama, one critic has dismissed its prior use in the morality plays as a ${ }^{\text {aspiritless muming of no importance compared with }}$ the zestful example of the Latin fable。 ${ }^{20}$ No one would deny the vital influence of Latin and Italian drame on Elizabethan comedy: and this critic ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ comment might be justified in relation to the
three plays last mentioned. But the lively dramatic use of *symbolic disguising" in the major works previously discussed would seem to oppose so sweeping a condemnation. Within these plays, the disguising of evil may be at once comic in its stage mechanics and tragic in its deeper implications; it thus points two ways toward future dramatic developments: Victor freeburg discusses the morality background of the comic Elizabethan mogue in multi-disguise, ${ }^{n}$ while M. C. Bradbrook (who defines disguise in its larger sense of "assumed personality") points out that it is the archetypal adisguise of the serpent ${ }^{m}$ in the moralities which Iends such strength to Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ}$ s concept of the false appearance or seeming: 21

The tragic consequence of the serpentos disguise is explicitly remenacted in Enough Is as Good as a Feast where, for the first time in the moralities, Satan accomplishes his desire as announced in Hisdon Wha is Christ and carries off to Hell the deluded and unrepentant mankind hero with no chance for his redemption after death. 22 Doctor Faustus, who like the worldiy Man destroys his own soul in exchange for the fulfillment of his worldiy ambition, enacts a final comment on the reason for the Devil's disguise as explained in wisdom. He recoils from Mephiso tophilis in an ${ }^{m}$ ugly likeness and charges him to ${ }^{m}$. . return an old Franciscan friar;/ That holy shape becomes a devil best ${ }^{\omega}$ (I.11.25-6). Less obvious, but equally significant allegorically, is his horrified revulsion at the hideous "woman devil" whom Mephistophilis obligingly fetches, in ironic contrast to his embracing of Helen, a fairer spirit of Hell whose lips "suck

Sorth his soul. 23 The poetry of this famous scene might tend to sweep away the reader. But it seems unlikely that the Elio zabethan audience would have failed to recognize the allegorical reference to delusion and self-delusion continually implied in the symbolic use of disguise in the morality plays.

The Vice's change of garment is always accompanied by a change of name. Even when physicel disguise is not used, the falsenaming convention, as Spivack points out, appears in nearly every morality play. He goes on to explain its absence in those few plays where it is not employed. Either the hero, as in Youth, is malready depraved upon his first appearance.; or, as In King Darius and Three Laws, the war between vice and virtue takes a more openly violent form; or the name, like that of Courage in The Tide Tarrieth No Man, is "surficiently equivocal" in itselfo ${ }^{24}$ The strength of this convention, and its intimate association with the playwrights ${ }^{\circ}$ view of contemporary life, is suggested with particular force in two widely separated plays where, since the Psychomachia appears largely in its original sense of open conflict and there is no clearly defined mankind hero, the vices do not need to adopt methods of deception.

The lament of Pity in the stocks in Hickscomer (c. 1513) contains, amid a general sermon on social evils of the time, the following complaint:

Alas now is lechery called loue in dede And murdure named manhode in euery nede Extorsyon is called lawe so god me spede worse was hyt neuer
(sig. B3)

Greatly expanded, the same satirical comment on man ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ ability to decelve himself is made by the Protestant preacher New Custom in the play of the same title (c, 1571):

Sinne nowe, no sinne, faultes no faultes a whit. 0 God, seest thou this, and yet wylt suffer hit? $\circ \circ{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} 0^{\circ} \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \cdot \circ$ Adulterie no vice, it is a thing so rife, A stale lest nove, to lie with an other mannes wfe. For what is that but dalliaunce? Couetousnesse they call Good husbandrle, when one man would faine haue all.
tho $0^{\circ}$ s $0^{\circ}$ will bee so ${ }^{\circ}$ drunken that hee scarsly knoweth his waye. 0 , hee is a good fellowe, so now a dales they saye. Gluttonie is Hospitalitie, while they meate, and drinke spill.
Theft is but poilicie, periurio but a race, Suche is now the worlde, so farre men be from grace.
(sig. $B-B^{V}$ )
In this rather stiff and lebored play, which some critics believe to be a reworking of an older morality, 25 the vices do in addition adopt false names. Ignorance becomes Simplicity; Cruelty, Justice with Severity: Avarice, Frugality; and Perverse Doctrine (who like the two rogues in Hickscorner starts as a typical vice figure but is forcibly converted) takes the name of Sound Doctrine which after his conversion is changed to Sincere Doctrine. But although there 18 much talk of a plot of deception, we never see it in action. The vices and virtues, when they actually meet, openly exchange threats, insults, and physical blows, again in a manner strongly reminiscent of Hickscorner although the comedy is less vivacious. It would seem that the author, aware of the falseonaming convention and its usefulness for polemical argument, was too unskilled as a playwright to use it dynamically.

In the hands of better playwrights, however, the falsenaming device is used with more theatrical liveliness to reflect
a variety of social and sectarian morals．Although there would not be space here for a full discussion，a few examples may give the general picture。

In Henry Medwal10 a Nature（c．1495）。Sensuality presents the relatively pure allegorical explanation for the euphemistic synonyms of the Seven Deadly Sins．He tells Worldiy Affection how Man，heving been introduced to the cardinal sin of Pride as Worship and having consequently banished feason（in a tavern brawl vividly described but unfortunately not enacted），has now called into his service the rest of the Sins．But，he further explains：

> - o mary there names be chaunged new For to blere hys eye iteli you he ys a serefull man For Reason styrreth hym now and than (Part I, $1203-6$ )

He goes on to list the pseudonyms which appear（mith slight varia－ tions）in numerous later plays although only once in their oris． ginal scheme of seven．Covetise is Worldiy Policy；Wrath is Manhood；Envy；Disdain；Gluttony，Good Fellowship：Lechery，Lust； and Sloth，Ease．${ }^{26}$ His final comment further points the moral：

> Lo these be fayre names parde Both good and honest as semeth me as for theyre condycyons what they be ye know well
（Part I。1228－31）
The final line might well be spoken with a significant glance at the audience，who would indeed mnow well the meaning of such ＂fayre and＂honest＂names．The Vice＇s ironic protestation of his＂honesty 1s，as Spivack points out，one of his outstanding attributes．？${ }^{2 ?}$

The false names of the courtier-vices in Magnificence mingle euphemistic synonym and ironic opposite. Counterfeit Countenances Crafty Conveyance; Clasked Collusion, and Courtly Abusion become respectively Good Demeanance, Sure Surveyance, Sober Sadness, and Lusty Pleasure. Fancy and his brother Folly, the comicosinister fools, become Largesse and Conceit. Robert L. Ramsay, who discusses the play exhaustively in terms of its Aristotelian philosophy and its problematic satire on Cardinal Wolsey, and whose lead in this respect most later critics of Skelton have followed, interprets the allases as illustrating the Aristotelian definition of virtue as the mean between two excesses. Thus Fancy is "prodigality" or "wanton excess, of which Largesse or "liberalitym is the corresponding virtue. He is forced to add, however, that me correspondence is not always quite logical. ${ }^{28}$ It is indeed difficult to see the logic: for instance, if Largesse is the "mean" and Fancy the mercess at one end of the scale, what character or name in the play is meant to represent mparsimony, which presumably would be the opposite excess?

Such problems of course disappear if one interprets the allases simply in terms of the psychomachia plot of deception without worrying overnuch about logical correspondences. Although the name of Fancy has no direct connection with the theological sins, its significance in terms of Renaissance psychology suggests that it would at once convey to the audience an lmage of the power of delusion. W. O. Harris. refuting Ramsay ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ interpretation. traces the etymology of the word in some detail, pointing out
that by Skelton ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{S}$ time $1 t$ would have been equated with pantasym or ${ }^{40}$ the fact or habit of deluding oneself into imaginary perceptions. He goes on to say:

In this light, one understands the character of Fansy within the play, who deludes with false appearances, whose letter shunts reason (Cyrcumspeccyon) aside, whose deception eventually looses the restive will (Lyberte) from its proper restraint.

Thus Fancy, not Pride, is the allegorical moot of all evilw who deprives man of reason, and thus it is he who first accosts the Prince and who devises most of the intrigue. He takes the name of Largesse because it is the quality most likely to appeal to princes. This purpose is made clear when he first appears to Mage nificence and Felicity:

Fel. Nowe leue this Iargelynge and to vs expounde why that ye sayd our langage wes in vayne
Fancy Mary vpon trouth my reason I grounde That without largesse noblenesse can not rayne
Magn. Nowe I beseche the teil me what $1 \dot{\circ}^{\circ}$ thy name Fancy Largesse that all lordes sholde loue syr I hyght [sig. A4 A4V]

In an amusing aftermath to this scene, Counterfeit Countea nance almost gives the show away by entering before his "cuem and calling Fancy by name while the latter frantically motions him to silence. Fancy ingeniously talks his way out of the trouble by exploiting the typical viceos trick of verbal gymnastics: It was a flemynge hyght hansy (sig。B)。30 Arter the Prince and Felicity exit, their suspicions appeased, Fancy lingers behind to curse and berate his fellowactor ("I hate this blunderyng that thou doste maken - sig. B2) and tells him to stay out of sight until he has
time for him. This is a comic scene which would be highly effective on stage, but the playmacting associations of Fancy*s role are entirely consistent with his more evil aspect.

In another morality concerned with affalrs of state, the use of false names takes an interesting new direction. Bale in King John takes the revolutionary step of combining the Psychom machia plot with historical chronicle. The vices Sedition, Prio vate Wealth, Dissimulation, and Usurped Power "become" respectively the historical characters Stephen Langton, Cardinal Pandulphus, Simon of Swinsett, and the Pope. As several critics have noted. this leads to an "element of uncertainty" about their roles, based on the alternate choices of doubiing parts in a genuine change of identity or allegorical disguise in the Psychomachia tradition. 31 It is in any case clearly a transitional situation. as suggested most concretely in a cancelled addition to the m $A^{m}$ text of the manuscript reproduced in the melone society edition. In this passege, the monk Dissimulation who poisons the martyrking does so not under the name of simon of Swinsett, but that of Monastical Devotion. 32 But in the rinal ma version, writien probably in Bale $s$ own hand, he introduces himself under the historical nameg retaining the other only as an epithet:

> Simon of Swynsett, my very name is per dee I am taken of men, for monastycall deuocyon (2054-5)

Perhaps nowhere in the moralities is the open fusion of literal realism and allegory demonstrated more economcally. The epithet of "honest Iago, whose connection with the morality Vice it is

Spivackis mejor purpose to demonstrate, may be seen as Shakespeare $s$ perfection of this fusing process.

There is in Bale $s$ play little attempt at theatrical realism in the use of false names. But, perhaps inevitably, the playwrights soon discover the comic possibilities inherent in making the blundering conspiratore forget their aliases and have to be prompted or mehearsed by their colleagues. The rudiments of this device may be seen briefiy in Nature, when sloth rebukes Pride for calling him by his true nare ("I haue a new name as well as ye - Part II, 381), but then relents and says it is only necessary when Man is present. In some of the hybrid plays the convention seems to degenerate into mere coyness, as when Ambidexter in Cambises (c. 1561) teases the audience by pretending to forget his name: or when Politick Persuasion in Patient and Meek Grissill (c. 2559) for no good reason pretends he cannot remerber his name when he introduces himself to the Marquis. But In two of the better plays, the device of roxgetting the name is used with genuine comic effectiveness which at the same time deftly reinforces the moral benind the false name.

In the Satire of the Three Estates, the vices Flatterie, Palset and Dissait change their names to Devotion Sapience and Discretion in a mock-baptism ceremony, unique among the moralities. which would make excellent meatre. 33 Falset, however, promptiy forgets his new name when introduced to the king and in a sharp aside by Dissait, is rebuked for being mot weillmwititw (line 856) . Flatterie nimself is finally forced to make the introduction. When the King asks "Sapience why he could not have told
his own name, he makes the amusing excuse that:

> I am sa full of Sapience, That sumtyme I will tak ane trance. My spreit was reft fra my bodie. Now heich aboue the Trinitie.
(864-7)
Lindsay economically combines a comic interval with a sailrical stab at monkish mystical irances.

In Respublica, the vices Avarice, Insolence, Oppression, and Adulation take the names of Policy, Authority, Reformation, and Honesty. During the conspiracy scene (when of course their victim Respublica is absent), the comic blunderer Adulation is so delighted with his new name that in his boastful exclamations he forgets the ralse names of his fellow-conspirators: "Howe saie you Insolence? I am nowe Honestie... Oh frende Oppression, Honestie, Honestie $e^{\omega}(393,396)$. For this he 1 s sharply rebuked by Avarice, who thus appears as a kind of actor-manager in a Stanislavsky-like insistence that they play their parts at all times. The suggestion of "rehearsal" scene continues when Avarice attempts to teach Adulation their allases (which he ino sists on miscalling Hypocrisy, Defamation and Deformation) by making him parrot them by rote and by dividing them into syllables. This device of schoolboy humor appars in two other probable children's plays of the period, Wht and Science and The Longer Thou Livest. But the mispronounced names are not merely comedy for its own sake; they additionally embody a pointed satirical comment on the false names themselves.

Moros, the hero of Wo Wager's The Longer Thou Livest the

More Fool Thou Art (c. 1559), is too wilfully stupid to learn even the false names of his would-be deceivers, let alone understand the meaning of their real names. ${ }^{35}$ The vice Wrath makes the latter point clear. In the traditional conspiracy scene, the purpose of which in all the plays is to prepare the audience fully to appreciate the irony of the herons gullibility, Ideness and Incontinencie put forth the usual allegorical explanation:

```
Idi. With me he is very well aqueinted, For all his bringing vp hath been with me, So that any vertue he could neuer se: Therfore pastime he calleth me alway, In plaies and games he hath no measure, Incontinencie to him thou must say, That thy name is called pleasure.
Inc. I am called so with them that be wise, Wrath is wonte to be called manhode.
```

$$
\left[\begin{array}{lll}
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\end{array}\right]
$$

But Wrath ${ }^{0}$ s literal-minded objectiong in terms which almost parody the entire convention, suggests at once the mankind hero $s$ developing autonomy and the play's transitional nature:

> In good faith litle needeth this deulse, To be called by our names is as good: Doth he know what Idlenesse doth meane, Knoweth he incontinencie to be leacherie, He discerneth not cleane from vncleane, His minde is all set on foolerie. [sigo c3]
"Wrath is wonte to be called manhode." Thus Wrath, one of the original Seven Deadly Sins, was designated in Nature. But by now the hero can enact the metaphor in h1s own person. Wager constantly stresses Moros ${ }^{0}$ irrational wrath and his deluded bellef in the mappearance of Manhood symbolized by the beard and the sword. The tone at first is comic, as when the adolescent Moros flourlshes his new sword ("How say you, like a man do I
not looke, ${ }^{m}$ sig. D) or enters ${ }^{m} G a l l y$ disguised and with a foolish beard ${ }^{m}$ and triumphantly exclaims. ${ }^{m}$ I thought that I should be a man ones, (sig. E3). It becomes more sinister when as a man elevated to high rank by Fortune ${ }^{0} s$ whim, he grasps his sword and rails against all who would oppose him:

Am I in authoritie do you say.
May I hang, burne, head and kill,
Let them be sure I will do what I may,
I will be knowne in authoritie that i will.
[81g. E4]
(Moros, the "angry ape" capering in his "brief authority, " striko Ingly foreshadows the famous lines in Measure for Measure.) Finally, the play ends in grim disaster when the greyobearded Moros, brainsick and raving, strikes with his sword at hallucinam tions and is carried off to Hell by Confusion. It is impossible within a short space to do justice to the combination of the grotesque and the tragic in Moros progressive degeneration; but he is certainly the most strongly individualized hero to appear in any morality play up to this time。 36

In Lewis Wager's The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene. the theological allegory reappears in full force in the opening monologue of the chief Vice Infidelity, who as noted above has a false name and disguise for all occasions. Infidelity invokes all seven of the original Deadiy Sins; which sometimes seem fors gotten in the plays with more secular lessons although the implio cation is seldom absent:

[^2]> As these: Pride I use to call cleanlynesse, Enule I colour with the face of prudence, Wrathe putteth on the coate of maniynesse, Couetise is profite in euery man's sentence;
> Slouth or idlenesse I paint out with quiete, Gluttonie or excesse I name honest chere,
> Lechery, vsed for many men ${ }^{\circ}$ diete, I set on with the face of loue, both farre and nere. (37-48; italics mine)

This speech, with its striking association of theological evil and its theatrical overlay of mask, paint and cosmetics, may serve to introduce the third aspect of the Vice as "actor": his skill at assuming a false face or ${ }^{\text {mask }}{ }^{\infty}$ of kindilness, grief. or piety. As Spivack puts it:

- . . part of the Vice ${ }^{0}$ s talent in deceit is his virtuosity in the art of false faces. "Two faces in a hode couertly I bere, " says Cloaked Collusion in Magnificence, and his comment on himself applies to the Vice generally. He has one countenance for his dupe and another for his audience, and the rapid transformation of his features, depending on which way his business lies, is a standard and sensational part of his repertory; His quality as a personification of evil gets its typical anthropomorphic expression through his vulgarity, insolence, cynicism, scorn, and triumphant hilarity .... But when he appears to his victim it is with a "grave countenance," full of pious solicitude. 37

A more extreme example of such duplicity, Spivack goes on to say, lies in the Vice's talent for weeping and laughter: weeping in pretense of affection for his victim, and laughter in triumphantly driving home to the audience the irony of the victions delusion:

To look piteous, to shed tears plentifully, and to howl dismally are the inveterate method of the Vice with his victim - his grappling irons whereby he boards the human soul. They show his affection, his compassion, his moral refinement: and compose the - flag and sign of loven behind which evil moves into position for its destructive assault. 38

This talent leads inevitably to brief and extended playacting scenes where the Vice ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ skill in "the art of false faces" reflects his skill as psychological persuader as well as "actor" and (In some cases) as manager, where in addition he instructs others how to play their parts. In these scenes specific refers ence to the false face is not always made; but if one visualizes the stage performance, one must of necessity picture the facial expression attending it。 Several allusions by the vices themselves suggest the playwrights conscious application of the theatrical metaphor: In our tragedie we may not vse our owne names"; "thowgh we playe the knavys, we must shew a good pretence"; "to hold all thynges vp, I play my part now \& than": "he can play too parts the foole and the K. [knave] \% . . . . now will I goe playe will sommer agayne. 39 "Farewel my masters our partes we haue playd. ${ }^{\text {w }}$ says the Vice Covetous at the end of Enough Is as Good as a Feast (sig. G); and he has indeed played his part superbly, for he has succeeded in sending his victim to Hell. This conscious theatrical association, as Anne Righter points out, is perhaps inevitable:

It was with the brilliant, unscrupulous figure of the Vice that the age-old connection of the actor with the deceiver seems first to have entered English drama. Even before he had acquired a capital letter and command over all other evil forces in the play, the Vice possessed a quality which associated him naturally with the actor. Both of them, as the Puritans liked to point out, were essentially hypocrites. As counterfeits, deep dissimus lators, they persuaded honest men of things which were not so and, to aid them in their task, assumed names and costumes not their owno 40

But the association goes beyond a mere general resemblance, for the Vice often demonstrates as well as describes his acting*
abilities linked with his metaphorical maskso Recalling M. C. Bradbrook ${ }^{\circ}$ s definition of disguise as assumed personality (see note 21 above), one may see in the Vice the rudiments of such impersonation.

The mask of friendiy affection is the oldest of all, ime plied in the wheeding accents of the vice covetise in The Castle of Perseverance (c. $1405-1425$ ) as he lures Pankind from the safety of his Castle:


In a much later play, Nathaniel woodes The Conflict of Conscience (c. 1572), the mask of the friend is blended with the literal role of the Inquisitor in the extended playaacting sequence of the trial scene. 41 psychologically persuasive technique of "We re your best friends if only you knew your own interests" which will be familiar to readers of Orwell and other writers on the devices of the "braino washer." When Philologuss still resisting the attempt to make hin denounce his Protestant faith, is threatened with torture, Hypocrisy plays the role of kindly friend:

Good Maister Philologus, I pittie your case, To see you so foolyshs your selfe to vndoo: I durst yet promys to purchase you grace. If you would (at length) your errours forgoe: Therfore, I pray you, be not your owne roe.
(1278.82)

Later he applies the same type of "friendy" psychological presc sure, commenting on the cardinal"s unusual forbearance (wi neuer saw my Lord so pacient before, - line 1572), but warning Philo logus that he had better not presume too far. Sensuality, who finally wins the victory with his enticing vision of worldy wealth and glory, also plays the role of pitying friend:
-. God saue you, good gentleman,
To see your ereat sorrom, my heart doeth welnigh bleede: But what is the cause of your trouble and dreede? Disdaine not to me your secrets to tell: A wise man sometime, of a fool may take counsell. (1481-5)

The psychology rests shrewaly on the superdor destructiveness of the Psychomachia as deception. Philologus, who iaces with courage the open threat of torture, is softened for his final yieiding by the technique of friendly persuasion.

The false face of the friend often assumes a pretense of grief or injury whereby the Vice draws back his wavering victim. ${ }^{\omega}$ Friendship" (Hypocrisy) in A 。Wever ${ }^{\theta}$ s Lusty Juventus (c. 1550) cleverly tricks the hero into acknowledging him as an old friend; when Juventus at first claims not to recognize him, he enacts a little scene of injured humility and sententious moralizing on the evils of the time:

> A poore mans tale cannot nowe be heard As in yymes past.
> I cry you mercy, I was somewhat bolde Thinking that your mastershyp would Not haue byne so straunge: But now I perceue, that promocson causeth both man, maners and fashion, Greatly for to chaunge. [sig. C3]
"Charity" (Envy) in Xmpatient Poverty (c. 1547) uses the same stratagem: first tricking the hero into acknowledging him as "cosyn" by sly reference to the bags of gold locked in his chest at home, then cementing his victory by the injured comment, wowe I am your kynsman because of my good/ Before of me he hadde dysdayne ${ }^{n}$ (sig. $C 2^{V}$ ) and forcing his victim to apologize.

As Spivack points out (see note 38 above), the mask of grief of ten takes the more vivid dramatic form of hypocritical tears. Sensuality in Nature resorts to such a show of hurt feelings when Man has deserted his old companions the Seven Deadly Sins and (temporarily) returned to Reason. The following ironic play-acting episode would be particulariy effective on stage:
Man Why wepe ye so Then he wepyth [stage direction]
Senso me alone
It wyll none other wyse be
and ye saw the sorowfull countenaunce
of my cumpany your old acquayntaunce
that they make
For your sake
I dare say ye wold mone theym in your mynde
They be so louyng and so kynde
(Part II, 8l-90)

The Vice "Courage" (Revenge) in Horestes stiffens the hero's wavering resolve by a melodramatic flood of tears: $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{ol}}^{0} 00$, you care not for me; nay sone I haue don I warrant ye (sig。 $D^{v}$ )。 Courage, it might be noted, has introduced himself to Horestes as a messenger from the gods on Olympus: another example of pagan deities set in a context of evil and deception.

An extended scene enacting the metaphorical mask of the grieving friend comes in $W$. Wager ${ }^{\circ}$ s Enough Is as Good as a Feast.

Both Spivack and Creik have analyzed this scene in detail: the former to show the Vice's skill as tempter and the latter to demonstrate the theatrical effectiveness of the Tudor interlude as a stage performance. ${ }^{42}$ A few extracts from this lengthy episode may serve to suggest its dramaric impact. "Policy" (Covetous), after cleverly maneuvering to one side the virtuous counselor Enough, pretends that he cannot speak for weeping:

Oh Sirs oh good Sir, oh, oh, oh my hart wil breke: Oh, oh, for sorow God wot I cannot speak. (sig。D)

When the Worldy Man asks what is the matter, "Ready Wit" (Precipitation) supports the role:

Pure looue causeth him, Sir I wus. I am sure that he looues you at the hart.
(sig. D)
When begged to cease his tears, Covetous outdoes even the Vice of Horestes, as specified in the stage direction: wet the Vice weep \& houle \& make great lamentation to the Worldiy Man. ${ }^{\infty}$ At the same time he shows his skill as psychologist by playing on his victimos curiosity:

I cannot chuse, oh, oh, I cannot chuse:
Whow? I cannot chuse if my life I shuld loose。
To hear that $I$ hear, oh wel it is no matter: Oh, oh, oh, I am not he that any man wil flatter. (sig. D)

Further pressed. Covetous finally reveals the "cause of his grief. In an ironic statement that would not be lost on the audience, he claims that the Worldiy Man is accused of covetousness and of deserting his old friends whom he used to entertain so lavishly:

Couetouse，couetouse，euery man saith you be： To hear my freend il spoken or 1 I had rather dye． Think you that it greeueth me not to hear éche boy and Girle： To say that the worldily man is become a Churle？
（sig。 $D^{\text {（ }}$ ）
The victim is now almost caught；and having been partially won over by the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ s skill as＂actor＂and psychological persuader， he is brought to his downfall by another aspect of the Vice ${ }^{0} s$ tempting methods（which will be discussed in the next chapter）： namely，his skill as logical＂reasoner＂and moral sophist．${ }^{43}$
＂Honest Iago，that look＇st dead with grievingo＂No one of Shakespeare ${ }^{0}$ s villains more consistently enacts the Vice ${ }^{0}$ s hypocritical part of the grieving，loving friend，as Spivack has convincingly demonstrated．But the play－acting associations of the mask of affection appear in other works of Shakespeare even when not linked with so striking a Vice figure．Macbeth and Lady Macbeth＂bear welcome＂to their kinsman Duncan and later to their banquet guests with smiling hospitality，but instruct one another on how to play their parts：

Your face，my thane，is as a book where men May read strange matters．To beguile the time，
Look like the time；bear welcome in your eye， Your hand，your tongue；look like the innocent flower， But be the serpent under ${ }^{\circ} t$ ．
（I。V．63－7）
Away，and mock the time with fairest show：
False face must hide what the false heart doth know． （I。v11．81－2）

And make our faces vizards to our hearts， Disguising what they are．
（III．11．34－5）

Claudius in Hamlet, who is both a wice of Kings" and a tortured human murderer, hypocritically declares his fatherly "nobility of love" for Hamlet, who in turn describes him as one who can "smile, and smile, and be a villain;" (III.1v.98; I.11.110; I.v.108). Claudius himself invokes the image of the mask and cosmetics in a speech revealing his human agonies of conscience: 44

The harlot's cheek, beautied with plastering art.
Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it
Than is my deed to my most painted word:
(III.1.51-3)

In each of these cases the moral allegory, though transformed into poetic imagery, is nonetheless identical with the morality play habit of looking at evil as deception.

The vices, too, rehearse their own false faces and instruct others in the art. "... how like you this countenaunce? ${ }^{m}$ Covetous in W. Wager's play demands of Precipitation, who gives his approval: ${ }^{\text {WVery }}$ comely and like a person of great gouernaunce (sig. C). In Mary Magdalene, when Infidelity asks his fellowconspirators how they like him in his new role, they tease him about his face being unsuitable to his respectable garment. Ino fidelity obligingly alters his expression (taking the chance for the traditional stab at monastical immorality), but ends with a sharp reminder about their own roles:

Like obstinate friers I temper my looke, Which had one eie on a wench, and an other on a booke.o passion of God, behold, yonder commeth Marie. See that in your tales none from other do varie.
(413-16)
Private Wealth in King John rebukes Sedition for his outburst of triumphant laughter at the success of their plot:

Holde thy peace whorson, I wene thu art accurst Kepe a sadde countenaunce, a very vengeaunce take the (1712-13)

In each case the tone is comic: but in the total context of the Psychomachia plot, the purpose is deadly serious.

In two hybrid plays where the Psychomachia plot is grafted onto a literal story, the Vice so instructs not subordinate vices (who no longer exist as such), but his victim who also becomes his fellow-conspirator. Politick Persuasion in John Phillipos Patient and Meek Grissill (c.1559) tells the Marquis:

You must counterfaite that Doller may amply abound: Let trickinge teares be nowe dystyld apace.

And in the scene which follows, where the Marquis pretends that Grissill's child must be slain to appease the anger of the commons against him, the Marquis perfectly performs the role of grieving father thus assigned to him. Later, when the faltering "actor" is almost overcome by Grissili's extraordinary ${ }^{\circ}$ patience, ${ }^{\circ}$ the Vice stiffens his resolve and sharply reminds him to keep a "sterne" countenance and "playe the man" (1583-7). 45

The rudimentary plot of domestic slander inherent in this play also appears in Thomas Garter ${ }^{\circ}$ Sirtuous and Godiy Susanna (c. 1569): and here again the Vice's victims ably perform the roles he sets out for them. Ill Report promises immunity for the judges ${ }^{\circ}$ desired seduction of Susanna by offering to spread a false report against her virtue which they will support by their grave demeanor and "demure countenaunce (1ine 569). After Susanna has shown herself truly "virtuous and godly" by refusing
them, Sensualitas and Voluptas duly enact their roles of false virtue and puritanical indignation for the benefit of her servants (the scene might also be regarded as "rehearsal" for their later accusations at Susanna's trial)。 First hinting that they have seen a shameful sight, but will weepe it close, till Ioachim may it know (line 780), they then address Susanna:

Sens. Come away, come away, in fayth Madame, you are a secrete whore
Fuil long haue I mistrusted it, though I tooke you not before.
Vol. A whore, yea vyle and fylthye whore, fye on it fylthy acte.
(793-5)
One is reminded of the subtler macting abilities of Don John, the slanderer of huch Ado About Nothing:

> Fie, fied they are not to be named, my lord, Not to be spoke of,
> There is not chastity enough in language Without offence to utter themo Thus, pretty lady, I am sory for thy much misgovernment.
(IV.1.96-100)

In the former two plays the Vice figure seems awtwardly forced into the interal story where, from the plot point of view, he is an unnecessary addition. But it is interesting that both authors stress the playacting associations of the borrowed allegory. The mask of virtue, grief, or affection takes its most dramatically ironic form when the Vice also assumes a guise of Christian piety. An episode from Impatient Poverty demonstrates most economically the mask of plety and the Vice ${ }^{0}$ s double face for victim and audience. After tricking Conscience into fleeing the land by telling him that a warrant is out for his arrest, he
speeds him with pious tears and then triumphantly invites the audience to share the joke:
I shall pray for you, praye ye for me.
Thys is an heauy departynge plora
I can in no wyse forbeare wepynge
yet kysse me or ye go
For sorowe my harte wyll breke in two.
Is he gone, then haue at laughynge
A syr is not thys a ioly game
That conscience doeth not knowe my name
Enuy in fayth I am the same
what nedeth me for to lye
I hate conscience, peace loue and reste
Debate and stryfe that loue I beste
Accordyng to my properte
(sig. $C^{v}$ )

As Spivack comments, "What need to lie indeed: Between the Vice and his audience understanding is perfect....0 ${ }^{47}$ This twoo dimensional relationship between actors and audience will be further discussed in the final chapter: but it might be remarked here that the ironic juxtaposition of false plety, true whate, ${ }^{n}$ and the Vice's delight in his own "acting" skill strongly recalls the theological nature of evil even in this apparently secular play.

This triple juxtaposition perhaps reaches its dramatic climax in the figure of Richard III, who has been interpreted by Anne Righter and by Sldney Thomas as a major descendant of the Vice as self-conscious mactor。 ${ }^{48}$ His famous wooing of the Lady Anne and its even more audacious counterpart when he begs the Queen Ellzabeth for her daughter ${ }^{\circ}$ s hand: these scenes are well-known samples of Richard ${ }^{\circ}$ s virtuosity as mactor." In another audacious playacting scene, he reluctantly appears before the London citizens, flanked by two reverend fathers, and
graciously allows his rellowoconspirator and actorm Buckingham to apologize for interrupting his devotion and right Christian zealn (IIIovil.103). His continual delight in his own skill is equally typical; as illustrated in his exiumphani speech from III Henry VI:
Why $I$ can mile and murder whiles I smile,
And freme my face to $211^{\circ}$ occasions.
Ioli piay thé oretior as meli as Nestor.
Decelve more sllly than Ulysses could.
And, like sinon, take another Troy.
I can add colours to the chameleon.
Change shapes with Proteus for advantages,
And set the murderous fiachlavel to school:
(III。15.182093)

Spivacts notes the important fact that agsiring Catainnappears instead of machiavel in an earlier version. 49 To this denial of Machiavelli as the sole and exclusive progenitor of the Machiaveliian villain" one might add the significant reference to Proteus in a context strikingly close to the idens of st. Augustine quoted in the Preface.

Richardea generic prototype, as Sidney Thoms puts it. may be termed mthe Vice Dissimulation. 50 The monk Dissimulation in King Johno who poisons the King as Simon of Swinsett (monaso tycall deuocyon ${ }^{(1)}$ by his nature apprasches his victim under a pious aspect. The following erchange of dialogue between the King, the "widow England, and Dissimulation recalls. in its repeated ironic underlining of the monk $s^{\text {m }}$ seeming ${ }^{\text {m }}$ the scene already cited Irom the Satire of the Three Estetes:

> King Who is that Englande, I praye the stepp fourth and see Eng. He doth seme a farre, some relygyouse man to be D1ss. Now Iesus preserue, your worthye and excellent grace for doubtlesse there 18, a very Angelyck face
> King $\AA$ louynge [gentie] persone, thu mayest seme for to be (2044-51)

The scene which follows builds up considerable tension and ironic 1mpact as Dissimulation presses the poisoned cup on the King under a guise of kindly concern (for he had "hearde" he was weary and thirsty), tries at first to evade John's request that he drink half as a toast to him, then accedes and dies a "martyr" $\mathrm{s}^{\prime \prime}$ death along with his victim. ${ }^{51}$

But the most complex and powerful scene of false piety, almost amounting to a play-within-a-play, appears in Magnificence when "Sober Sadness" (Cloaked Collusion), disguised in priest's robes, brings about the banishment of Measure while pretending to intercede for him. This scene brings together and sums up most of the separate elements discussed in this chapter. Again one sees the rudiments of the plot of slander, perhaps always $1 \mathrm{~m}-$ plicit in the attempt to separate the hero from his virtuous counselor. 52 Inherent in making evil appear to be good is the opposite suggestion of making good appear evil: "Pair is foul, and foul is fair. ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ Or, to paraphrase Lucifer ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ less equivocal words in the speech already cited from wisdom, part of his end is to prove that virtue is wickedness. Skelton ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ play might seem to have little connection with this theological point; but if one follows Harris' lead in considering the entire play as it stands in the morality tradition, rather than only as Aristotelian philosophy or political satire (see note 29 above), the lesson
becomes clearer. The banishment of Measure is the final step In Magnificence ${ }^{9}$ downiall which leads him to despair and attempted suicide, the cerdinal sin in Medieval theology.

The scene is carefully prepared. Pancy paves the may, as proposed by Crafty Conveyance:

```
what and I rrame suche a slyght
That fansy with his fonde consayte
Put magnyfycence in suche a madnesse
That he shall have you in the stede of sadnesse [e.g. Measure]
And sober sadnesse shalbe your name
                                    (sig. C)
```

Cloaked collusion in his expository monologue tells the audience what to expect as he boasts of his skill as actorg his double face, and his skill as psychologist:

I can dyssemble $I$ can bothe laughe and grone
Two faces in a hode couerriy $\mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ bere

- $\circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$
whan other men laughe than study $I$ and muse Deuysynge the meanes and wayes that $I$ can
Howe I may hurte and hynder euery man
Paynte to a purpose good countenaunce I can.
And craftely can I grope howe euery man is mynded. $\left(s 1 g\right.$ 。 $\left.C-C^{V}\right)$

The actual scene in which Measure falls from favor is only rea ported; but it would seem that he has been provoked into a quarrel with Crafty Conveyance and Fancy (m.。- crossed than with a chalke. . . by a praty slyght sig. C3 ${ }^{\text {ºn }}$ ) and will soon be deposed altogether.

When Magnificence next appears on stage his mind is already corrupted (as sarowed when he gives, felledty over to the bupero vision of Fancy and Liberty); and "Sober Sadness" in his pretended
intercession does not need further to deceive him. His primary dupe in this scene is Measure himselfo for whom he enacts an extended "play" of the grieving friend. Cleverly stationing Measure at a sare distance where he can see the action but only hear the lines if loudly spoken, he kneels before the Prince in a guise of pious humility:

> Hlease it your grace at the contemplacyon of my pore instance and supplycacyon Tenderly to consyder in your aduertence of our blessyd lorde syr at the reuerence Remembre the good seruyce that mesure hath you done And that ye wyll not cast hym away so sone

$$
\left[8 i g \cdot E 3-E 3^{V}\right]
$$

Speaking aside, he readily admits to the Prince that he is only pretending to intercede in order to mearn" his bribe; and Mago nificence, in his corrupted state, applauds his cleverness and reluctantly agrees to put on a show of letting Measure approach him. While Cloaked Collusion departs to fetch him, Courtly Abuo sion praises $n i s$ confederate as a wyse mang and the irony of the Princes reply would not be lost on the audience: An honest person I tell you and a sad" [8ig. E4]. Even more pointediy ironic is the exchange between "Sober Sadness and Measure as they approach the Prince:

Coll. By the masse I have done that I can And more than euer I dyd for ony man I trowe ye herde yourselfe what I sayd
Meas. Nay in dede but I sawe howe ye prayed And made instance for me be lykelyhod

The noly goost be with your grace
[sig. E4]
Measure then attempts to plead his own case before the Princes but is angrily refused and ordered out of his sight.

Magniflcence then falls into a violent and uncontrolled fit of rage (as Courtiy Abusion has previously instructed him on how a prince should act if anyone displeases him) and is physically 111 while "Sober Sadness" ministers to him and holds his head. 53 The oncewtruated officer provoked into a braml which leads to his banishment; his replacement by the Vice pigure; the pretended intercession; the fit of rage: the parallel to Iago ${ }^{\circ} \beta$ role in othello, if not exact in all details, is nonetheless strikings although curiously enough no critic appears to have noted the connection with this particular scene. 54 cloaked collusion, though less subtle in his methods than Iago, is also a selfostyled master at playing on his victimes emotions and a superb "actor" in his double-faced role. Iago himself sums up the theological purpose behind such a play-acting scene in his famous lines:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { When devils will the blackest sins put on, } \\
& \text { They do suggest at insst with heaveniy shows. } \\
& \text { As I do now . . . (II.ill. } 356-9 \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

The same theological point is made by Polonius in Hamlet, although he is ironically unaware of its full import and, true to his character, puts it in terms of sententious moralizing:

> Tis too much proved oft that bith devotiones visage And pious action we do sugar oier The devil himself.
(III.1.46*9)

The setting is important. For since Polonius and Claudius are about to make Ophelia act as decoy to draw out the "true cause ${ }^{\infty}$
of Hamleto g grief they are themselves stagemanaging a playo acting scene. "Read on this book: Polonius has just instructed Ophelia, mat show of auch an exercise may colour/ Your lonem inneas. 0.0 (III.1.44-6; italics mine) o The ironic Juxtao position, es Terence Hawkes points out, reinforces the theme of appearance and reality since in this scene polonius is at once desiribing the activities of the court and instructing Ophelia how to deceive Hamlet by appeering to be what she is not, 55 But closked collusion enacts in his own person the metaphor of courtly intrigue and corruption hidden under a fair appearance: a theme which of course dominates the poetic imagery in Shake. speareяs play.

## FOOTNOTES，Chapter I

$I_{\text {Of }}$ particular importance 1 s Spivack＇s chapter on Moral Metaphor and Dramatic Image（pp．151－205）．Two other critics have also discussed more briefly the Vice ${ }^{9}$ s role as actor and its connection with Shakespeares plays：Anne Righter，Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play（Lond on 1962），pp．68－72，96－102；and Sidney Thomas．The Antic Hamlet and Richard III（New York，1943）： pp．11． 32 and passim．The latter two critics，however，discuss this aspect of the Vice primarily in terms of comedy without stressing the theological background：Thomas，in fact，explicitly states that the Vice is＂predominantly a comic character＂（p．18； see also ppo 25．31，36）。

What I have attempted to do in this chapter is to examine in greater detall some of the more specific playaacting associa－ tions of the Vice particularly where he plays an extended false role．
$2^{60}$ The Revenger ${ }^{\circ}$ s Tragedy and the Morality Tradition，${ }^{\prime \prime}$ in Elizabethan Drama：Modern Essays in Criticism，ed．R．J．Kaufman．， （New York，1961）：p． 215.
$3_{\text {p．}} 156$ 。
${ }^{4}$ C．F．Tucker Brooke，The Tudor Drama（Bostong 1911），pp． 48．110．

5 The Tudor Interlude（Leicester，1958），p．xil，and Plate XI rollowing po 48 。
${ }^{6}$ Tudor Drames pp．213－14。
7I．vil．I．In The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser，ed．J． C．Smith and E．de Selincourt（Londong 1912［1957］．Cited by Splvack as a chapter heading（p．151）．
$8_{\text {p．}} 157$ ．
9nThe Devil Can Cite Scripture，in Shakespeare 400：Essays by American Scholars on the Anniversary of the Poet 8 Birth ed． James G．McManaway（New Yorko 1964），ppo 17．23．
${ }^{10}$ Endeavors of Art：A study of form in Elizabethan drama

${ }^{11}$ Pride in Medwall ${ }^{\circ}$ s Nature is also extravagantly dressed as a fashionable＂gallant＂a social theme to be discussed in a later chapter．But here the purpose seems to be a demonstration of Pride ${ }^{9}$ own ${ }^{\text {nature }}$ rather than a change of garment to deceive his victim．

## 12

Tudor Interlude．p．88．
${ }^{13}$ sedition？s victims，in terms of the psychomachia plot，are the ${ }^{\text {repesentatives of the several estates }: ~ n a m e l y, ~ C l e r g y . ~}$ Nobility，Commonalty，and Civil Order（Spivack，p．209）．The purpose of the plot is to rob the king of support in his battle With the Pope by subverting and blinding all orders of the Come monwealth．It is interesting to note the symbolic equation of physical and spiritual blindness in the figure of Commonalty，a motif several times repeated（1ines 1538－68）。

14
The further change of garments when the vices take on the roles of historical characters will be discussed at a later point in this chapter in connection with their change of name．

15This difference may be partly explained by the fact that it is a children ${ }^{9}$ play（as proved by specific reference in the Prologue to ${ }^{(w e}$ childrenw），and was possibly acted at queen Mary＇s court，as suggested in David M．Bevington，From mankind＂to Marlowe：Growth of Structure in the Popular Drame of Tudor Ensland （Cambridge，Massoo 1962）．ppo 27－8．65．
${ }^{16}$ Ed．Respublica，Early English Text Society（London，1905）， note，$p .66$.
${ }^{17}$ Tudor Interlude，pp．60， 84 ；note，p．134．See also plate VII following p． 48 por an illustration of the traditional usurer．

Magnus（op．citoo Introog ppovilioiz）suggests that Avarice wears a thiefog cloak＂which he turns inside out to hide the pockets；but Craikes suggestion，with its pictorial support，seems more likely．

18 Tudor Interlude，p．89．
${ }^{19}$ Ibid。 p ． 90 。
${ }^{20}$ Tucker Brooke，Tudor Drama，p． 153.
$21_{\text {Victor } 0 \text { ．Freeburg，Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama }}$ （New York． 1915 ［1965］）．ppo 121－37；Mo C．Bradbrook，Ghakespeare and the Use of Disguise in Elizabethan Drama．Essays in Criticism． II（1952），161，159－62。
$22_{\text {Mankind }}$ in The Castle of Perseverance dies imperfectly repentant but crying out on God＇s mercyp and although carried off to Hell．is redeemed after death．Moros in Wagers other play， The Longer Thou Livest，is carried off to Hell by confusion．In between these plays lies a major change in attitude toward divine retribution and mercy which vitally affects the protagonistis potential role as tragic hero，to be discussed in the final chapter．
${ }^{23}$ Leo Kirschbeum，ed．，The plays of Christopher Marlowe （cleveland and New York，1962），pp．103，lllol3，points out the
irony in almost every word of Faustus speech and suggests that Helen is literally a succubai he also discusses the general connection of paustus with the morality tradition，especially in its use of comedy．See also Bevington，mankind to Marlowe． pp．245－62．

To MeAlindon，＂Classical Mythology and Christian Tradition in Marlowe ${ }^{\circ}$ ．Doctor Feustuge phlas LXXXI（June 1966），216，221－2， also points out the ironic juxtaposition between the figures of Helen and the devilowoman and its connection with the Medieval theological view of pagan deities as deceiving tools of Satan．

24pp．158－9．
${ }^{25}$ E．K．Chambers，The Ellzabethan Stage（Oxford，1923），IV， 37．Chamers quotes a previous opinion of fleay although neither mention Hickscorner as possible example．
$26_{\text {Robert L．Ramsay ed．Magnyiycence by John Skelton Early }}$ English Text Society（London 1906 ）：Intro．ppo cliximag clx， incorrectly states that the alias of Covetise is Worldiy affection rather than Worldiy Policy．Covetise does not in fact appear on stage，but is later traditionally described as the sin of Man a age．

27pp．164－5．
28 opo cito po xl．Later critics of skelion who base their studies of the play primarily on Ramsay ${ }^{\circ}$ s arguments are：William Nelson，John Skelton Laureate（New York，1939）：H．L。 Ro Edwards． Skelton（London 1949）；Ian Ao Gordong John Skeltong poet Laureate （Melboume and London：1943）．L。J。Lloyd John Sinelton（oxiorda
 otherwise largely follows Ramsay ${ }^{\text {a }}$ interpretation。

29W．O．Harris，Skelton ${ }^{\circ} s^{\text {m Magnyrycence and the Cardinal }}$ Virtue Tradition（Chapel HIII，No Cog 1965）ppo 50－51。 Harris argues that to interpret the play exclusively as Aristotelian philosophy or political satire is to ignore the structural unity between the two halves of the work which places it squarely in the morality tradition with emphasis on the Medieval cardinal virtuem of Fortitude（pp．3－11，7lo3；and passim）．

A．R．Heiserman，Skelton and Satire（Chicago，1961）．pp．66e 125，also refutes Ramseys interpretations，although he views the play primarily as a general satire on political and courtiy abuses．

30 This is a variation of the slipoofatongue device which， as Spivack notes（pp．168－70），is another aspect of the Vice ${ }^{3}$ skill in uerbal decelt．
${ }^{31} J_{\text {．H．H．Pafford }}$ and W．Wo Gref，edso，King Johan by John Bale，Malone Society Reprints（1931），Introo po xx．For varying other opinions，see：Craik，Tudor Interlude，pp．88o9； Tucker Brooke，Tudor Drama，p．131；Frederick So Boas，An Introduction to Tudor Drame（Oxford 1933）．p．113：Barry B． adams，＂Doubling in Barers King Johan，${ }^{\prime \prime}$ SP，LXII（1965）．111－20．

It seems clear that the historical names are intended by the vices as aliases in the psychomachia tradition, as suggested in their dislogue over John"s insubordination in accepting "Stephen Langton (Sedition) as Archbishop of Canterbury. Usurped Power asks. "phy do ye not saye, his name ys stevyn langton? (line 938) and later specifically proposes the historical names as allases "To colove this thang.... (line 1057).
$32_{\text {malone }}$ Society Reprint. p. 84 (inne 146 of cancelled ado dition following line 1682 in ma text). The history and diso tinction between the two texts is explained in the Introduction, pp. x1-8xili.
${ }^{33}$ E. S. Miller, "The Christening in The Three Estates, ${ }^{\circ}$ MLNo LX (1945), 42-44, comments on the ingenuity and theatrical effectiveness of this scene.
${ }^{34}$ R. W. Bond, ed. Early Plays from the Italian (Oxford, 1911). Intro. p. xlim, notes that in Latin-Italian comedy ma constant incident of imposturesis the forgetting or ignorance, at the critical moment, of some name essential to the success of the fraud. and the clever evasion of the difficulty. This scene from a play totally unconnected with the Latinaitalian tradition may indicate the inevitable universality of such a device.

35 Moros enacts a schoolboyish but sharp commentary on the pseudonym mphilosophy" for the vice Implety when he insists on mispronouncing it as mpild lousy boym [sig. E4V].
$36_{\text {Moros }}{ }^{\circ}$ striking independence of the vices and his thoroughly depraved nature may account for some critical confusion over his role. Ola Elizabeth Winslow incorrectly describes him as the ${ }^{m} h e r o$ and vice ${ }^{m}$ of the play (Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642, Menasha, Wiscos 1926. p. 62). Bevington, Mankind to Marlowe, at two points ado mits Moros.as the human hero (ppo 82, 165), but elsewhere in his discussions of casting requirements treats him as the vice (pp. 81. 84, 86).

37p. 161 。
38p. 163.
39 Mary Magdalene, Iine 365; King John, Iines 682, 676; Conflict of Conscience, line 391; Misogonus, I.111.79. These plays make frequent specific reference to bacting a part of which the lines cited represent only a few examples.

40 Idea of the play. p. 68. R1ghter also notes Shakespeare ${ }^{0}$ irequent use of such words and phrases as "counterfeit" or "play the partp often with an undertone of deceit and treachery (pp. 95-6, 101-2).
${ }^{41}$ L．Mo O11ver，＂John Fore and The conflict of conscience： RES，XXV（1949），lo9，points out the borrowings in this play from actual Inquisition trial scenes reported in Poxe＇s Acts and Monuments．

The role of the Inquisitor，as seen by Protestant eyes at this time would of course blend perfectly with the Vice ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ role $a s$ evil manipulator and psychological persauader．
${ }^{42}$ Spivack pp．171－5；Craik，Tudor Interlude，pp．990110． Craik analyzes the action of the entire play to demonstrate his argument set forth in the Preface（ $p_{0}$ 2）that the Tudor plays ${ }^{\omega}$ were far more effective when acted than we can guess when we merely read them．．．so much of the meaning．．．is conveyed by the significant use of action and costume that unless this is borne in mind they cannot be appreciated or even properly under． stood．${ }^{\circ}$
${ }^{43}$ Tucker Brooke（Tudor Drama，p．103），commenting in general on the moral interludes of the period beginning roughly with the first years of Elizabeth＇s reign（1558），condemns them as＂dull＂ and poor in content．${ }^{\text {a }}$ Such threadbare motives as the quarrels of vices and virtues or the masquerading of vice under the cloak of virtue are retained for mere convention ${ }^{\circ} s$ sake，sometimes to the positive detriment of the action and sense＂

This comment might apply to such a play as New Custom where， as suggested above，these conventional devices do seem static and poorly integrated．But the moral and theatrical effectiveness of W．Wager ${ }^{9}$ s play；which seems convincingly demonstrated by Spivack and Craik in their analyses cited above，might serve as the best rebuttal to Brooke ${ }^{9}$ s blanket condemnation．

44 Terence Hawkes．Shakespeare and the Reason（London，1964）． pp．59－60，146 0 ．although he does not mention the morality plays， comments on the play－acting associations of Macbeth ${ }^{\theta} 8$ speech（I． vil．81－2）and the speech of claudius below，and their connection with the theme of appearance and reality．Claudius ${ }^{\circ}$ metaphor based on cosmetics Nis fitting because it is traditional（the drama of the time abounds in like metaphors almost to the point of eanibiting an obsession with the implications of makingoup ${ }^{\circ}$ ）． for he is describing his own activities，and they are otradio tionally evil，${ }^{\circ}$ traditionally ${ }^{\circ}$ devilish（p．60）。

45Although this is in many ways a crude and dramatically unsatisfactory play，Spivack points out（pp．274ヵ7）that its doo mestic portrayal of a malicious attempt to break up a happy maro riage is an interesting forerunner of othello．

46 Spivack（pp． $407-12$ ）convincingly demonstrates the mybrida Vice elements of Don John in his＂malignant humor，his selfo styled＂Villainy ${ }^{\circ}$ and his apparent lack of a convincing motive。 although he does not mention the playacting association．

The passage from Much Ado cited here is not meant to suggest a direct parallel or influence，but merely that the marchetypal： situation of a slanderer acting the part of virtuous indignation would inevitably be expressed in similar terms．

## 54

${ }^{41}$ Lo Mo Oliver，John Foxe and The conflict of conscience BES．XXV（1949） $1-9$ ，points out the borrowings in this play from actual Inquisition trial scenes reported in Foxe ${ }^{\circ}$ Acts and Pionuments．

The role of the Inquisitor，as seen by Protestant eyes at this time，would of course blend perfectly with the Vice $s$ role as evil manipulator and psychological persauader．

42 Spivack ${ }^{4}$ ppo $171=5 ;$ Craik，Tudor Interlude ppo 990110． Craik analyzes the action of the entire play to demonstrate his argument set forth in the Preface（ $p_{0}$ 2）that the Tudor plays ${ }^{\omega}$ were far more effective when acted than we can guess when we merely read them．．．so much of the meaning ．．．is conveyed by the significant use of action and costume that unless this is borne in mind they cannot be appreciated or even properly undero stood．${ }^{\circ}$

43 Tucker Brooke（Tudor Drama，po 103），commenting in general on the moral interludes of the period beginning roughly with the first years of Elizabeth ${ }^{\circ}$ s relgn（1558）o condemns them as＂dull and poor in content．Such threadbare motives as the quarrels of vices and virtues or the masquerading of vice under the claak of virtue are retained for mere convention ${ }^{9}$ s sake，sometimes to the positive detriment of the action and sense．＂

This comment might apply to such a play as New Custom where， as suggested above，these conventional devices do seem static and poorly integrated．But the moral and theatrical effectiveness of Wo Wager＇s play，which seems convincingly demonstrated by Spivack and Craik in their analyses cited above，might serve as the best rebuttal to Brooke ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ blanket condemnation．

44 Terence Hawkes，Shakespeare and the Reason（London，1964）． pp．59－60，146－7．although he does not mention the morality plays comments on the play－acting associations of Macbeth ${ }^{\circ} s$ speech（I． vii． 81 m ）and the speech of claudius below，and their connection with the theme of appearance and reality．Claudius metaphor based on cosmetics 1 is fitting because it is traditional．（the drama of the time abounds in like metaphors almost to the point of exhibiting an obsession with the implications of makingoup ${ }^{\theta}$ ）， for he is describing his own activities，and they are otradio tionally ${ }^{\circ}$ evil，＂traditionallyo devilish＂（p．60）。

45Although this is in many ways a crude and dramatically unsatisfactory play，Spivack points out（ppo 274o7）that．1ts doo mestic portrayal of a malicious attempt to break up a happy mar－ riage is an interesting forerunner of othello．
${ }^{46}$ Spivack（pp．407－12）convincingly demonstrates the nhybrida Vice elements of Don John in his＂malignant humor ${ }^{\text {a }}$ his selfo styled $⿴ 囗 十$ although he does not mention the playaacting association．

The passage from Much Ado cited here is not meant to suggest a direct parallel or influence，but merely that the＂archetypal＂ situation of a slanderer acting the part of virtuous indignation would inevitably be expressed in similar terms．

47p．184．
48 Righter，Idea of the play，pp． $96-100$ ；Thomas，Hamlet and Richard III $\mathrm{pp}. \mathrm{I1-32}$. Thomes（ $\mathrm{pp} .33-52$ ）also discusses Hamlet＇s mantic disposition as a further dramatic refinement of the tradition of the Vice as＂sardonic masker＂who dupes his victims with doubleaedged puns and wdazzling metamorphoses of personality．He adds，however，that for the Vice these con－ ventions were merely comic（ p 。36）。

49 p． 377.
${ }^{50}$ Hamlet and Richard III，po 11 ．
5lpissimulation in an earlier scene has casually accepted the necessity for his own death，thus demonstrating what Spivack （ p 。197）describes as the Vice＇s＂allegorical immunity＂to human motives or human suffering．
${ }^{52}$ The rudiments of the plot of slander to get rid of the virtue figure may also be seen in Mankind，where Titivillus de－ ludes the hero with a false dream that Mercy has been hanged as a horse thief；and in the scene already cited from Impatient Poverty．In the latter play，it is interesting to note that the hero himself，as part of his worldiy punishment，is falsely ac－ cused of slander and made to do public penance．
$53_{\text {Ramsay }}$ interprets Magnificence as a thinly disguised poro trayal of Henry VIII and the six vices as a composite portrait of Cardinal Wolsey（Magnyfycence，Intro．ppocviii ffo）．In this light，the Prince ${ }^{0}$ sit of rage might well be interpreted as a satire on Wolsey ${ }^{\circ} s$ evil influence in encouraging Henry ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ well－known uncontrollable temper．It seems highly unlikely that Skelton would have dared to present such a scene in public if he knew that his ruler would so interpret it，although the entire question of the supposed Wolseyan satire is a complex one which cannot be fully discussed here．But in the context of this work as a morality play，the importance of the fit of rage is，surely， to demonstrate man ${ }^{\circ}$ s total lack of control once he has banished the better part of his nature and given way to delusion．

54 Spivack does of course discuss cloaked Collusion as a typical vice figure and notes the allegorical importance of the banishing of Measure（pp．153，161，162，193，383）．

Thomas L．Watson，＂The DetractoroBackbiter：Iago and the Tradition，＂n Teras Studies：In L4t，and Lang：，V（1963），546－54， comments on the general similarity of lago＇s role as slanderer to that of Cloaked Collusion and Detraccio in The Castle of perseverance，although he does not go into a detailed comparison．
${ }^{55}$ Shakespeare and Reason．po 59．

## CHAPTER II

## THE VICE AS MREASONER

Pope Gregory, whose Morals on the Book of Job has been quoted in the preface, makes in the same work another perceptive coment about the ways in which man deceives himself: The first vices force themselves into the deluded mind as if under a kind of reason. ${ }^{1}$ The Vice repeatediy acts out this second characteristic of the porces of evil as seen by a Medieval theologian. Once he has partiy drawn in his victim by means of his anill as "mctorm and psychologisto he brings about his dome fall by his sitil ma*reasoner or (recaliing Bassanio s speech) one whose plausible arguments and wellosounding advice could readily mentrap the wisest.m In fact. no one could logically deny the type of unanswerable seeming iruth which reaches its height of sophistry in Iago ${ }^{\circ}$ s statement to Othello: whe did decelve her father, marying youg (IIIolil.206). Otheilo himo seli cannot deny it.

A comment on Lucpfer ${ }^{\circ}$ deceptive arguments by an editor of Higdora tho Is Christ vividly though unwittingly illustrates this aspect of the Viceg activities in later plays as well as the function of moral irony in his relationship with the audience:

His preliminary appearance in his true form and his boast of his willness were certainly needed, as some parts of the arguments with which he assails Mind, Will and Understanding might deceive the very elect. What geems to us nowasodays the harmesisness of the suggestions that a man should not leave a wire and famly to perish in order to become a monk (11. $405-412$ ) or that 1t 18 a good thing to take a wife (1. 476), reaches its culmination in the really ine saying in 1.494 . God loveth a clean soul and a merry" a as good a motto to go through ilfe with as man can wanto 2

In this play, which may have been performed before a manastic audience as a warning against the growing tendency ror monks to leave their monasteries and to succumb to worldiy and politis cal ambitions, ${ }^{3}$ Lucifer also reinforces his argument by measonably quoting the eqamples of Martha, and of Christ Himself. who lived in the world. He argues that a life of fasting, flagellation and weeping for sins may lead to madness and dese pair which would be unpleasing to God. "What synne" 18 there in enjoying life?

In other wordsp ene Devil can cite Scriptureo Emest Strathmann in inis article by the same title brings. the example up to Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ} s$ time, quoting Claudiusi. advice to Hamlet on the sin of immoderate grief as wa falt to heaveng/a fault against the dead $0 . \circ 0^{\circ}\left(I_{0} 11.101-2\right)$ : excellent advice of which no Christian moralist: would disapprove. ${ }^{4}$ Unlike Othello, Hamlet is not taken in by such sophistry, and in pact continually penetrates the seeming of the corrupted court. But one might say that it is his om anguished recognition of how he has been deceivec (by his uncle and nis mother, by Ophelia, by his whole idealistic conception of man and the universe) which leads to his destruction. Referring back to Strathmann ${ }^{\circ}$ argument quoted In part in the previous chapter:

- . Ialsehood has a goodly outside which is not so readily perietrated by rrail mortals. In broad terms, the deception is at the heart of the bitter contrast between the appearance and the reallty which shocks and ultimately destroys the great tragic heroes. 5

Terence Hawkes, who discusses Shakespeare $s$ villains in the major tragedies and problem plays as ${ }^{60}$ reasoners presenting
a convincing mappearance of eruth, comments on the analogy between Lucifero 5 arguments in Wisdom and Iago $s$ deception of Othello. He suggests that the basis of Lucifer ${ }^{0} \mathrm{~s}$ argament is its appeal to logic. regarded during the Middle Ages and Renaissance as the lower faculty of man's reason by which he knows only the illusory things of this world. as opposed to intuition man ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ higher form of reason which inks him with the angels and by which he comes to know the "reailty, or God:

An attempt to establish the "lower reason as the arbiter of truth and reality . . is here crudely labelled devilish because the substitution of appearance for reality is a traditional aco tivity of the devil. The persistence of such an idea - however more subtle its formal statement in drama will become o is readily discernible in later renaisance writing。... Iago ${ }^{\circ}$. temptation of Othello has much in common with Luciferis arguments here. . . Satan, of course, traditionally holds the role of archodeceiver in the sense that he tries to deceive man into accepting his evil in place of $\operatorname{God}^{8} 8$ good....6

## Although Hawkes does not extend this analogy to other

 morality plays, he is in fact perfectiy describing the "reasoning" activities of the Vice as well as suggesting one aspect of his audienceappeal. The smoothotalking knave with his devilishlym plausible arguments is of course an archetypal character in 1iterature. On philosophical level, his methods may be desc cribed in the above terms of logic as opposed to intuition. To expand on Spenser ${ }^{\circ}$ g verse, the argument may seem like truth" because it is based on unanswerable fact or logic; and man ${ }^{9}$ proo tection lies not in his "earthly wit but only in his instinctive recognition of the evil intention. At the level of popular stereotype, the same ideas may be roughly summed up in theproverbial picture of Satan as the father of lies and the citer of Scripture. M. C. Bradbrook, discussing the strength of the debate tradition and the fascination with legal argument as an element of continuity between Medieval and Tudor-Elizabethan drama, comments that marguments were in themselves exhilarating, especially the fallacious arguments of the Vices."7 In other words, the audience would presumably enjoy the sense of superiority involved in seeing through the "devilish" logic at the expense of the deluded mankind hero.

The allegorical importance of the Vice's talent for som phistical argument is perhaps most strikingly demonstrated in The Castle of Perseverance (c. 1405-1425). As stated in the Preface, this earliest extant complete morality presents the Psychomechia largely in its original context of open war; but even here, the powers of evil bring about man's first and second downfall by means of deceptive argument. Mankind (Humanum Genus) first enters "naked and feeble, attended by his Good and Evil Angels: a moral void to be filled by his personifled vices and virtues. ${ }^{8}$ The Evil Angel, like Lucifer, argues that there can be no harm in admitting the claims of the world. If he should sing there is plenty of time to repent:

> with the werld thou mayst be bold tyl thou be serty wynter hold. wanne thi nose warit cold, thanne mayst thou drawe to goode.

$$
\text { ( } 418-21 \text { ) }
$$

Mankind submits, and is led away to the scaffold of the world where Last and Folly clothe him in gorgeous garments symbolizing
his corruption. But the playwrignt carefully underlines the sophistry of this argument in a later scene. The hero, after repenting of $n i s$ first downall, has retired to the castle dem fended by his seven virtues and besieged by the vices in full battle array. But when open assault has falled. Mankind once again succumbs to plausible argument, this time by the vice Covetise. 9 First lured from his stronghold by the wheeding arguo ments of his mold friend, ${ }^{m}$ he hesitates on the brink and addresses to Covetise three questions, whose irony would not be missed by the audience, ending with a pointed echo of the Evil Angel ${ }^{0} 8$ earlier speech:

Coueytyse: whedyr schuld I wende? what wey woldyst that I sulde holde?
to what place woldyst thou me sende?
I. Eynne to waryn hory \& colde;
my nose is colde, \& gynnyth to dioppe; byn her waxit al hore.
(2480-92)
Covetise $s$ quick retort, the ironic opposite of the Evil Angel 8 advice, would sound equally plausible if one did not know his true intention:

> Petyr: thou hast the more nede
> to haue̊ sum good in thyn age:
> (2493-4)

He goes on to argue that "thl purs schal be thi best [E] frende" (IIne 2522), for if he 18 rich all men will befriend and respect himg but if he is poor as well as old, then he will euyl fare ${ }^{m}$ (Iine 2531). This is the clinching argument, and Mankind leaves the Castle and resolves to heap up riches, repeating in his own person the rationalization already provided:

## it is good, whonoso the wynde blowe, a man to haue sumowhat of his owe. what happe sooeuere beotyde. <br> (2542-4)

Covetise encourages him with promises of help and felicity: anoo ther aspect of the meeming truth ${ }^{m}$ of the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ arguments, for such promises are always fulililed in a strictly ractual sense:

> Coveytyse, it is no sore, he wyl thee feffen ful of store, \& alwey, alwey sey more \& moreg \& that schal be thi songe.
> $(2710-13)$

The treachery of the promise soon becomes apparent when Covetise $s$ master, the world, exults over the dying Pantind and tells him that all the stored-up riches for minch he has endangered his soul will be inherited not by his family but by a stranger: the World ${ }^{\circ} s{ }^{99} \mathrm{BOy}_{8}$ or ${ }^{6} \mathrm{I}$ wot neuere who (11ne 2981).

Variations on this pattern of the logical and wello sounding argument, the convenient rationalizationg and the equivocal promise are repeated time after time in later moralitieso although not all of these elements are present in each play. We hear the familiar ring of the unanswerable seeming truthm in the words of mpriendship (Hypocrisy) to the hero of R. Wever s Lusty Juventus (c. 1550):

Can you deny, but it is your Duty Vnto your elders to be obedient?

$$
\text { sig. } \mathrm{Ch}^{4}
$$

When Juventus partially capitulates by admitting that he is bound to obey in everything "honest and lawfull. ${ }^{\infty}$ Hypocrisy ino geniously turns the tables on him by moralizing on the lawlessness of youth: 10

Lawfull, quod ha, foole foole Wilt thou set men to scoole when they be old?

Now euery boy wilbe a teacher
The father a foole, and the childe a preacher
Thila is preaty geare.
The foule presumptions of youth,
wyll turne shortly to great ruthe.
I feare, I reare. I feare.
(sig. $\left.\left[C 4^{\text {r }}\right]-D\right)$
The purpose of this stratagem is to divert Juventus from the Protestant "preaching" he was on his way to attend in his newo found state of sober austerity. Juventus himself takes the nert downard step, rationalizing that the sermon must by now be almost over and he does not greatly care whether he goes or not, but for what his companions might say. ${ }^{11}$ Again he is no match for the Vice ${ }^{0}$ ingenuity in citing Scripture. Hypocrisy tells him in effect - that his companions should mind their own business. adding with superb insolence that such a holier manothou attitude 18 nothing but popish hypocrisy:

```
What, are those felowes so curious
That your selfe you cannot excuse?
Byd them plucke the beame out of there owne eye
The olde popysh priestes mocke and despyse
And the ignorsunt people that beleue theyr lyes
Call them papistes, hipocrites, \& cloynes of the plough
Tushe tushe.
I could so beate the busshe.
That all should be flusshe,
That euer I did.
    (sig。 \(D-D^{V}\) )
```

The victim is now caught, and agrees to accompany his nold friend" and "tutor" to a tavern where he will find merrier companions.

The lively colloquial tone of Hypocrisy ${ }^{\circ}$ s speech throughout this play might be compared with that of other rogues of

London lowalife such as the assorted vices of Medwall s Nature, Folly in The Gorlo and the Child, or Envy and his cohorts in Impatient Poverty. The social implications of this move toward concrete reallsm will be discussed in the next chapter. But it might be noted here that the element of social realism in Hypocrisy ${ }^{\circ}$ arguments is a long way from the pure allegory of The Castle of Perseverance, although Satan's introductory speech proves that the theological purpose is the same.

In Calisto and Melibea (c. 1527), another play dealing with the corruption of youth, the vice figure also plays the role of wise elderly "tutor" giving excellent moral advice to wayward young people. ${ }^{12}$ The following speech of the bawd Celestina, when she dissuades Calisto s servant Parmeno from trying to interfere in her plot against his master, resembles strikingly Hypoco risy ${ }^{9}$ s pious strictures on obedience to one ${ }^{\circ} s$ elders:

Leue wantonnes of youth than shalt thou do well Folow the doctryne of thy Elders and counsell To whom thy parentes on whos soulis god haue mercy In payn of cursyng bad the be obedyent
(523-6)
In her subsequent temptation of Melibea, Celestina shows herself both a consumate "actor" in the role of false piety and perhaps the most ingenious of all the "reasoning" vices in the arguments by which she convinces Melibea that surrendering herself to Callsto would be Christian charity rather than sin ...."13 Her pious advice, when she first sets the stage by general ado monitions to charity, rivals that of Lucifer himself in its apparent excellence:
 (706*9)

For folkes be not made for them self onely For then they shuld lyff lyke bestes all rudely (765-6)

Like Hypocrisy, though even more clever as verbal equivocator, Celestina can cite Scripture with ironic double meanings which the audience would not miss. Polonius may well have had such an archetypal character in mind when he warns Ophelia against Hamlet ${ }^{\circ}$ s "unholy ${ }^{\text {m }}$ vows, "Breathing like sanctified and pious bawdso/ The better to beguile... . (I.111.130-1).

The vices in Lewis wager $s$ The Iife and Repentance of Mary Magdalene (c. 1558), 1ike those of Lusty Juventus, play double roles as corruptors of youth and destroyers of the Proteso tant faith. The first purpose is accomplished in part by sophiso tical argument recalling on the one hand Luciferes claim that there can be no sin in enjoying ilfe, and on the other, numerous Renaissance poems on the theme of "carpe diem":

Do you thinte that it is not more then manesses
The lusty and pleasant ilfe of a man $s$ youth Miserably to pass anay in study and sadnesse?
Be ye mery, and puí away ali fantasies. One thyng is this, you shal neuer be yonger in dede. (154-9)

Later, in words suggesting mankindes rationalization that it is good for a man to haue sum-what of his owe, Infidelity argues that lary has every right to use her worldiy riches for her own enjoyment:

> It were decent, I saye, to vee the fruition of suche richesse as is left you here. You neuer hesrd in any erudition
> But that one with his om should make good chere. $(191 \infty 4)$

Again we hear the unanswerable logic with which the external power：of evil－or the selfodecelving mind orationalizes the impulse to sin．The wisest or most eruditem man mould not deny the right to spend one ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{a}$ own money：but the audience，already informed of Infidelity ${ }^{\circ}$ intention to damn Mary ${ }^{\circ}$ s soul by tempting her to a harlotes life，would not miss the moral sophistry． The attempt to destroy Mary ${ }^{*}$ s faith is concentrated in the scene where she is visited by Knowledge of $\operatorname{Sin}$ and cries out against the injustice of the Law which without faith cannot pros mise salpation．${ }^{14}$ Here，as the editor of the play comments． Infidelity＂s role as＂plausible rogue＂and ${ }^{50}$ Mephistophelian tempter reaches its height when he attempts to ensnare Mary＇s soul in the reaction of her despair．。．。．． 15 He first encourages her despairing outburst：WWell spoken：An indust God do you esteme：（iine 1127）。 With ingensous sophistry，he then argues that since she is certainiy damned anyway，she might as well make the best of it：

And make you mery in this worlde while you may：
of one hell I would not haue you twayne to make： Be sure of a heauen while you dwell here；
（1133－5）
Metaphorically switching back to the older spirit of the Psycho－ mechia，he then drives away Knomledge of $\operatorname{Sin}$ with abuse and threats of violence．But，in a scene following the Biblical account．Mary is rescued by the intervention of Christ who casts out the devils from her soul．

Although in this play the sophistical arguments of the Yice are highly developed, it is interesting to note that Mary, a strongly individualized protagonist, states some of their rationalizations in her own person. ${ }^{16}$ Hints of inis transference have been seen in Lusty Juventus and Mankind (see note 11 above). and even, briefly, in The Castle of Perseverance. But two paso sages in Mary Magdalene go somewhat beyond these early suggestions. At one point Mary recites a floral elaboration of Infidelity's "carpe diem" argument which, though the style hardly approaches Herrict ${ }^{0} s_{\text {a }}$ gives an amusing picture of rationalization in the form of poesy:

The pleasure of youth is a thyng right frayle,
The swete violets and lyiles flourishe not alway; The rose soone drieth, and lasteth not a day.
I see in other women by very experience, That the tyme of youth heth no long permanence. (694-9)

Early in the play, she begs her oold family friend ${ }^{n}$ Infidelity for his advice and counsel:

> You see that I am yong and can little skill
> To prouide for myne own honor and vtilitie.
> Wherfore I pray you in all thyngs counsell to haue, After what sort I may leade a pleasant life here; (140-3)

The words, like many of the arguments of the vices, sound harmo less enough. But later, in the traditional conspiracy scene, the Vice Pride takes the name of Honor; Cupidity becomes Utility; Carnal Concupiscence becomes Pleasure; and Infidelity, who states that he is ". . . sometime called counsel, and sometime Prudence" (line 394), takes the latter name to deceive Mary. It would
seem that the playwright, by carefully using all four euphemisms in Mary ${ }^{\circ}$ s earlier speech, means to underline the process of self-deception. Although this fusion of allegory and reallsm is somewhat labored, the mark of autonomy shows that the morality play protagonist has taken a long step from the "moral void" of Mankind.

Later plays also reflect the move toward individualization, although perhaps only Mary comes as close to being a threedimensional human character. The Vice ${ }^{0}$ s technique as plausible "reasoner" remains, but instead of tempting his victim from a state of innocence, he aids and abets a man already sinfully inclined by arguing away his fears or scruples, stiffening his courage, or by equivocal promises of help and immunity.

The Vice Ill Report in Thomas Garter's Virtuous and Godiy Susanna (c. 1569) encourages the judges by arguing that their grave demeanor will shield them from public shame, and he duly performs his promise of spreading a slanderous report against Susanna's virtue. But his intent all along has been to "Teach them a way themselues to confoundem (line 272) and in the trial scene his treachery is fully revealed. As Spivack comments, the judges and not Susanna are his real victims. "When they are condemned he jears at them, and when they are stoned he is the most vigorous of their executioners. ${ }^{17}$ The jeering takes on a note of human realism as Ill Report and Voluptas exchange vitus perations and the latter attempts to rationalize his crime by claiming angrily that ${ }^{\circ}$ 。. . thou art as 111 as $I^{m}$ (line 1144). Ill Report then draws him further into the $t$ ap of his own sophistry:

# Ill Rep. I am an honest man, proue it he that can. I will not be iudged by thea. <br> Vol. No God shall ludge thee. <br> Ill Rep. What haste thou learned that Lesson now? Had you learned it sooner, it had bene better for you. 

The judges, who like Shylock exploit the letter of the law for their own selfish ends, are caught in their own snare. Murray Roston suggests that Shakespeare ${ }^{0}$ s audience, familiar with this and other Susanna plays of the period, would instantly recognize the Old Testament parallel to Shylock ${ }^{\circ}$ s situation and its dramatic 1rony。 ${ }^{18}$

In another play dealing with the theme of corrupt justice, the Vice Haphazard of "R. $B 0^{0} s^{\infty}$ Appius and Virginia (c. 1564) encourages and abets the judge Appius in a similar plot of seduce tion to be cloaked under the "appearance" of legal justification. After Haphazard has proposed the legal fiction whereby Virginia will be taken from her father on the pretense that she was stolen as a child, a curious scene follows suggesting a clumsy but ino interesting move toward internalization of the debate of conscience, with the Vice providing the rationalizing argument on the other side. As the stage direction indicates. Appius apparently turns away from the audience and the two figures of Conscience and Justice "come out of him (sig. C) , perhaps from behind his spreadoout cloak as he faces the exit. He then laments his mental conflict: ${ }^{19}$

But out I am wounded, how am I deuided?
Two states of my life, from me are now glided.
For Consience he pricketh me contempned,
And Iustice saith. Iudgement wold haue me condemned:

> And both in one sodden me thinkes they do crie, That fler eternall, my soule shall destroy: (sig. C)

Haphazard, however, speaks with the voice of reason" as he argues that since Conscience is hardohearted and Justice has been corrupted by bribes, they are not worth considering:

> Why these are but thoughts man: why fie for shame fie For Conscience was carelesse, and sayling by seas, Was drowned in a basket and had a disease, Sore mooued for pitye, when he would graunt none, For beyng hard harted, was turned to a stone:
> And Iudgement iudge Iustice to haue a reward, For iudging still iustly, but all is now marde, For giftes they are geuen, wher Iudgement is none, Thus Iudgement and Iustice a wronge way hath gone: (sigo C)

The first part of this speech, with its proverbial reference to the drowning of Conscience, represents a late and crude version of the plot of slander against the virtuous counselor: but the legal quibble of the second part is more interesting in relation to the playos ending. The corrupt judge Appius has been argued into the sophistical equation of moral with strictiy legal justice, implied in Haphazard ${ }^{\circ}$ s claim that since courts have been corrupted, all justice is invalidated. But, like Shylock and like the judges of Susanna, he is caught in his own trap; and when he calls on Justice and Reward to execute sentence on Virginius, these alleo gorical nemesis figures promptly enter ("like the catastrophe of the old comed $y^{\circ}$ ) and inform him that he will indeed receive his "rewardo" which will be death.

Two of the pairs:of sinners in Ulpian Fulwell ${ }^{\circ}$ s Like Will to Like (c. 1568) are also drawn on and then trapped by a form of equivocation which here descends to a somewhat labored punning
level. The ubiquitous Nichol Newfangle encourages Tom Tosspot and Ralph Roister in the vices which their names describe by promising them the inheritance "by my fathers wil" of a "pece of ground" called "beggers maner" (sig. B4). To the more serious criminals Pierce Pickpurse and Cuthbert Cutpurse, he also pros mises financial immunity in the form of an inheritance mcalled the land of the two legged mare" [sig. C4], a colloquialism for the gallows which would deceive only the most determined gull. But despite the crudity of such tricks, the repeated insistence on this verbal equivacation which runs throughout the play is an interesting, if extreme, example of what M. C. Bradbrook describes as ". . . the great stress which Elizabethans laid on the sense rather than the intention of words, so that equivocations could be a serious matter. Very of ten the whole plot of a play turns on a verbal quibble .... ${ }^{20}$ Macbeth is the most obvious example which comes to mind of a major drama in which the powers of evil entrap the hero by equivocally worded promises of immunity. But even in Fulwell's play, equivocations turn out in the end to be a "serious matter," for Tom and Ralph are reduced to beggary and highway robbery, while Plerce and Cuthbert are betrayed to the hangman by Nichol himself.

The activities of the vice in encouraging his victim in volves in two plays a verbal amblguity concerning the word "courage ${ }^{*}$ itself. The Vices of John Pikering ${ }^{\circ}$ s Horestes (c. 1567) and George Wapull's The Tide Tarrieth No Man (c. 1576) both are named Courage (although the former at the end reveals his true name as Revenge): a fact which has led some critics to conclude
that the Vice is not always an entirely evil rigure. ${ }^{21}$ But such an interpretation, as Spivack points out, ignores an older meaning of the word. Besides its modern connotations, the term can also suggest "the bilnd will and appetitive energy governing the lives of animals.... . the equivalent of limitless selfo indulgences it is sinful and destructive, reducing human ilife to bilind desire and brutish passion." ${ }^{22}$ The Vice of Wapuilis play makes explicit the equivocal narure of the word and its evil secondary meaning:

```
For as in the Bee,
For certayne we see,
Sweete honey and sting:
So I in my mind.
The better to bilind,
two corages bring.
Euen so some while \({ }^{\circ}\)
To collour my gulle.
Do geue corage to good:
For I by that meane,
WIII conuey very cleane.
And not be vnderstood.
                                    ( sig 。A3)
```

This verbal equivocation lies behind the Vice ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ sophistry in both plays. although the argument is often reduced to the level of the proverb stated in Wapulios title, itself a variation of the familiar "carpe diem" argument. As Pikering's Courage puts it:

Fauil to it then and slacke no time, for tyme once past away, Doth cause repentence, but to late to com old foulkes do say. When stede is stolen, to late it is to shyt the stable dore, Take time I say, while time doth giue a leagure good therfore。 (sig. B)

Wapull's Vice, arguing away the merchant Greediness' attack of conscience, blends his proverbial axioms with a more ingeniously
sophistleated argument recaling the archetypal inducement to worldiy gvarice first seen in the Castle of Perseverance:

> Why doltish patch, arte thou so vnwise, To quayle for the saying of suche a knaue, Thou knowest all the world will thee despyse, And a begging thou mayst goe, if that naught thou haue. Remember thy house, and thy wife that peate, Rust still be kept in their costiy kinde: Therfore take the time, while the time doth serue, Tyde taryeth no man, this thou doste know. If thy goods decay, then mayst thou sterue, So dooing thou seekest thine own ouerthrow. (sig. B3)

The spate of homely proverbial wisdom with which these Vices mask their deadly arguments may seem crude on the printed page, but the psychological appeal is a shrewd one. lago, a subtler master of such techniques continually laces fis arguments with proverbs: a habit of speech which has been documented by Joseph MeCulism in an article which (though it does not mention the morality plays) is significantly titled, "Iago's Use of Proverbs for Persuasion, ${ }^{2} 23$ The deadilness of the appeal to Greediness in Wapuli ${ }^{\circ}$ s play soon becomes apparent. Though stiffened in his resolve to heap up riches, he is at once unable to repent and unable to forget the words of the unnamed street preacher who had first pricked his conscience: and Courage later reports that he has at last hanged himself in despair.

Among all the Tudor morality plays, Wo Wager ${ }^{9}$ Enough Is as Good as a Feast (c. 1560) is perhaps the most dramatically powerful in its treatment of the temptation to worldiy avarice and its bitter consequences. ${ }^{24}$ The fact that this play contains many striking parallels with The Castle of Perseverance suggests
the archetypal nature of the theme; but the equally striking differences show the lone step that has been taken toward the concrete tragedy of the individual. The play opens with the Worldy Man himself, no longer a moral voide but fully formed in his worldy ambition and determined to rationalize or justify it. Using Ramsay's definition of the seven stages in the most fully developed morallty play structure, one might say that here the two initial stages of innocence and first temptation are cut off, and the mankind hero is presented in the midst of his first downfall. ${ }^{25}$

He begins in a mood of defiance:

Indeed I haue riches and money at my pleasure. Yea, and I wil haue more in spight of them all.
(sig.A3)
Or, as the vice Covetise had urged: "\& alwey, alwey, sey more \& more:" (line 2712).

A common saying better is enuy then rueth. I had rather they should spite then pitty me: - I wis I am not of the minde as some men are, Which look for no more then wil serue necessitie: No against a day to come I doo prepare, That when age commeth I may liue merily.

$$
\left(s i g . A 3-A 3^{v}\right)
$$

Covetise, too, had urged that man has the right to "sum good ${ }^{m}$ in his old age (line 2494). Also of interest in relation to the plays previously discussed is the sophistical use of proverbial expression as a means of justifying evil. ${ }^{26}$

Oh saith one inough is as good as a feast, Yea, but who can tel what his end shalbe? ( $518 \cdot A 3^{V}$ )

To $H_{0}$ Crain coments on the irony inherent in the fact that the speaker is thinking only of his waterial end, not of his spirlitual salvation. ${ }^{27}$ This comment might equaliy apply to the ironic questions of Mankind ("to what place woldyst thou me sende? ${ }^{m}$ - line 2482); for he too at this point is not thinking of his spiritual end.

As by mine own Father an example I may take, He was belooued of all men and kept a good house: Whilst riches lasted, but when that did slake, There was no man that did set by him a Louse.

And so at such time as he from the world went, I mene when he dyed he was not worth a grote: And they that all his substance had spent, For the value of xijo pence would haue cut his throte. ( $\mathrm{sig} . A 3^{\mathrm{V}}$ )

Again, one recalls Covetise's argument that a rich man is befriended and respected while one who is poor and old comes to a wretched end. But now the sophistical argument is directed to far more concrete social situation. Craik comments on the dramatic efm fectiveness of this speech and its social reference:

When the Worldy Man replaces the Prologue, his speech is full of life and energy, stuffed with the proverbs of worldy wisdom -. . . But the audience is invited to see that his logic is false. The possibility that others may treat us selfishly does not justify our selfishness as a precaution. Covetousness is not the only alternative to waste. There is also the suggestion... that the Worldy Man's father did not practice true hospitality but ${ }^{\text {rept }}$ a good house for revellers who spent his substance. Attention is drawn to these false arguments by the obvious greed of the first quatrain $\circ \circ .28$

Assisted by the admonitions of his virtuous counterpart the Heavenly Man and the good counselor Enough, the Worldiy Man then moves into the stage corresponding to Mankind ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ first rem pentance, followed by his second temptation and downfall. The
temptation scene, part of which has been discubsed in the previous chapter, presents the vices ${ }^{\circ}$ sweet reasonableness" 29 at the height of plausible ingenuity. mpolicy" (Covetous) smothers Enough ${ }^{\circ}$ s blunt and uncompromising objections with the logico chopping argument:

> Inough is not inough without ve two: For hauing not vs, what can inough doo? Inough is maintained by wisdome and policy: Hnich is contained of a redy wit naturally.

$$
\left(s 1 g . D 2^{V}=D 3\right)
$$

Taking up his cue, "Ready Witw (Precipitation) adds that if he is rich, he can help his "poor Breethern." The Worldiy Man eagerly accepts this ingenious sophistry:

Your words are euen as true as the Gospel: As one named Reason of late to me did tel. You may be more heauenly saith he hauing riches:

Inough I haue for my self I cannot say nay:
But I would I had more to succour the needy alway. (sig. D3)

Here Nager is in part practicing dramatic economy for the audio ence has already been informed that the vice Inconsideration, who does not appear in this scene, has taken the false name of "Reason" and gone ahead of the others to pave their way (sig. $C^{\nabla}$ - C2). But, recalling Pope Gregory ${ }^{\circ} s$ warning that The first vices force themselves into the deluded mind as if under a kind of reason, this seems like a nice allegorical point.

Enough then brusquely warns the hero that he speaks *。. . from a worldiy lust which dooth you blinde" (sig. D3). But Covetous again smothers him with "sweet reasonableness and goes on to cite Scripture to such good effect that Enough retires, defeated:

He sayes wel by Lady, yea and like an honest man; But yet Sir, riches to be good. wel prooue I can. For euery man is not called after one sorte: But some are called to prophecy, some to preach \& erhorte. And he by that meanes Heauen loyes to min:
But euery man knoweth not that way to walke in. Therfore euery man (as his vocation is) must walke: I am sure that against this you wil not talke.
(sig. D3 - D3 ${ }^{\text {V }}$ )
In the final line, we hear again the undeniable weeming truth ${ }^{\text {m }}$ with which the Vice so often assails his victims. Craik notes the "superb insolence" of this argument, together with the generally "comic and sinister" tone and the skillfully maintained dramatic tension and irony of this scene. 30

The retreat or banishment of the virtuous counselor is of course the allegorical sign of the hero $s$ domfall Covetous. his victory wong launches into a long glowing speech on all the marvels that can be accomplished by ${ }^{\infty}$ policy" and promises that $1 f$ the Worldiy Man will be ruled by nim, he will show him "A thousand, thousand, thousand waies. . . of heaping up riches [sig. D4], again echoing covetise ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ promise of more $\&$ more. The Worldiy Man enthusiastically assents and confirms his own downfell in words ironically echoing the reference to Heauen loyes in Covetous. earlier speech: जThe best heauen is me thinks rich for to be $\left[51 g .04^{V}\right]$.

Both promises of Vice prove equally treacherous. The Worldiy man also tries vainly on his deathbed to will his goods to his om family and to escape the warming of God ${ }^{\text {s }}$ plague that "straungers" shall inherit "that, whiche by irawd thou hast got: ${ }^{(s i g .} \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ) o But unlike Mankind, he is cut off in the stage of his second downfall. He dies still deluded and unrepentant,
unable even to pronounce the name of God in the attempt to dictate his will, still less to call for mercy.

In Macbeth, Shakespeare ${ }^{0} s$ supreme play on the theme of worldiy ambition, the crown replaces worldiy goods and the equivocating witches replace the morality vices. But whether the witches are meant to represent the external forces of evil or the impulses within Hacbeth's own soul, ${ }^{31}$ their mode of operation is within the morality play context of the treacherous promise. Macbeth, like Mankind, comes to the bitter realization that the object of his ambition for which he has endangered his soul will be inherited by a stranger, although at this point in the play his deluded mind (ilke that of the Worldy Man) still seeks a means of escape:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Given to the common enemy of mane } \\
& \text { To make them kings, the seed of Banquo kings: } \\
& \text { Rather than so, come fate into the list, } \\
& \text { And champion me to the utterance: }
\end{align*}
$$

Banquo himself, playing the role of virtuous counselor, has warned against the treachery of the seeming truth":

> And oftentimes to win us to our harm, The instruments of darkness tell us truths, Win uswith honest trifles, to betray ss In deepest consequence.
> (I.ii1.123-6)

But Macbeth, in his deluded state, refuses to accept the warning and in his rationalizing aside speech gullibly insists on the "truth" of the witches ${ }^{\circ}$ prophecies (I.111.127-33). Only after their full treachery has been forced upon him does he realize how he has been decelved:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I pull in resolution, and begin } \\
& \text { To doubt the equivocation of the fiend } \\
& \text { That lies like truth o o (V) } \\
& \text { (V. } 42-4 \text { ) } \\
& \text { And be these juggling flends no more belleved, } \\
& \text { That palier with us in a double sense; } \\
& \text { That keep the word of promise to our ear, } \\
& \text { And break it to our hope. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
(v \circ \vee 111.19-22)
$$

Hardin Cratic notes the obvious connection of these two speeches with the morality tradition, commenting that Macbeth
-. . was tempted by the thin delusions of the devil, who had nothing to offer but flattery and temptation bolstered up by a slight and valueless framework of fact.... When the diabolical assurances of the impregnability of his castle and of his own invulnerability break down before him, he arrives at a definition of evil perfectly in accord with what the morality play had to teach - - - 32

Craigos reference to a "framework of fact" may be applied to the methods of the "reasoning Vice, whether as tempter of innocent Mankind or as encourager of mankind ${ }^{\circ}$ s more specialized evil types. Hypocrisy ${ }^{\circ} s$ "Can you deny . . . . $\%$ Infidelity ${ }^{\circ} s$ mou neuer heard in any erudition 。. . ."; Covetous ${ }^{\text {m }}$ I am sure that against thls you wil not talken: these arguments are based on irrefutable fact if taken in their logical context. Their Victims cannot mdeny it, any more than Othello can deny that Desdemona has deceived her father, or Macbeth can deny that the witches have, in a strictly legal and logical sense, fulfilled their promises. The argument based on "seaming truth" may take many forms: some proverbial, some highly ingenious, some falling to a level of crude puns, but always involving the substitution of an appearance of truth for its rality.
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The word "reason" (like the word "nature") was of course susceptible to many shades of meaning during the Renaissance, and not all these meanings were mutually consistent. one should note the role of Reason as a good counselor in Madwall's Nature; here the word was probably used in its "higher" sense, with additional humanist connotations of man ${ }^{\circ}$ s capacity to advance himself by knowledge. But in general, the conservative view of logic as deceptive and ultimately diabolical would seem to form the philosophical core of the morality playwrights ${ }^{\circ}$ treatment of the Vice as tempter.

[^3]the Psychomachia in its pure allegorical form. The later heroes enter on stage ${ }^{\text {minith }}$ their moral natures already inside them. with souls committed to good or 111 from the start - as individe ualized, although elementary, human portraits. . . The effect of this trend toward concreteness is to disorganize the original metaphor and to dispossess the personifications of vice and virtue from their original functiono

This increasing concreteness of the mankind hero, which Spivack traces in some detall (see especially pp. 92-4, 207-8, 227-35. 304-7) must inevitably affect the nature of the temptae. tions offered by the Vice, to be discussed in the present chapter.
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Spivack ( $p$. 143) comments on this visual allegorical lesson as an early example of the habit, becoming conventional in later plays, of representing a particular Vice as the metaphorical ${ }^{\text {m }}$ root of all evil ${ }^{\text {th }}$ from which all other subordinate vices spring.
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { the olde people would beleue stil in, my lawes } \\
& \text { But the yonger sort leade them a contrary way } \\
& \text { they wyl not beleue they plainly say. } \\
& \text { In olde traditions } \\
& \text { (sig. } \left.B 3^{v}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$
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Celestina herself has many tallor-made aspects of the Vice as outiined by Spivack, although Spivack does not discuss this play. She is the central intriguer and star actor" who boasts of her cleverness and explains her deceptions to the audience. Another point of kinship with the Vice is her constant use of proverbial expressions to support her "reasonable arguments. B. J. Whiting, Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama (Cambridge。 Mass. 1938). pp. 65-6, notes that in the morality plays proverbs are found "most commonly in the speeches of the evil and comic characters. The Virtues often get a fair share of the senten. tious remarks, but seldom many of the proverbs and proverbial sayings." The use of proverbs "may well be said to form a characterizing feature of the chief Vice."
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${ }^{27}$ The Tudor Interlude (Leicester, 1958), p. 102.
${ }^{28}$ Ibld.. pp. $100-01$.
${ }^{29}$ Spivack: p. 173.
30 op. cit., pp. $104-6$.
$31_{\text {Kenneth Muir in }}$ his Introduction to the New Arden edition of Macbeth (Cambridge, Masso, 1957), p. 1xili, points out that "the fact that we no longer believe in demons, and that Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ} s$ audience mostly did, does not diminish the dramatic effect for us; for with the fading of belief in the objective existence of devils. they and their operations can yet symbolize the workings of evil in the hearts of men. ${ }^{\text {m }}$

This comment might equally apply to the morality Vice, who may be interpreted either as the evil intriguer and imp of Satan, or as the self-deceiving force operating within man ${ }^{\circ}$ s mind.

32
Enclish Religious Drame, p. 388. For similar discussions of Macbeth, see: Creeth, लMoral and Tragic Recognition. ${ }^{\text {m }}$. 389; Edwin Ro Hunter, Macbeth as a Morality," SAB, XII (1937), 217-35.

CHAPTER III
THE VICE AND SOCIAL FRAUD

A third aspect of the Vice's activities involves his blending with the backeround of everyday ife at all social levels. major social and political issues of the time presented in terms of a warning against the dangers inherent in ralse apo pearances, are reflected in the Vice s infinite variety of false roles. His part as priest or iriar, hiding avarice and corrupa tion under the guise of sanctity symolized by clerical garments. mirrors a major issue of the Reformation. The deceptiveness of splendid garments $1 s$ also reflected in the Vice's role as social upatart parading in fashionable clothes: to the Tudor audience a sure elgn of moral corruption. He may also practice the more specific frauds of the financial swindler and ${ }^{m}$ coneymeatcher ${ }^{\omega}$ : gamber, plckpurse, moneylender, landiord, corrupt servant or steward. In his role as cormpter of youth. the servant or old friend becomes in addition the merry tavern compenion introducing the young man to cards, dicing, and mad company: to the Tudor audience another sure sign marking the road to damnation, and of particuler social concern if the hero so corrupted is one who might come to dignitie and promotion. ${ }^{1}$ As flattering courtier and advocate of Machiaveligan policy, the Vice reflects numerous sixteenthocentury warnings to rulers on the dangers of false counsel, as well as the widespread distrust of political "policym with the rise of Tudor statecraft, an attitude based on the theological Inheritance of the middie Ages.

Since it would be impossible in a short space to discuss fully all these social aspects of the Vice, the present chapter will concentrate on a selective study of his roles as corrupter of youth and as flattering courtier, which seem the most interesto ing as background for future dramatic developmentso But it might be remarked here that the increasingly concrete social gulses assumed by the Vice reflect the bewildering social. politicaly and economic changes of the simteenth century. As Sidney Thomas puts it; the Tudor audience

[^4]In this contert, the function of morel recognition or the uno masking of evil takes on additional social urgency.

The intense Tudor preocoupation with fraud and pretense at all levels of gociety, and its connection with the medieval theological inheritance $1 s$ forcefully summed up in a passage from one of the most representative humanist documents of the age: Sir Thomas Elyot's The Governours a mort dedicated to Henry VIII and specifically directed to parents and goung gentiemen of noble or wealthy iamliles destined to hold positions of civil authority. Agein we hear the familiar theatrical metaphor and the gmplied reference to the greater moral destructiveness of the Psychomachia es deception, which rorme the allegorical core of Spenseris The Feerle puezne as well as the morality plays:

Iniurle apparant and with powar inforced eyther may be with lyke powar resisted, or with wisdome eschued, or with entreatie refrained. . But where it 18 by creftie engyne imagined, subo tilly prepared, couertiy dissembled, and disceytefully practysed. suerly no men may by streneth withstande $1 t_{0}$ or by wisedome eskape it:.0. therfore of all iniuries that which is done by fraude is moste horrible and detestable: nat in the opinion of man onely but also in the sight and tugement of god. And the deusll is called a $\mathrm{Iver}^{\circ}$ and the ferter of Ane the Wherfore all thinge, which in visage or apparance pretendeth to be any other than verely it is, may be named a leasinges the execution wherof is rraude, which is in effecte but untrouthe, enemie to trouthe, and consequently enemye to god. For fraude is (as experience teacheth us) an eusil disceyte, craftely imagined and deuised, whiche, under a colour of trouthe and simo plicitie, indomageth him that nothing mistrusteth. 3

Eiyot, so temperate and moderate in most of his statements, here becomes almost evangelical. Although the humanist writers have often been described as contributing to the mecularization of English social and cultural thought, such a passage as this would seem forcibly to illustrate Dougles Bush ${ }^{\theta}$ s counteroargument that Tudor humanisms despite its secular and Classical content, had its roots in medieval Christianity. 4 This argument might equaily be applied to the increasing secularization of the morality plays. particularly to such works as Medwallos Rgture and skelton's fiegnifieqnce with their striking infusion of Classicel philosophy. Charges of fraud, avarice, and moral corruption cloaked under a guise of sanctity form major preocupation (if not an obsession) of Reformation propegandises on both sides. although the antiocatholic argument is better represented in the extant morality plays. Each party in fact accuses the other of what. in the contert of Elyot's denunciation. mey well have been regarded as the exdinal sin of hypocrisy. The charge is ade explicit In the name of Hypocrisy as a vice in Bale ${ }^{0}$ Three Lams (1538),

Wever ${ }^{0}$ s Lusty Juventus (c. 1550). New Custom (c. 1571), and Woodes ${ }^{\circ}$ The Conflict of Conscience (c. 1572), all antioCatholic plays; mhle the Catholic counteracharge appears in Respublica (1553) when Adulation insists on mispronouncing as "Hypocrisyo the Vice Avarice's alias of mpolicym (line 403). 5

Two passages from plays of John Bale may best sum up the constantly reiterated theme of ignorance and moral corruption benemth the holy garments of Catholic clergy and monastics. The Vice Sedition of King John ( $1538-1562$ ), in a speech too long to cite in full, reels off a comprehensive survey of cathollc orderss
In euery estate, of the clargye, I playe a part
sumtyme I can be, monke in a long syd covie
sumtyme I can be, a none \& loke iyke an owle
sumtyme a chanon, in a syrples fayer \& whyght
a chapterhowse monke, sumtym I apere in syght
I am ower syre Iohn, sumtyme with a new shauen crowne
sumitym the person, \& swepe the stretes with a syd gowne
sumtyme $I^{\circ}$ can piaye, the whyght monke, sumtyme the fryer
the purgatory prist, \& euery mans wyffe desyer
(196-210)
At the end of Three Laws Bale, following his usual custom of reo inforcing his polemic with carefully underlined visual allegory. gives the following directions for costuming of the vices:

Lete Idolatry be decked lyke an olde wytche, Sodomy lyke a monke of all sectes, Ambycyon lyke a byshop, Couetousnesse lyke a pharyse or spyrituall lawer, false doctryne, lyke a popysh doctour, and hypocresy lytre a graye fryre. The rest of the partes are easye ynough to coniecture.

$$
\left(\text { sig. } G^{\nabla}\right)
$$

Commenting on this passage. T. W. Craik points out its wide apo plication to plays of the Reformation period:

To catalogue every instance of this between Bale ${ }^{\circ}$ g plays and the end of the century would be tedious, but it can be truthfully sald thst scarely a single antioCathollc play in thls period rails to introduce some such character as Flattery disguised as ariar (Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis) or Ignorance as an old Popish priest (Enough is as good ase Feast The longer thou livest the more Fool thou grt. New Custom) $?$

One further passage, however, is of particular interest for its explicit appication of the appearance and reality theme to Protestant polemic. The Prologue to Nem Custom opens with the rollowing eamonition:

Al thinger be not soe ss in sight they doe secme. What so euer they resemble, or what euer men deeme. For if our senges in their owne oblects vs doe fayle Sometimes. then our iudgemente shall but little aualle
 Makinge semblant of antiquitie in all that they did. To the intent that their subtilitie by suche meanes might be hid.

As Ao Po Rossiter points out, both sides issued similar warninge. "OThe old redsgion looks all right. sald the protestant obut beware of covert evil. Ioli show you. The catholie replied in simblar terms. . . om A major topical theme in this play is the controversy over cierical gaments which almost spitt the Established Church during the early years of Elizabeth ${ }^{\circ}$ reigno ${ }^{9}$ The extreme bitterness of this controvergy mignt be partially explained in terms of the horror of pretense and hypocrisy which was, ironically, inherited by the Reformers from Medieval Catholic theology.

Another form of pretense 18 exposed in the stock figure of the social upstart or fashionable "gallant. although the playwrights sarirical purpose is blended with a more general
denunciation of worldiy vanity and excess. Craik points out the widespread appearance of this theme in both Tudor and Elio zabethan drama:

The purpose of most moral interludes is to condemn the extravao gance and frivolity of the young mgallant." his dress, intended by him to reach heights of novelty, became for that reason as instantly identiplable as andform. Hhen sumptuary laws preo vented, or at least condemned, excesses in apparel. it would be instantly perceived that a character in a feathered hat. slashed doublet, scalloped sleeves, and (later) bombested breeches was full of vanity and wickedness .o. o The gallantos costume contrnues on the Elizabethan public stage, and indicates (for example) the degeneracy of Gaveston in Edward II or of Richard II's iavorites in Woodstock: it also i imagine, diso tinguishes the decadent marberomonger ${ }^{\infty}$ Oswld from the home. spun plainedealing Kent . . . in King Lear. 10

Newogyse in Mankind (c. 1465-1470) and Nsehol Newfangle in Fuls wello lesson in their names as well as their dresso Pride in Medwallos Nature (c. 1495), who boasts that his father 18 a knight and his mother "callyd mademe (Part 1 . line 734). ds one of the earliest vice plgures to be given a specific social milleu. He describes in detail his fine garmentss a scarlet cloak which "cost me a noble at one pyche (Part $I_{0}$ line 752). laced doublet with satin stomacher, and short gom mith mide sleeves. His status as social climber is further revealed in his boastful extrance accompanied by his diminutive page-boy, which as Spivack points out bears a strong resemblance to Falstarf in II Henry IV ${ }^{11}$ and later in an interesting colloquy tith Sensuality:

Syr I vnderstand that this gentyimen 18 borne to great foro tunes and intendeth to inhebyt herein the contray. And I ama gentylman that almey hath be brought vp wyth great estatys and
affeed wyth them and yf I myght be in lyke fauour wyth this gentylman I wold be gled therof and do you a pleasure. (Part $I_{9}$ fol. ine 836)

This speech, also notable as the first example of prose in English drame, gives a vivid impression of the spurious gentleman attaching himself to the household of a rich young man newly arrived in London.

The gambler Colhazard of Impatient Poverty (c. 1547) emo bodies a topical satire on intrusive foreigners as well as social upstarts. His coneyocatching colleague misfule describes him as follows:

Colehassarde came late from be yonde the see
Ragged and torne in a garded cote
And in hys purse neuer a grote
And nowe he goeth lyke a lorde
(sig. DV)
Later, after they have rooked the hero of 2000 in a rigged game. Colnazard exultingly speculates on what use he will make of his winnings:

Now shall I take a manauntes place
To occupye $I$ truste wythyn shorte space
To be in credence wyth Englysh men
And when I am so well be truate
I maye borowe so moche as me luste
A subtyll crafte then fynde $I$ muste
To conuaye ander coloure lyte free men
(sig. D2 ${ }^{\text {V }}$ )
In this speech, the fledieval denunclation of deceit "coloured" like truth is given a specific topical application.

Another spurlous gentleman is the vice Courtly Abusion in Skelron ${ }^{\circ}$ s Magnificence (c. 1515). The Tudor audience would not fail to appreciate the ironic contrast between his opening mords. describing and demonstrating himself as a "rutter, ${ }^{12}$ and his fashionable dress:

Huffa huffa tanderum taunderum tayne nuffa huffa. Howe sayst thou man am not I a Ioly rutter. Me seme I flye $\dot{I}$ am so iyght $_{\circ}^{\circ}$
To daunce delyght
properly drest all poynt deugse
My persone prest beyonde all syse
of the newe gyse

$$
\left(\text { sigo } C^{\mathrm{V}} \propto \mathrm{C} 2^{\mathrm{V}}\right)
$$

- . carlys sonne brought vp of nought wyth me wyll wonne whylyst he hath ought
He wyll haue wrought
His gowne so wyde that he may hyde
His dame and his syre within his slyue Spende all his hyre that men hym gyue
(sig. C3)
Once corrupted by the vices, the mankind hero is often deluded into belleving that fine clothes make the gentleman and, as Courtly Abusion suggests, will mpende all his hyren to buy suitabiy fashionable garments. The impoverished courtier willingo toowinoworship in WQpullis The Tide tarrieth No Man (1576). Ilo lustrates this lesson at a level close to domestic tragedy. Urged on by the Vice Courage, he borrows money at adsastrous rate of interest (further padded by graft) to buy the "costle and gay attire without which his position at court is hopeless: and his final fate mey be shown in the figure of the Debtor on his way to prison and unable even to send for a friend to pay his ball since he lacks money to bribe the sergeant. ${ }^{13}$

But this lesson carries more than secular implications. Man, the "poor, bare, forked animal. cannot remain innocent and "naked": but his Pride instructs him to cover his "unaccomoo dated ${ }^{m}$ lesh with a false appearance of giltter and splendor. This symbolic use of clothing, as Thelma N. Greenfield points
out is presented with particular allegorical clarity in Nature. and reaches its dramatic climar in King Learo 84 Pride in Nature not only displays himself as counterfeit gentleman and social climber: but he also devises the fashionable dress which he assures Man, is nore pitting for one of his high station than his simple gowno Allegory and secular reallsm are inextricably blended.

Lewis Hager"s Pride in The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene (c. 1558) instructs Mery in the mequivalent costume for remale characters . . . elaborate hair dressing, tighto laced stays, and hooped skirts. ${ }^{15}$ Good counsel in Lusty Juventus rebukes the corrupted hero for his frivolous dress: To aduaunce your plesh. you cut and lag your clothes ${ }^{m i g}$ [83]. In Like ㅂ11 to like es Craik conments ethe direction Tom Tospot commeth in with a fether in his Hat announces him as a debauched prodigel: from this one detall the producer mould mow the rest of the costume required . . . . ${ }^{16}$ The satirical significance of so simple a stage property as the feathered hat 18 even more pointediy demonsirated in $W$. Heger ${ }^{\circ}$ The Longex Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art (c. 1559). When Moros new steward Ignorance promises him anything his heart fancies, ${ }^{m}$ 。. . what so euer it doth cost ( ${ }^{(1 g}$. F2), Moros can think of nothing more desirable than a feather for his hat: This will make me a Gentieman alones (sig. F2 ${ }^{\text {V }}$ ). But Pride goeth before a fall; and in looking upward to admire the reather. Moros stumbles and hurts his knee. (Despite the slapstick elements of this scene, the Tudor audience would probably have fully enjoyed the visual
proverb.) Moros also appears as the false gentleman and social upstart when Ignorance rebukes him for his wunseemlie fashion of wearing his sword and fusses about trying to tidy up his clothing。

The Vice as corrupt servant or steward in the household of a rich young gentleman also illustrates one aspect of his larger social role as financial swindier and coney-catcher. This element of his activities has considerable moral as well as social significance in reflecting the conservative distrust of worldiy rlches inherited from the Middle Ages. During the sixo teenth century, the closed, coooperative, and largely agricultural Medieval economic system was giving way to the rise of capitalisa and large profits; social classes were being dislocated in part due to enclosures and the growth of the land market; poverty. unemployment, and wandering bands of criminais and beggars were major social problems. ${ }^{17}$ Financial opportunism and apolicy existed at all social levels; and once again. Elyot's The Governour sets forth the conservative attitude in terms strongly suggesting the theatrical metaphor of the morality plays:

That maner of iniurie, which is done with fraude and disceyte, is at this present time so communely practised, that if it be but a litle, it is called policie, and if it be moche and with a visage of grauitie, it is than named and accounted for wisedome.
(BK. III. Ch。 4 ; p. 206)
Salingar, who discusses the distrust of wealth and profit in Jacobean drama and its Hedieval roots, points out that in the moralities, "the moral role of the disguisers is of ten completely merged into their role as the agents of social change, ${ }^{n}$ whereas
the other charecters represent "the permanent and unequivocal morel standards which maintain social stability。" He goes on to say:

Tredetionsi ethies under the Tudors subsume social and economic questions directiy under moral categories; the system rests on the belief that the social order has been established by Nature In accordance with the divine will.。. . By the end of the century, as comercial enterprise, money power, and new induso trial technlques began to dominate ceonomic lifes they seemed to involve change in the whole relationship between man and nature - $\circ$ - To conservative minds. it meant the substitution of appearence for realityo 18

In other mords. during this perlod religion cannot be dissociated from secular ethicsi even when the religious appilcation is not specifically stated, the audience would probably make the connection.

Since the markind hero, morel and social victim of the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ financial saindles. $s$ often in addition the gullible young prodigal nemly arrived in London and looking ror ways to spend his inheritance, the moral appidcation of this theme all be discussed more fully in connection with the vice?s role as corrupter of youth. But a em eraplesmight serve to indicate the more general social aspects of nis criminal activities. In the two plays by W. Wager, the laments of People (The Longer Thou Livest) and Tenant, Servant and Hireling (Enough . . .) demonstrate both metaphorlcally and literally what happens to the innocent bystander when mankind surrenders to the evil halif oi his nature, represented by the vices as corrupt and cheating* stewards of nis household. 19 In The Mide rexrieth No Meno the associate vices Hurtful Help. painted Broist and Feigned

Furtherance are hardiy to be differentiated in function from two of their colleagues and victims: the covetous landiord No Good Neighborhood and the landlordomerchantousurer Greediness. Together they act out a comprehensive denunciation of pinancial profiteering and fraud in the mercantile world of Lond on. 20

Tuming from the midales to the lowerclass milleug the Vices of several plays mould seem to represent the company of mandering beggars, tinkers, rogries, and wrufflers ${ }^{21}$ denounced In the earliest coneyocatching pamphletsi John Awdeley ${ }^{\circ}$ Fras temity of Vagabonds (1561) and Thomas Harman ${ }^{\circ}$ A Caveat for Common Cursitors (1566). The disreputable trio NewoGyse, Nought and Nowomodays in Mankind are perhaps the earliest ancestors of this type. Folly in The Horld and the child (co 1508) offers himself as servant to lanhood essures him that he can mynde a syue and tynke pan [sig. B4 $]_{0}$ 。 and boasts of his extensive travelling over London and all of England. The title-character of Hickscomer (c. 1513) with his rowdy tale of shipwreck on the Irish seas might combine elements of the rurfler with Harman ${ }^{\circ} 8$ *Freshe Water Marlner or Whipiacke ${ }^{6}$ while Awdeley description of the Curtesy Man ${ }^{\circ} s^{\text {m }}$ method of approaching his victim could apply to any number of smoothotalking and mellodressed vices, of which Covetous in Enough Is as Good as a Feast (c. 1560) is perhaps the best example: ${ }^{22}$ comment by $A_{0} V_{0}$ Judges on the public attitude toward this magged army virtualiy sums up the major characteristics of the Vice as Spivack has defined them:

They were feared by gentry and common people alike, because they had courage, resource and versatile talents, had often too a good address and plausible appearance, and knew how to stir up trouble in a district when it suited their purpose. 23

Harman's pamphlet, which purports to catalogue and expose the variety of knaves encountered by the author as a country magistrate, is of particular interest in relation to the morality play habit of looking at evil as deception. It is significant to note how often and how emotionally he uses such words and phrases as "hypocrisy," wdeceit, "dissimulate, "dissemble" "deep dissembler, "deep dissimulation. ${ }^{24}$ An object of his special horrori, whom he favors with severel woodcut illustrations as well as two strikingly inept poems, is one Nicolas Jennings, a ${ }^{\text {ecounterfet cranke }}$ (or one who felgns affliction with epio lepsy) who is also a master at playing many other parts. The first of these poems, accompanying a woodeut showing Nicolas in two of his roles. is worth quoting in full:

These two pyctures, lguely set out, One bodye and soule, god send him more grace. This monstrous desembelar. a Cranke all about. Vncomly couetinge, of eche to imbrace, Money or wares, as he made his race. And sometyme a marynar, and a ruinge man. Or els an artiflcers as he would fayne than. Such shyftes he vsed, being well tryed. Abandoninge labour, tyll he was espyed. Conding punishment, for his dissimulation, He sewerly recequed with much decination. ( p 。 50 )
${ }^{W}$ Thowgh I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle foxe ${ }^{\infty}$ These words of the Vice Dissimulation in King John (line p08) wight easily have been spoken by Nicolas as Harman depicts him. Or as Hapo hazard in Appius and Virginia puts it: why the Gods, I snow
not how best to deulse./ My name or my property, well to dise guisesm (sig. B): Harmin gives to the knave who plays many roles a realolife identity。 ${ }^{25}$

The financial swinder and coneyocatcher appears most characterietically in these pamphlets as the gambler or one of his highly specialized colleagues. Although this aspect of the Vice appears in Impotient poverty it is more often infsed with his role as corruptor of youth under the guise of jovial tavern companione: The indiscretions of the roistering prodigal might seem more venial than deady. But the Tudor audience, even while enjoying the farcical comedy of the London taverns and stews, would be made fully aware of their place on the primrose path. Elyot in The Governour inveighs against the darigers of dicing and evil companions in what seems consciously intended as a miniature morality play plot. complete with false names. After denouncing gambing as device of Lucifer nto allure or bringe men pleasauntly in to damiable seruitude...em he continues as follows:

The rirst occasion to playe is tediousnes of vertuous occupation. Immediately succedeth coualting of an other mans goodes. whiche they calle playinge; therto is annected auarice and straite kepynge, whiche they call wynyng . . . . than folowethe furye or rage, whiche they call courage: amonge them cometh in inordinate watche, whiche they name paynfuinesse; he bringethe in glotonie. and that 28 good fellowshippe; and after cometh slepe superfluous. called among them naturall peste; and he sometyme bringeth in lechery, which is now named daliance. The name of this Tresorie $1 s$ verily ldienesse, the dore wherof is lefte myde open to dise plaiers; but if they happe to bring in their company, lerninge. Vertuouse busines, ilberalitie, pacience, charitie.. . they must leue them without the gries. For Eulll custome, which is the porter, will net surfre them to entre.
(Bk. I Ch. 26; p. 109)

It is significant that although the subject of this chapter is eames and "exercises" which may be expedient for a gentleman if moderately used. Elyot expends great space on his denunciation of gambing.

The deceptiveness of Good Fellowship has been suggested in passages cited in the first chapter: in Nature and New Custom. his true names are Gluttony and the drunkard. Even in Everyman (c. 1495), a play without an obvious vice figure, Fellowship reo veals the same social and moral pedigree in his essurances to the hero: ${ }^{26}$

And yet, yi thou wyite ete \& arynke \& make good chere. Or haunt to women the lusty company. I wolde not forsale you whyle the daye is clere, But and thou wyil nurder; or ony man kyil. In that I wyil helpe the with a good wyil. (272-82)

To the humansist, as Elyot so clearly explains, the first step on the road to such scicial evils is lack of "vertuouse oce cupation ${ }^{\text {; }}$ and recognition of this attitude makes more explicable the long closing sermon of Lallsto and Melsbea (c, 1527) on the dangers of idieness: from a dramatic point of view almost ludio crously irrelevent to the story. ${ }^{27}$ Idieness, the allegorical sign above Elyot's tavern door, is of course a favorite vice of the educational moralists, whi would have taken with utmost seriouso ness the proverb that me Devil finds wort for idie hands. ${ }^{\circ}$ Along with Ignorance and Sensual Appetite, he plays a major part in the humanist John Rastell ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ Nature of the Four Elements (c. 1517). This piay, as Spivack points out, ciosely imitates

Medwalls Neture paxticulariy in its rowdy scenes of London low IIfeg and the secularosounding vices of Rastellos play, like Medwallos Seven Deadly Sins, perform the roles of roistering tavern companionsa 28 In W. Wager ${ }^{\circ}$ The Longer Thou Livest. the Vice Idleness as the allegorical mroot of all evil" becomes the Vice Ignorance in Moros manhood. This play. though not mritten by a member of the recognized humanist circie, contains a thoroughiy humanist dedication to young men destined to places of authority (see note 1 above) as well as continual emphasis on educetion. ${ }^{29}$

Idigness. Ignorance, and Tediousness all appear in John Hedrord ${ }^{\circ}$ sit and Science (c. 1539), although the latter 18 not a vice pigure but the giant of chivalric romance whom the hero must conquer in order to min the lady Science. The Vice as gambler or tavern companion does not appear, but the theological horror of genbline 48 expressed in full force. Idieness herself. rollowing the Vices sophistical habit of slandering Virtue with their own qualities, drives away Honest Recreation with a superbly ironsc "virtuous" diatribes
am I the roote seyst thon of vyciousnes nay thow axt roote of all vyce dowteles thow art occacion 10 of more evyll then I poore gerle nay more then the dyvyll the dyvyil \& hys dam can not devyse more dysiyshnes then by the doth ryse marts her dawnsyng her maskyng \& mumang mhere more concupyscence then ther cummyng her cardyng her dycyng dayly \& nyghtlye where fynd ye more falcehod then there not lyghtly

> serche the tavemes and ye shall here cleere such bawdry as bestes wold spue to heere but whych is wurst of vs twayne now iudge wyt ( $368 \times 88$ )

Redford's distinction between Honest Recreation and Idleness duplicates Elyot's humanist lesson cited above. It is interesting that even in this play, with its entirely secular content. gambiing, taverns and Idieness (which is of course another name for the Deadly Sin of Sloth), are inextricably inked with raiseo hood and the Devil.

The figure of youth, regarded by the Tudors as naturally prone to rashness and folly unless properly gulded, ${ }^{30}$ thus prom vides early examples of the specialized mankind hero, and the first example of manind ${ }^{\circ}$ instial appearance in the play as one neturally incilned to the evil side of the psychomachia. Just as the entrance of Moros whygyng the foote of many Songes, as fooles were wont.m (sig. A3) would at once suggest to the Tudor audience the willful heediesmess of youth, so would the entrance of his prototype, the titiecharacter of youth (c. 1520):

> I an goodle of persone
> I am pereles where euer I come In neme is youth I tell the I plourish as the vine tree I on the heyre of ony fathers lande ind it is come into my hande I care for nomore.
( $40-58$ )
The latter lines may daentify him as the first of many prodigal sons in English drama. Such a charecter needs little urging to wickedness, and this in fact is one of the few morallites where

Vice does not need to disgusse itselfond the military Psychoo mehian survives strongly in the open violence and insult between Youthes virtues and viees (particularig in the setting of Charity In the stocks). But 10 is interesting in providing the relatively pure allegorlesl background for ister prodigaloson plays, par. ticularly Iusty Juventus and Misogonus. which present the same theme in an increasingly realistic setting.

Even in Youth, one might add, the idea of deception 18 not altogether absent. When Youth calls on his "brother Rior to help him drive apay the tiresome preacher Charity, there is the guggestion that Riot has already corrupted him under the guise of company. This social motif is again hinted at when Youth repeats his boast of being the rich heir to his fatheres estates and. wishes he had more servants. Riot promptiy obliges: and as in Nature, the rich young man ${ }^{\circ}$ Pirst mervant is Pride:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I can spede the of a seruante of pryce } \\
& \text { That wil do thee good seruice } \\
& \text { I se hin go here be side } \\
& \text { Some men cal him mayster pryde } \\
& \text { Io mayster youth here he is } \\
& \text { A prety man and wise }
\end{aligned}
$$

(312-23)
Youth enthusiastically agrees to follow their counsel and commit himself $\operatorname{vinder}$ the techynge of Ryot and you (ine 355); they begin his education by introducing him to Lechery; and later, When Youth is besieged on either side by his vices and virtues attempting to possess his souls Riot reminds bim that their memyngem surpasses that of Charity and Humility:

# Syr [we] can teache you to play at the dice At the quenes game and at the Iryshe The Treygobet and the hasarde also And many other games mo 

Thls scene, though dramatically unrewarding, is interesting for its double and unblended presentation of pure allegory and deo tailed social realism.

Lusty Juventus, a mork which makes more explicit use of the Biblical prodigal son theme and (perhaps) of the continental 31
educational drame, is also more complex in its social realism. The hero ${ }^{\circ}$ s first entrance, singing the lyric In youth is pleasure ${ }^{\text {m }}$ Is in the same tradstion as the entrances of Youth, Moros, and the prodigals Ismal and Dailian in Nice Wanton But unilke these protagonists, he goes through a stage of initial conversion and repentance, alded by Good Counsel and Knowledge. Therefore the Vice Hypocrisy, under the allas of Friendship, must devise an elaborate plot of deception in order to introduce him to the associate vices Fellowship (whose lack of an alias suggests that the name itself was regarded as sufflciently deceptive), and Abominable Living, whose allegorical pseudonym is muknowen Honesty but who also plays the ifteral role of ${ }^{\circ}$ Little Bessim a servant girl who entertains the hero and his vices while her master and mistress are at the opreaching. 32 Although there is no actual tavern or gambling scene, the playwright economically uses a reference to gambling both to suggest the depths of Juo ventus ${ }^{\circ}$ downfall and to get him back on stage at a crucial point. Good Counsel. preaching to the audience, laments the hero $s$ coro ruption in a speech ending with the words: Heaping sinne vpon
sinne, vice vpon vice. Juventus promptly reenters, exciaiming:

Who is here playing at the dice?
I heard one speake of synnes [cinque] and cyce. His wordes did me entice, Hither to come:
(sig. E2)

This incident, when acted, would be both amusing and splendidiy 1ronic. The deluded hero (newly dressed in his foppish "cutw and jagged clothes) hurries in expecting to find a jolly dice game, only to receive an overwhelming moral scolding from Good Counsel which drives home to the audience the fatuousness of nis delusion.

The elaborate and psychologically realistic scene in which ${ }^{\infty}$ Friendship draws Juventus to nis first tavern visit has been discussed in the two previous chapters. But the social background of this scene $1 s$ of special interest in relation to another early coneyocatching pamphlet, Gllbert Walker's A Manifest Detection of Diceoplay (1552). In his preliminary address to the readero the author explains that he wishes to expose such naughty practices ${ }^{\circ}$ only because "under colour and cloak of friendship, many young gentlemen be dram to their undoingom 33 In the text itselfo written in the form of dialogue between ${ }^{m} R^{n}$ (a young man newly arrived in London) and an older and wiser ${ }^{\omega M} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{M}}$ the former narrates how he was accosted on the street by a pleasant and wellodressed gentleman of a cheerful countenance who offered himgelf as friend and counselor. His new friend invited him to the first of several supper parties at which were "divers gentiemen。 all strangers, and by the end of a week he had somehow, by bad lucko
lost the mount of tho while playing at cards and dice. wMm laments, ${ }^{\text {n }}$ How soon reckless youth falleth in snare of crafty dealing:" and proceeds to undecelve the young gull by exposing to him the "sleights and falsehood $s^{n}$ of gamblerso ${ }^{34}$

Among the more elaborate devices which ${ }^{\mathrm{Hm}}$ describes is one called "barnard ${ }^{9}$ s law which requires an association of conspirators, "each of them to play a long several part by himselfow These skilled actors include the "takeroup," who by long practice has learned ${ }^{\text {ma }}$ hundred reasons to insinuate himself into a man ${ }^{\circ}$ acquaintance": the "verser, noted for his respectable appearance and who "counterfalteth the gentlemen"; and the marnard" or master cardosharper, who instigates the game often by acting the part of a country bumpisin or drunkard. 35

The famly resemblance to the general methods of the ino sinuating vices (opposed by mood counselm) seems unmistakable, particularly in relation to Lusty Juventus and Impetient Poverty where gambling is made major issue. The authoris concern for the morals of wealthy young men, his use of the theatrical metao phor, and his kinship with both Harman and Elyot in his special abomination of social injury as fraud and deceit: all these may serve as further evidence that the morallty playwrights drew on real social conditions, and not mereiy abstract theology, for their picture of vice and human gulilbility;

Three additional plays are of interest in transferring the theme of prodigal youth to a setting in which the external devices of allegory have almost disappeared. The first two will be mentioned briefly since the role of the Vice 18 not of primary
dramatic importance. Nice Wanton (c. 1550) presents a convincing middleaclass picture of two spoiled children, a virtuous elder brother, and an indulgent mother; and the vices Iniquity and Worlaly Shame are the only characters with openly ailegorical 36 names. Insquity retains some vestiges of his original alleo gorical function in the suggestion that he is an old comrade With whom the two sinners have been long acqualnted. But he plays a primarily itteral role as a rake who seduces the sister and introduces her to harlotos life, and drives the brother to robbery and the gallows by fleecing him of his money (stolen from his father) in rigged dice gemes. In Like will to Like. the prodigals Tom Tosspot and Relph Rolster are at once victims and confederates of the Vice Nichol Newfangle. Tom boasts of how he encourages servants and poor men to spend their pay on drink: while Raiph claims that he is the superior knave: wor I intice yong gentlemen all vertue to eschewes/ And giue them to rioutousnes, this is irue ${ }^{\text {mo }}\left(s i g\right.$. $B 4^{\nabla}$ )。 The drunken Hance ${ }^{\circ}$ once a scholar but now servant and soon to become an inhabitant of the spittalohouse, is one of Ralph ${ }^{\circ}$ sictims:

I knew Haunce when he was as he saith
For he was once a scholler in good faith. But through my company he was withdrawn from thence, through his riote and excessiue expence. Unto this erede, which now you doo in him see: So that now he is wholy addicted to followe me.

The social tragedy of prodigal youth, present only a possio bility in the earlier plays, is in Nice wanton and Lite will to like brought to asevere conclusion. In these plays, the external
allegory of the Vice as corruptor of youth has become dislocated. but its moral bechground remains the same.

Misogonus (c. 1570) is of particular interest for future dramatic developments in its thoroughly English blend of elements from three genres: the continental prodigalason play, Latin intrigue comedy, and the morality play. ${ }^{37}$ Cacurgus is an especially interesting mixture of Vice, domestic fool, parasite, and ciever intriguing servant assisting the son against the father. But as Madeleine Doran points out:

- . though he is a fun-maker, as both these [latter two] characo ters are, he 1s evil, as they are not, and as the tempting Vice is. As in the morality plays generaliy, it is the scenes of loose living that are depicted with the greatest realism. The tavern setting, with dreing, dancing, and whoring, is made contemporary and topical by the inclusion of Sir John, a merry and seandelous priest.
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Sir John (or the same ramily as the village priests in Wo Hager ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ two plays) the meretrix melisse, and the roistering servants Orgelus end Oenophilus: these are of course Idieness, Ignorance, Lechery, Rsot, Pride, Gluttony, and mood Fellowshipm given local habitations and nawes.

Cacurgus himself is a versatile representative of the Vice as "actor. ${ }^{\circ}$ His subsidiary role as travelling quack doctor and astrologer (by which he tries to dilssuade the two rustics from disclosing the existence of Misogonus ${ }^{\circ}$ longolost twin) is outside the morality tradition, ${ }^{39}$ but artistically in keeping with it. In his major role, he dellberately plays the part of wW11 Somer ${ }^{\infty}$ or the natural fool, not to decelve Misogonus who is already corrupted, but to deceive the father who gullibly
belleves that his "slmplem servant will keep him informed of his $\operatorname{son}^{\circ}$ s misdoings. Cacurgus does in fact betray the son to the father as well as the father to the son when it suits his purpose, thus reveailng himself as an Ambidexter who with both hands finely can playom His contempt for his victim, and his conscious reference to himself as matorm and vice, are abundantiy expressed in a number of sardonic boasts to the audience:

I laughe at the olde fooles so hartelye. he ha he
You may percelue what I am so muche I doe laughe
 He talketh of me I warrent yow in my absence who but I to make him pastime who cham his none sonne And proudiy I tell yow to everie in commer He bragges what a naturall his lucke was to haue [How si]mple ${ }^{\circ}$ how honest, how falthfull and irewe
(I.21.13-32)

Ho ha. now will I goe playe will somaer agayne and seme as verle a gose as i waz before musche douche yow vounder.
(II.111.79ヵ81)

These passages also point up an interesting refinement of the Vice's acting skill: cacurgus not only assumes a role, but adds the appropriate rustic aialect to go with it.

As Madeleine Doran points out. the theme of prodigal youth continues to be a favorite in Elizabethan and Jacobean comedy: and the plays of middleton, Heywood, and Jonson expand and improve on the structural combination of genres presented in Misogonus. ${ }^{40}$ The coneyocatching pamphlets of these periods continue even more explicitiy the moralityoplay association of mickedness with deo ception begun by their Tudor predecessors. As Thomas Detyer puts its

All Vieeg maske thenselues with the vizards of Vertues they borrowe their names. the better and more currantiy to passe without suspition: for murder will be called Mannood, Dronkene nesse is now held to be ghisief. Impudence is Audecities Byot, good fellowship \&c. 41

Although by this time such pamphlets may put the financial purm poses of joumalism gbove thet of morel instruction for its own sake, their wide popularity suggests that these themes were still of mejor social concern.

But the most fascinating and complex descendant of the Vice as *Good Fellowship* is of course Falstarf. Prince Hal nimseif, signilicantly in the midst of a playacting scene in which he and Falstarf twice exchange roles as father and song sums up the matter in a speach full of double ironies which the audio ence could hardiy have falled to appreciate:

-     - there is devil haunts thee in the ilkeness of an old fat man; tun of man is thy companiono Why dost thou converse with that truak of humourss, that boltingohutch of beastiness. that huge bombard of sack - . that reverend vice, that grey iniquity, that father rufilan that vanity in years? Wherein is he good but to taste sack and drink it? wherein neat and cleaniy, but to carye a capon and eat it? wherein cunning, but in craft? mherein crafty, but in villainy? wherein villainous. but in all thinge? wherein worthy, but in nothing?
(I Henry IV. II。iv.492-506)
Spivack and other critics have eramined the vice elements in
Falstaff and the more general morality influence on the two Henry IV pleys. Spivack also coments on the more specific resemblances to his allegorical prototypes in Nature and Nature of the Four Elements: to Gluttony with ${ }^{\text {ma }}$ chese and a botellog the social upstart and bombastic knigint pride; and the tal knyghte of the "shrewd fray" reported by Rastellos Ignorance。 42 Falstaff is
of course far too complex \& eharscter to be categorized only in these ferms. But Spivactis axgument that the Elizabethan audience would have recognized Falstaff ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ moral pedigree indicates the continuing vitalify of the morality tradition even after the decline of external allegory. Debteros apparently deliberate use of morality terminology in a pamphlet adaressed to the general public would seem further to support this argument. The sixteenthecentuxy audience would naturally expect a prince such as Hal to be surrounded - in court as well as tavern by false frlends and counselors who, by undermining his moral charscter, would seem to strike at the heart of their society. The Vice's role as plattering courtier thus replects a major preoccupation of the time, expressed both poetically and in countless prose works of advice to princes of which Erasmus ${ }^{\circ}$ The Education of a Christian Prince is among the most fawous. In the Pollowing pasage, Erasmus seems almost automatically to use the theatrical metephors

[^5]Thomes Wyatt, in words closer to the morelity play terminology. brings the same thought down to a direct personal level when he explains his voluntary exile from court:

[^6]```
As dronkenes good felloweshippe to call:
    The frendly froo with nis dowble fece
    Say he is gentill and courtois therewithall:
And say that Favell hach a goodly srace
    In eloquence; and crueltie to name
    Zele of justice and chaunge in tyme and place;
    The leccher a lover: and tirannye
    To be the right of a prynces resgne:4i
```

Elyot, in a chapter of The Governour significantiy titled whe election of frendes and the diuergite of flaterers" continaully stresses the flatterer"s skill as actorg

Of this peruerse and cursed people be sondry kyndes, some whiche apparauntly do flatter praysinge and extoliinge euery thinge that is done by their superior. . . And if they perceyue any parte of their tale msastrusted, than they sette furthe sodaynly an heule and sorowfull countenaunces as if they were abiecte and brought in to exireme desperation.. . . Semblably there be some that by dissimulation can ostent or shewe mighe grauitie, mixte with a sturdy entretaynement and facion . . naming them selfes therfore playne men . . . And in this wyse pytchinge their nette of adulation they intrappe the noble and vertuous harte, which onely beholdeth their fayned soueritie and counterfayte wisedome . . .
(Blz. II. Ch. 148 pp. 190ه93)
From the ${ }^{\omega}$ sorowfull countenaunce of fian ${ }^{\infty}$ s temporarily deserted companions in Neture, to the sober Sadness of Cloaked Collusion
 ing." - Elyot whether consciousiy or not. perfectly describes the false face of the flattering vice. Man and Othello, though not princes in the sense of royalty, are princes in the wider humanst meaning of men of rank responsible for the welfare of othersi and like Magniflcences each in his initial innocent state may be described as a noble and vertuous narte。m 45

Skelton in his allegorical poem The Bowge of Court (1499)
as well as in fignificence is continueliy preoccupied with the
flatterer as actor, the "frendly ffoo with his dowble faces the symbolism of the hood and the cloak. 46 one speech of the courtier Dissimulation is of particular relevance to the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ ironic pretense of being a "playne" and wonest" man:

I wolde eche man were as playne as $I$ : It is a worlde, I saye, to here of some:
I hate this faynynge, fye toon it, fye: 4 ?
-I speke plainlye I cen not flatter, Politict Persuasion assures the Fiarquis in Patient Grissil1 (inne 419). Covetous in Enough Is as Good as Ferst weeps as he protests. $\mathrm{m}_{\text {。 . . I am not he }}$ that any man wil flatter (sig. D). With a subtler double ironyo Iago (referring to Cassio) tells Othello that men should be what they seem: (III.111.126): and Cornwall in King Lear thus accuses the genuinely plainodealing Kent after he has beaten the foppish sycophant Oswald:

This is some fellow.
Who, heving been prased for bluntness, doth affect A saucy roughness, and constrains the garb Quite from his nature: he cannot flatter, he. An honest mind and plaing he must speati truth: An they will take it. so if not, he s plain. These kind of knaves I know, which in this plainness Harbour more crapt and more corrupter ends Than twenty gilly ducking observants That stretch their duties nicely.
(II.11.101-10)

Cornwalis speech suggests that by the time King Lear was writo ten, if not long before, this type of deceiver had become viro tually a cliche whom the audience would instantiy recognize. The first type of flatterer named by Elyot is perhaps best represented by the figure of Courtly Abusion who charms

Magnificence with his "pollyshed and pleasantw speech praising his princely estate, mich he makes bold to suggest might become even more splendid eIf it wolde lyke you to here my pore myndew (sig。E2) o Magnilicence graciously urges him to speak, and consents to a further step toward hss domfall by commissioning him to "purchase" such princely necessities as a mistress and clothes in weuery newe facyon (sig. E2 ${ }^{\mathrm{V}}$ ). But Magnificence has already been corrupted by rlattery, as suggested on his first entrance after the conspiracy sequence when he puts his wealth (Felicity) in charge of Liberty and Fancy, ignoring Fella city ${ }^{\circ}$ protest and listening instead to the flattering approval. of Crafty Conveyances All that ye say syr is reason and skyll* [sig. $\left.D 4^{V}\right]$ 。

Mesndficence unquestionably attacks many courtly evils of the time as skelton and nis contemporaries saw them; whether in addition it was meant as a specific warning to Henry VIII against Skelton's archoenemy Cardinal Wolsey 18 complex question beyond the scope of this thesis. 48 But it is interesting to note the repetition of the waming against flattery in sackville and Norton ${ }^{\circ}$ g Gorboduc (1562). play openly directed to the reigning monarch. 49 The major $18 s u$ e 18 of course concerned with the dangers of civil mar when a ruler dies without an heir: but the second act in two companion scenes treats the corruption of the King*s sons Ferrex and Porrex by their flattering counseloro parasites Hermon and Tyndar. The explicit statement of the moral Besson 1 s transferred from characters within the play to the dumboshow and chorus framing the act. A pasange from the
playwrights ${ }^{\circ}$ explanation of this dumboshow is interesting for 1ts imagery of appearance and reality conveying a strong auggestion of the theological bachground:

Hereby was eignifled, that as glasse by nature holdeth no poyson. but 18 clere and may easely be seen through, ne boweth by any art: so a faythfuil counsellour holdeth no treason, but is playne and open.... The delightfull golde filled with poyo son betokeneth flattery, which vnder faire seeming of pleasaunt wordes beareth deadiy poyson which destroyed the Prince that receyueth it.
(description of dumboshow before Act II)
Howerd Baker provides the first extended critical recognition of the elements of morality plag and Nedieval metrical tragedy in Gorboduc and its several departures from the senecan form. 50 Not only are the two princes flanked by good and evil counselors in the morality tradition: but the flattering parasite Hermon in tempting Ferrex to attack his brother uses the typhoal Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ s methods of sophistical argument and promise of immunity diso cussed in the previous chaper. He remands the prince that he Is his motheres favorite and she will appease his father if he should become angry; he assures him that he need not even fear the wrath of God:

Know ye, that lust of kingdomes hath no lawo The Goddes do beere and well allow in kinges. The thinges they abhorre in rescall routes. $\circ \circ \circ \circ^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \circ \circ \circ^{\circ}$ Murders and violent thertes in priuate men. Are hainous crimes and full of foule reproch. Yet none offence, but deckt with glorious name Of noble conquestes, in the handes of kinges. (II.1.143-55)

Although external allegory has disappeared, the euphemistic reo naming of "murders ${ }^{\oplus}$ and ${ }^{\text {minertes }}$ as noble conquestes is
exactily in the morality tradition of wrathe is wonte to be called Manhode. ${ }^{51}$

In the companion scene, Hermon's counterpart Tyndar cleo verly plays on Porrex emotions and provokes him into irrational rage by whispering to him of the or secrete quarrels and ${ }^{00}$ mono strous talest that are circulating against him as a result of his brotheris favored position. The concluding Chorus reiterates and sums up the moral lesson, using the sententious 10 , thus. . . which as Spivack points out is an identifying characteristic of the Vice 8 gpeech as moral erpositors 52

Loe, thus it isg poyson in golde to take. And holsome drinke in homely cuppe forsake. (Act II, Chorus, 2506)

Richard Edwards ${ }^{\circ}$ Damon and pithias (1565), a play which was probably performed before Elizabeth by the Children of the Chapel of which Edwards was the Master presents Elyot's lesson on "the election of frendes and the diuersite of flaterers" in a welloknit plot contrasting true and false friendship at several levels. The classical tale of the faithful friends 18 transo formed into a speculum principig" on how the ruler with no true friends must become a lonely and rearful tyrant preyed on by the ${ }^{*}$ serpent ${ }^{(1)}$ flattery: the moral is explicitiy dram in the virtuous counselor Eubulus closing epeech. At the lowest social level; this theme 18 reflected in the farcieal comedy of the pages Jack and will who first platter and then (metaphoricaliy and ifterally) shavem their gulisble victim Grim the collier. At the court level their masters Aristippus and Carisophus vow
eternal friendship to one another while gleefuliy explaining thedr falsehoods to the audience Carisophus is an interesting blend of Vice, courtier, parasite, agentoprovocateur, and proo fessional informer in the means by which he plays on Dionysus ${ }^{\circ}$ obsession about spies and traitors, and draws the innocent Damon into his trap. The faithful and vircuous servant Stephano (an obvious foil to Jack and Will) takes the measure of Carisophuse calls him a meounterfait Courtier ${ }^{\text {m }}$ and describes him in the familiar theatrical terms:

In a trope of honest men, some knaues may stand ye know: Such as by stelth creepe $1 n_{0}$, wnder the colour of honestie. Which sorte vnder that cioke, doo all kind of villanie: (1181-3)

Although Carisophus takes care to explain his human motives ( ${ }^{\text {which thinge, }}$ I assure you, I doo for myne owne gayne, o ine 195). his gloating asides and his defiant speech when exiled sufficiently reveal his moral pedigree: 53

Yet Eubulus, though I begone, here after time shall trie, There shail be found euen in this Court as great fletterers 28 I:
Hell for a while I wyll forgo the Court, though to my great payne.
I doubt not but to spie a time when I may creepe in againe. (2207-10)

Besides undermining their ruier's integrity by flattery. the false counselors of Gorboduc, and to some extent Carisophus. may also be seen as advocates of machiavelisan pollcyom Hermon convinces Ferrex that it would be expedient to attack his brocher before he has "By gulle full cloke of an alluring showeof Got him some force and fauor in the realme (II.11.103-4), or at
least to assemble an army for his "safetie. Dordan, the vir. tuous counselor, cries out ageinst such sophistry and wicked counsell to a noble prince (II.11.163). But Ferrex, consenting to the archetypal rationalization of mpoliticm statesmen from all ages, forbids him to talk further in such a manner and soothingly repeats that he will arm only in selfoderense. Carlo sophus is not directiy shown in his role as tempter of Dionysusi but under his influence the king refuses mercy to Damon on the grounds that the people despise a mild king; he would rather be hated so long as he is reared; ${ }^{\omega} \mathrm{a}$ dead dogge can not bite ${ }^{\infty}$ (line 899). Again the argument of mpolicy" is joined with the sophise tical use of proverb.
mpolicy is the allas of the Vice Avarice in Respublica who becomes chief administrator of the commonwealth. He explains in his introductory monologue that whe Name of policie is of none suspected. ${ }^{\circ}$ (line 83) ond later jovially reminds the audio ence to wremembre nowe my name ys maister policieal all thing I tell yowe muste nowe go by policie (478-9) 。 His victim the "widow Respublica puts the matter into a more specifically political context when she congratulates herself on her excellent mAdministracion based on Monestye ${ }^{\omega}$ (Reformationo and ${ }^{\text {M Auctoryties }}{ }^{\infty}$ concludings
what comon weale shall then bee so happle as I? For this (I perceive) is the dripte of poilcie. (530-31)

The audience, already informed of the true names behind these aliases, would enjoy the irony of this deluded expectation.

Later, in an interesting scene between the vices, Respublica and People, her madministrators answer People ${ }^{\circ}$ s complaints with ingenious political sophistry which is in some cases based on contemporary events. ${ }^{54}$ Among many possible examples from this scene, the following speech of Insolence ( ${ }^{\text {A Authorlty }}$ ) epitomizes the universal soothing evasion of the skilled politicians

> Doe ye not see this by all experience plaine that men from deseases recover [ed] againe, doe after sycknes paste remaine along tyme weake? So y o thoughe oppressed with ionge aduersitee. So yet doubte not are towarde wealth and prosplritee. (1121-6)

Continually implied here and throughout this scene is the ancient argument that the end justifies the means. Remembering in ade dition that the "gallant Oppression is reanamed merormation. ${ }^{\text {m }}$ one is reminded of Hyate ${ }^{\circ}$ complaint that cruelty 18 named "Zele of jusidce and chaunge in ryme and place." In The conflict of Conselence, Tyranny is named "Zeal"; In New Custom, Cruelty becomes "Justice with Severity。" Or as the later Machiavellian" Claudius puts its

> By o diseases desperate grown By desperate appliance are relleved, or not at allo (Hamlet. IV.111.8-10)

The ilst of mpolitick villains in Elizabethan drama is a long one which includes Claudius, Edmund, Iago, Richard III, Aaron the Moor; Marlowe ${ }^{9}$ s Barabas; and Kyd ${ }^{\circ}$ s Lorenzo of The Spanish Tragedy, regarded in the older critical view as the sole ancestral prototype. 55

Spivack has convincingly demonstrated
the whbridm Vice elements in most of these and other machiam velifans ; and in the course of his discussion he points out the powerful theological background of the Elizabethans ${ }^{\circ}$
anysterical denierstion of Machiavell1:

By propounding the technique of worldy success without regard to any higher alleglance, fechavelli elevated the most serious defect of human nature. from Christion viewpoint. into a positive achievement. By defining porger as the prize available to certain natural qualities he dissolved its divine auspices. By creating political science he abolished the religious principle In human society. The Elizabethans really understood him well enougho and indeed their transitional age taught them to appreo hend the evil before they were actually aware of the man who later lent it his name.

Felix Radb, although he does not discuss the morality plays, also points out the strength of the Medieval Catholic outlook in framing the Elizabethan interpretation of Machiavelli, and the sense of conflict between the growing mensciousness of statecraftm during the relgns of the early Tudors and the unessy realization that such ideas contradieted Christian ethics. 57
"For then sathan being a disguised person . . . in the likenesse of a merry leaster acted a Comadie, but shortly ena sued a worull Tragedie. ${ }^{\circ}$ These words by the English translator of Gentillet 8 attack on Machiavelli, quoted in the first chaptero may epitomize the conservative Tudor attitude not only to policy* but to all social and political fraud. Secular ethics and theology cannot so easily be separated during this period; and the wan who pretends to be what he $\$ s$ not would be seen by many as a tool of Satan. Men should be what they seem。ต Mang with his infinite capacity for selfodeceptiong must be taught to recogo nize social evils; and this is a major object of the moralities.

FOOTNOTES, Chapter III
${ }^{1}$ The title page oî. Wo Wager ${ }^{\circ}$ The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art advertises the pley as:

A Myrrour very necessarie for youth. and Specially for such as are ilke to come to dignitle and promotion:
2The Antic Hamlet and Richard III (New York, 1943)。p. 20.
The continuation of thas theme in Elizabethan drama and journalistic pamphiets is discussed briefly in Paul A. Jorgensen, Honesty in Othelio, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{SP}$. XLVII (1950). 557-67. Jorgensen relatea the eplthet honest Iago to the vices of the late moralitses and to the widespread and urgent Elizabethan problems How may one know the honest man from the knave? (p. 557).
${ }^{3}$ The Bolre Nomed the Governour (1531), ed. Foster Watson, Everyman's Library (London and New York. 1907): p. 207. It is significant that Elyot devotes this entire Chapter 4 of Book III to the subject of Fraud and Deceit. not exposing specific frauds as do the coneyocatening pamphlets; but setting forth a generel denunciation of pretense and deception in all forms.
${ }^{4}$ This argument, as well as a gummery of previous critical theorles, 2 d developed at length in his work, The Renaissance and English Humanism (Toronto. 1939 [1962]).
$5^{5}$ The charge of hypoerisy is of course also implied in the other allases: ${ }^{\text {meformation }}$ for Oppression. "Authority" for Ino solence, and Honesty for Adulation.
${ }^{6}$ Bale repeats this satirical device in a later speech of Diso simulation, careíuliy stressing the theatrical metaphors
thowgh I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle fore nay dowst thiu not se ${ }^{\circ}$ hos $\mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ in ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{my}$ coiours Iette to blynd the peple, I haue yet a farther fette (708-19)
7 The Tudor Interlude (Leicester, 2958) p p. 56.
$8_{\text {English Drems from Early Tines to the Elizabethans (London. }}$ 1950), pa 125.

An interesting discussion of how the Reformation propagandists adopted morality techniques may be found in Rainer Pineas, whe English Morality Play as a Weapon of Relighous Controversyo SEL. II (1962), 159-80. Pineas points out (p. 166) that the purpose of these playwrights was to reveal to the audience the deceptive nature of cathollcismi in their eyes the outsianding evil of the time.
${ }^{9}$ Craik, op. cito. p. 82; E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage (Oxford, 2923). IV, 37.
${ }^{10} 0$ p. cit., ppo 5709. Craik ${ }^{\circ}$ s Plates II, III, VI, VIII, and X, folloming $p_{0}$. 48 , also sllustrate the attstude of the time toward extravagant dress.

The figures of Osric in Hamlet, and the unnamed mpopingaym who demands Hotspuris prisoners in I Henry IV might be added to Craikos llst.

11p.89.
$12_{\text {A. V. Judges. The Elgzabethan Underworld (London, 1930), }}$, p. 530 , derines a mutter as the last of agang of cardoplaying coneyocatchers to appear on the scene. If need be he provides quarrels and confusionon (Again one might note the idea of "acto ling a part.a)

The characteriaing words whuffa huffan are also used by Newo Gyse in Mankind, by Riot in Youth, and by Riot in Skelton ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ allegorieal poem the Bonge of Court.
${ }^{13}$ Spivack ( $p$. 232) suggests that although the dentity of the Debtor $1 s$ not made entirely clear, his fate may at least be taken as an apt moral conclusion to the Courtier s history.

14

For a discussion of the symbolic use of clothing in Nature in relation to Jacobean drama, see L . G。Salangar, "The Revengeris Tragedy and the Morality Tradition, in Eiszabethan Dramas Modern Essaysin Crielcism, ed. R.J. Kaufman (New York 1961). pp. 210. 215.
${ }^{15}$ Craik. Tudor Interlude, $p_{0}$ 59.
In their advice to Mary, both Pride and Infidelity impart a considerable note of social resilsm (Elizabethan rather than Hebrews) in their detalled and knomledgeable discourses on the hairdresser ${ }^{\circ} s$ and the tallor ${ }^{\circ}$ art.
${ }^{16}$ IbIa. p. 58.
${ }^{17}$ Ro $H_{0}$ tawney ${ }^{9}$ Relletion and the Rise of Capitalism (London, 1926) provides the mor discussion of this subject. L. C. Knights. Drame and Society in the Age of Jonson (London, 1937), discusses the rise of capitalism and the inherited distrust of worldiy riches in relation to Jacobean drama (see especially Chapter $1 .{ }^{\text {an }}$ The Inherited Economic Order under Elizabeth. ${ }^{\text {® }}$ pp. 15-29).
$18_{\text {wievenger }}{ }^{\text {s Tragedy }}$ and Morality Tradition ${ }^{\infty}$ pp. 216-17.
${ }^{19}$ Henry Hitch Adams. English Domestic ors Homiletic Trasedy, 1575 to 1642 (New York, 1943), pp. 59-61, comments on this zoclel aspect of Enough is as Good as a Feages maded to the familiar tale of the man tempted by vices [13] remonatrance aganst the
abuses of grasping landlords and harsh masters in what is perm haps the first expression of social protest in English drama．。。． The swindling of the servant and tenant was viewed as the most damning of the sins of Mr．Worldiy Man．＂
${ }^{20}$ Charles Mo Gayley，plays of our Forefathers（New York． 1907）．pp．30405，comments on this play＇s skiliful plot developo ment of three parallel actions in the fates of the tenant，the courtier．and the two prodigals，wlifull Wanton and Wastefulness．

Adams（op．cito．po 67）also comments on the element of social realism in the character of Greediness the merchant and its importance in the move toward domestic tragedy．
${ }^{21}$ Judges（Elizabethan Underworld，po 530）defines a＂ruffler＂ as a lusty rogue who has，or pretends to have，seen service in the wars；his trade is robbery，open or disguised．＂
${ }^{22}$ Harman defines＂Freshe Water Mariners＂as counterfeit sailors whose＂shipes were dromned in the playne of Salisbery．These kynde of Caterpillers counterfet great losses on the sea；these bee some Western men，and most bee Irishe men．These wyll runne about the countrey wyth a counterfet lycence，fayning either shypwracke，or spoyled by Pyrates $\circ \circ \circ$（A Caueat or Warening． for Commen Cvrsetors Vvlgarely Called Vagabones $0 . e^{\circ}$ Edward Viles and Fo Jo Furnivall，Early English Text Society． Lond on，1869．p．48）。

Awdeley ${ }^{8}{ }^{\infty}$ Curtesy Man pretends to be asking charity for his ＂poore afflicted fellowes ${ }^{\text {m }}$ lately come from the wars and thus is also a species of＂ruffler．＂He is noted for his gentlemanly apo pearance and polite and flattering form of address（The Fraters nitye of Vacabondes o o o，ed．Edward Viles and Fo Jo Furnivall， Early English Text Society，London．1869，pp．6m7），
${ }^{23}$ Elizabethan Underworld，po xvi11．
24 caveat；ppo 20，23，37，47，48，50， $51,53,54,56,57,58$ 。
25 Harman apparentiy found Nicolas so particularly abominable that he took special pains to inform the reader of how he met his just deserts．He adds a note at the end to the effect that ＂whyle this second Impression was in printinge，Nicolas was caught at his tricks，whipped，put in the piliory in his disguised ＂lothsome attyre＂and carried through London as a horrible ex． ample to the populace．The episode is illustrated with several woodcuts and another incredibly bad poem（ppa 87o91）．

26A。Co Cawley，ed．Everyman（Manchester，Engo．1961），Intro．， p．xxi，notes the strone resemblance of Feliowship，Kindred． Cousin，and Goods to the later vices．
${ }^{27}$ Danio 8 sermon expounds at great length on the dangers of idleness and the necessity to teach young people a usefultrade。

Two cricles, while objecting to the dramatic inappropriateness of the sermons cite it as evidence for John Rastell's authorship of the play, referring to his interest in education as shown in other works Frederick So Boas, An Introduction to Tudor Drama (Oxford, 1933), po 9: A. W. Reed, Early Tudor Drame (London, 1926). pp. 112-16.

Although Rastellos authorship seems extremely likely, it might be added that these ideas also represent a general humanist concern of the time, reflected as well in the wouth moralities.

28 pp. 86o7.
${ }^{29}$ Idieness, Wrath and Incontinencie also attempt to play their traditional roles as tavern companions and gamblers. But they succeed little better than Piety. Discipline and Exercitation succeeded in teaching him learning and virtue. Moros, as pree viously suggested, is too auconomous to be a victim of anyone but himself, and the vices . allegorical function has become diso located although their social role 18 lively and realistic.
${ }^{30} \mathrm{Th}$ is atcitude soon crystallizes into a stage convention. as suggested in two of the many Elizabethan strictures on "decorum of character. Richard Edwards in his Prologue to pamon and Pithias states that the old man should be sober, " the young man "rash" (IIne 19). George Whetstone In his Epistle Dedicatory to Promos and Cassandra advises that . . grave old men should instruct young men should show the imperfections of youth... Cited in Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art: A study of form in Elizabethan drama (Madison, W1sco 1954 [1964]). p. 220.

31
Iily B. Campbeli, Divine Poetry and Drama in Sizteentho Century England (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959), p. 195.

32 The reallstic and well-notivated role and entrance of mittle Bessf may be contrasted with the stark allegorical presentation of her counterpert Lechery in Youth.

33A manifest dectection of the most vyle and detestable vse of Diceplay . . © ed. A. V Judges, The Elizabethan Undervorid. p. 26.
$3^{34}$ Ib1d. ppo 28-33.
${ }^{35}$ Ibid. ppo $47-8$. Judges in his notes to this pamphlet (pp. 492, 494) drams atcention to the fact that Robert Greene, in his later and more ramous exposure of diceplay in A Notable Digo covery of cozenage, iffted whole passeges from waiterte rorkg to which he was especially indebted for nis eleboration of mom nardes lawo

36
The names of Xantippe (the shrew) Dallian (the narlot)。 and Ismal (the outcast) have an obvious typical significance although they are on the surface individual.

37 Several cricscs have noted the mixture of genres in this play: Doran, Endeavors of Art, po 162: Campbell, Divine: Drama. pp. 201-2: R. Ho Bond ed., Early Plays from the Itallan (Oxford. 1911). Intro., pp. xci if. Bond also notes the typical signifio cance of the character names based on Greek etymology as another link with the moralities: Misogonus and Eugonus are the bad and good sons: Cacurgus, the "mischiefomakern; Orgelus indicates "passionate : Oenophilus "full of wine": and Liturgus, "good for service (pocil: note, po 303).

38 Endeavors or Art, p. 163.
A contrasting comment by John V. Curry. Deception in Elio zabethan comedy (Chicago, 1955). pp. 2899. might be cited as showo ing a total misunderstanding of the Vice ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ nature, an important point since throughout his work he characterizes the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ s contribution to the later drama only in terme of farcical comedy. After noting cacurgus double nature as Vice and tricky ino triguing servant, Curry remarks that wiough his motives for favoring Misogonus are not entirely clear, he seems to feel that by his "pollicye' he prevents his young master from trying his father's patience beyond the breaking point."

39 Bond (op, cit., pp. cixacx) mentions this role of cacurgus as a link with Italian drama and also, possibly, with the Faust cycle.
${ }^{40}$ Endeevors of Art, pp. $163-6$.
${ }^{41}$ The Bel-man of London. In The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekter, ed. Alexander Bo Grosart (London, 1885 [1963]]. III; 116. cited in Spivack, p. 155.

Dekiker's catalogue of adetestable yices" and "horrible and Hel ohound-like-perpetrated flagitious enormities (p. 168) strongly recalls those of his Tudor predecessors.
${ }^{42}$ Spivack, pp. 87091 ; $J$ 。Dover Wilson, The Fortunes of Falstaff (Cambridge, 1943 [1953]), pp. 17-35: J. Wilson Mecutchan, Simio larities between Falstarf and Gluttony in Medwall s Naturee ${ }^{\circ}$ SAB. XXIV (1949), 214019; D. C. Boughner, wVice, Braggart, and Falo staffon Anglia. LXXII (1954). 35061.
${ }^{43}$ Desiderius Erasmus, The Education of a Christian Prince. trans. Lester K. Born (New York, 1936). po 193. Cited in A. Ro Heiserman, Skelton and Satire (Chicago, 1961), p. 80. Heiserman also quotes from numerous other warnegs to princes on the dangers of flattery, from Classical times through the Renalssance, as part of his extended argument (pp. 66-123) that Skelton in Mago nificence was attacking general evils of the time and need not have been aiming his attack specifically at Cardinal wolsey.

44 First Satire, lines 57-75. In S1r Thomes Wyatt, Collected Poemse ed. Kenneth Muir (London, 1949 [1960]). Cited in Spivack. pp. 469-70.

45
Another aspect of the theme of flattering friendship Is pointed our in Thomes $I_{\text {。 }}$ Hatson．${ }^{\text {m The DetrectoroBackbiters }}$ Iago and the Tradition＂Teras Studies in Lit．and Lango $V$（1963） 546－54．Hatson points out that Iago may be olassed with cloaked Collusion and with Detraccio in The Castle of perseverance and that Elyots cautson gingt the viee or detrection cloaked under the wpleasmunt habite of friendshspem constitutes malmost an abstract for the plat of othello（ppo 548－9）．

46 Wo O．Harris（who ilse Helserman argues oganst Ramsey ${ }^{\circ}$ wolseyan interpretation of Magnificence）cites The Bowge of Court and other early poems of SHeliton to suggest his lifelong aversion to courtly abuses unich need not heve included Wolsey ＊a specific object until the later polstical satires in which Wolsey is clearly attacked．He also points out that such terms as meloated collusion and＂crefty conveyancem mere used by Elyot． Tyndale and Grafton，and were＂more ilkely to have been literary clichës than Strelton s oxclusive terminology especially reserved for use against Wolsey．${ }^{\circ}$ Staelton ${ }^{\circ} g^{\text {m Magny }}$ Mcence and the Cardinal Virtue Tradition，Chapel Hillo NoCo 1965．p． 32 also ppo 12032 pas81mo）

47Lines 46306．In John steitong poetical Horks，ed．Rev． Alexander Dyce（London，1843），Volo Io

48 The standard affirmative view is presented by Robert L。 Ramsay in his Introduction to Skelton s Magnyfycence Early Engo 11sh Text Society（London，1906）．pp．cvili ffo Most later critics of Skelton，with the exception of Harris and Heiserman， have in general followed Ramyo interpretations（see Chapter $I_{0}$ notes 28 and 29）．

It seam lifely that skelton may have had wolsey in mind as a minor object．But the arguments of Herris and Heiserman though they differ somewhat in their final conclusions，seem more cono Vincing in considering the play as a whole and as it relates to the thought of the time．

49 As stated on the title page of the 1570071 edition，the play was＂．－shewed on stage before the Queenes maiestie，about nine yeares pasto yz．the xvily。 day of Ianuarie．1561．by the gentlemen of the Inner Temple．

50 Induction to Tragedy．（Baton Rouge．La． 1939 ［1965］）．pp． 9047．

Two other critics have discussed briefly the blending of Vice and parasite in Gorboduc（as well as in Damon and pithias and later plays） 8 E．P．Vandiver．Jro o The Elizabethan Dramatic Paresite ${ }^{\text {PP }}$ SPXXII（1935），411－27；Robert Withington，wovice ${ }^{\circ}$ and parasite．A Note on the Evolution of the Elizabethen VIII』In。 PMLA，XLIX（1934）．743－51．These dsscussions although somewhat generalized，are of interest in suggesting the complex ilterary pedigrees of many Elizabethan rogues and piliainso
$5_{\text {Baker ( }}$ (Op. cito, pp. $35-6$ ) points out that this apparentiy "Senecan" passage is in fact a thoroughly English invective against ambition and tyranny. aIt is satiric a a fact not meno tioned by the critics; spoten by an evil counselior who is but a scarcely disguised vice from the moral plays, it lays open the evils of ambition by seeming to praise ambition.

52 pp 。189-90.
53 Although Spivack does not discuss this play, he notes the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ s defiance on his discovery as an aspect of his wallegorical immunity to human motives ( $\mathrm{pp}, 196 \mathrm{~m}$ ).

54 por instance, people compiains of the hardship wrought by debsaing the coinage, and Insolence argues that "yet if ye marke ytt well, for one peice ye have threeg which for your people is no ame Commoditie (108506).

Leonard A. Magnus, ed. 0 Respublica. Early English Text Society (London, 2905), Intro $0_{0}$ p. $\mathrm{XXX}_{0}$ notes that these ingenious arguo ments are not entirely invented. Froude quotes them from hise torical sources. ${ }^{\infty}$ Magnus (notes, pp. $67 \mathrm{ff} \mathrm{f}_{\text {. }}$ ) also points out additional probable references to political abuses during the reign of Edward VI.
${ }^{55}$ C. F. Tucker Brooke, The Tudor Drama (Boston, 1911), p. 211. describes Lorenzo in terms ironically foreshadowing Spivack ${ }^{\circ}$ s later definition of the Vice: wlorenzo is the first of a long ilne of Machlavellian viliains . . . . the original progenitor of the villain of modern melodram. . . . when first introduced upon the stage, there was aest hitherto inspired by no dramatic figure about this ardent devotee of policy who could smile and smile and be alilain. ${ }^{\circ}$ - who, utteriy soulless and heartless, could composediy intrigue out of his way the innocent obstacles to his ends, and, if necessary, could meet his om fate with a like egotistical composure.

For a similar discussion of the MMachiavethan villain, see C. V. Boyer, The Villain as Hero in Elizabethan Tragedy (London, 1914).

56 p. 375. For Spivack ${ }^{9}$ s detalled discussions of the mhybrid ${ }^{\infty}$ Vice elements in Elizabethan and Shakespearean villains other than Iago, see pp. $337-414$.

57 The Engish Face of Nachiavel11: A Changing Interpretation 1500-1200 (London and Toronto, 1964), pp. 34,256 , and passim.

## CHAPTER IV.

THE ACTORS AND THE AUDIENCE

Since the avowed aim of the morality plays is to instructs Talse appearance must be accompanied by the audience ${ }^{\circ}$ s recognio tion of the evil reality; it may or may not be followed by recogo nition on the part of the deluded hero. The structure of the plays thus mirrors the dramatic and moral problem of revealing to the audience the depths of the hero s ignorance. The Vice $s$ theatrical counterfeiting, deceitful arguments, and social frauds discussed in the previous three chapters would convey to the audience the traditionally decepelve nature of evil and sts apo plication to their everyday lives. It has also been suggested that the spectators would enjoy seeing their counterpart on the stage making a rool of himseli just as they would enjoy the antics of the Vice: both for the gulifbility and knavery itself and for the moral reference which, to the Tudor way of thinking. would represent not a rault of didacticism but a necessary and expected part of the play.

A passage from Erasmus ${ }^{\circ}$ The Praise of Folly contains amid a penetrating statement on the nature of theatrical $111 u s i o n$ and its connection with human life a suggestion of the way in which deception joined with recognition wight define the kind of enjoyo ment which the audience would derive from the morality plays:

It is not unknowen, hom all humaine thyngs lyke the silenes or duble image of Aleibiades, have two faces much unlyke and dise semblable, that what outwardiy seemed death, Jet lokyng within ye shulde fynde it lyfes and on the other side what seemed life。
to be death; what fayre, to be foule: what riche, beggeriy: what cunnyng, rude: what strong, feable, what noble; vile. . . . If one at a solemne stage plale, woulde take upon hym to plucke of the plaiers garmentes . . shoulde he not (trow ye) marre all the mattier? . . Ye shoulde see yet straightwaies a new transmutacion in thyngs: that whobefore plaied the woman shoulde than appeare to be a man: who seemed youtho should shem his hore heares: who counterfalted the kynge, shulde tourne to a rascall. and who pladed god almaghtie, shulde become cobler as he was berore.

Yet take awale this errourg and as soone take awale all togetherss in as muche as the feignyng and counterfeityng is it, that so dellghteth the beholders.

So lytewise, all this ilfe of mortall men, what is it els, but a certaine kynde of stage plale? whereas men come foorthe diso guised one in one arraieg and an other in an otherg eche playing his parte, till at the last the maker of the plaie or bokebearer causeth thelm to avoyde the skaffolde.。. And all this is dooen under a certaine velle or shadow, which taken awale ones. the plake can no more be plaied. 1

This passage of course is not restricted to the morality play situation. But whetever the author ${ }^{\circ}$ s conscious intent may have been it illustrates a central reason for the theatrical appeal of these plays. The actor stripped of his disguise; winings as they are: the seraightforward moral serinon: these matters become far more alive if contrastedimith othe reignyng and counterfeiryng or minings 28 they are not. ${ }^{\circ}$

The specific methods adopted to illuminate the discrapancy between appearance and reality within the plays give rise to an interesting relationship between the audience and the characters on stage. By indsrect means of contrast and direct means of exa pository specches and asides. the playmsight constantly exploits the gap $1 n$ awreness between the informed audience and the deluded protagonist. Anne Righter hes noted this distinctive twoodmeno sional quality and its connection mith the need for moral instructions

The poor morality hero mas surrounded by the ralsifications and disorder of a contemporary secular society: the world appeared to him most of the time exactly as the Devil wished. If the spectacors identified themselves completely with this central character, they might also share his lack of understanding until the darks inal moments of the play. Only by granting fiankind in the audience a measure of enlightenment denied his countero part on the stage could the morality fulifil its purpose as a clarification of experience, a revelation of divine order in the midst of confusion.

She goes on however, to join with previous critics in condeming this nethod as a dramatic inconsistency:

Intellectually, these two attitudes tomard the audience were perfectly compatible. Dramatically, however, they proved almost impossible to reconcile. . . The technique of audience address taken over from the mysteries demanded, if it wes to be dramatio cally effective, an audience involved in the action of the play on a level with the other actors. . . A barrier that had been nonoexistent in the mystery cycles now divided the piay world from the place where the audience stood. 3

This comment points up an important difference between the mystery and morality plays; and the objections to audienceoddress are logical if one judges the plays only by modern. giandards or theatrical naturalism. But such objections fesl to account for the undeniable vitality and popularify of these plays over more than 150 years 4 starting in the early iffeenth century: a popularity which may in part be explained if one recognizes the function of moral and dramalc irony as the means by which the playwright exploits the "barrier" betmeen audience and protagonist. This use of irony" has been mentioned throughout the previous chapters. But since it is a vital aspect of the process of recognition. it should now receive cloger artention.

A brief definition of dramatic irony may clarify this
function. Alan Reynolds Thompson, although he does not discuss
the morality plays. describes irony in terms which could be readily applied to them:


#### Abstract

irony is a device... which uses contrast as its means. Its essential feature is a discrepaney or incongruity between expression and meanine, appearance and reality, or expectation and event. . . . there are three different points of view toward irony: that of the person using it for attack, that of its victim, and that of the onlooker. ${ }_{5}$


G. G. Sedgewick suggests the kind of enjoyment which such irony may imparto bringing up to date the ide which seems inherent in Erasmuse discussion:

In essence it [irony] is a pretence... the purpose of which $1 s$ mockery or deception of one sort or another; and its force derives from one of the keenest and oldest and least transient pleasures of the reflective human mind o the pleasure in contrasting Appearance with Reality ${ }_{6}$

The morality hero is of course ignorant of the discrepancy between mexpectation and eventws he expects every form of worldiy felicity. only to find the promise broken to his hope. He is supremely igo norant of the discrepancy between the $V 14 c e{ }^{0}$ s appearance and his "reality." The audience would enjoy the contrast without foro getting the moral lesson behind it。

In order to demonstrate the way this twoodimensional relationship works toward recognition, few general comments should be made about the function of each group of characters (the hero and his personified vices and virtues) and the function of contrast as it relates to the comedy of the vices.

For the mankind hero, delusion followed by recognition involves the rudiments of tragedy. Willard Farnham has pointed
out the elements of tragic choice in the moralities, insofar as man is given free will and made individually responsible for his own sins, rather than the victim of a blind Fortune. ${ }^{7}$. If one adds to this concept the allegory of selfodelusion. one sees the rudiments of tragic selforecognition followed by spiritual regeneration. This aspect of tragedy, as Edmund H. Creeth points out, 18 largely confined to the eariser moralities; in the later plays (beginning roughly with the early Elizabethan period) the hero usualiy dies ignorant and unredeemed; his worldy sins are -isited ith divine and worldiy retribution as moral example to the audience. 8 . This shift to a catastrophic ending invoives a mejor change in religious doctrine which lies outside the scope of this thesis. But the irony of the herois belated recognition of his folly, or his deadly lack of recognition, is mintained in either case. Once undeceived, he often turns to the audience and ruefully warns them to besare of his own example, with a suggestion of mad-I-butoknomn to which a member of the audience might have gleefully responded, whe could have told you so. ${ }^{\mathrm{m}}$ The extradramatic address would of course be particularly irrio tating to the advocate of theatrical naturalism; but the appeal to human nature shows considerable shrewdness. In some later plays, the speech of rueful recognition becomes in addition the ${ }^{n}$ scafrold speech ${ }^{m}$ pavorite theme of Elizabethan life and 1iterature. In those plays where the hero dies unrepentent. still belleving in the moodness ${ }^{\text {m }}$ of evil. the audience would recognize the terrible irony of his ignorance.

Allegorically, the Virtue figure represents man ${ }^{\theta}$ s better nature. As suggested above, he may also be sald to represent the Reality, or minings as they arean He acts as preacher to audience and hero, and (at times) as deusoexomachina revealing the Vice's deceptions. As preacher, he indulges in long moral homilies which no doubt partly justify the charges of wdullness ${ }^{\text {on }}$ made by some critics against the plays as a whole. ${ }^{9}$ But the didactic purpose of the plays, and their probable derivation from the Medieval sermong gives thls form of exposition a degree of artistic justification. 10 The fudor audience, accustomed to hearing sermons and to reading literature of an avowed moral purpose, , ould probsbly not share our modern dislike of anything didactic. Nor are the ${ }^{\omega}$ virtuousm comments on the hero $s$ folly without their occasional humanizing touches.

Psychological realism in the recognition scenes is
usually less mell developed than in the plot of deception. The herois delusion is usually total and the disguise mimpenetrablem until sudden and apparentig unmotivated conversion is brought about by the aid of Virtue. As Hardin Craig puts it, Mankind behaves in a wey which is consistent with allegory rather than with behavioral psychologys When Repentance asks him to return to his better nature, this abstraction is suddenly and immediately in a state of repentance, leaving individual struggles to indio vidual human beings. 11 The role of Emilia in othello might well be described in these terms: 12
0 gull8 0 dolt:
As lgnorant as dirti thou hast done a deed .
祭oor, ghe was chaste: she Loved thee ${ }^{\circ}$ cruel Moor:
(V.11.163-4. 249)

It s interesting to note that in some moralities, all the machinery is provided for unraveliing the deception at a literal plot level. But the playmrights never quite take this drastic step, alweys reverting to the allegorical conclusion. The Vice represents the Appearance of good, or minings as they are not." His double function as deceiver to the victim on stage and moral expositor to the audience constitutes the most drametically powerful source of irong. Spivack divides this exo pository function into enree conventions: the introductory monom logue or morel pedigree expounding the Vice 8 name, nature and fame; the conspiratorial monologue confidentially explaining his deceptions to the qudiences and the ironic. gloating aside, often at the moment of the nero ${ }^{\circ}$ downfall. Two conventions of the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ s speech to his victim also reinforce the irony: the delis berate slipoofotongue wherein he flashes a gleam of truth in the face of his dupe, but quickiy withdraws it 0.0 and the jeering speech of triumph with which the Vice himself sometimes undeceives the deluded heros abetting him in the further delusion of despair. ${ }^{13}$ Summing up the theatrical effect of these quallties. Spivack remarks:

His talent for converting morel instruction into exciting theater explains his great popularity and long life on the stage. He creates a play to demonstrate a moral text. and he interprets every stage of the demonstration with a homiletic zeal matched
only by his derision. His relationship with the audience, orlginating in the homiletic principle organic in his role, is one of the remarkable features of the moralities. . . . 14

These talents of the Vice are a consistent feature of the morality genre, although in some later plays there 1 s a tena dency for nonsense speeches and clowning for its own sake to usurp the moral function. But considered purely as a character within the piay, the Vice 8180 undergoes a more legitimate theatrical change. In the earlier moralities, he tends simply to fade out before the denoument; but in number of later plays he $1 . \operatorname{m}_{\text {masased }}$ in a scene of symbolic disrobing, and punished. thus giving the theme of recognition neater theatrical con clusion. 15

The Vice $s$ function as comedian also 11 ustrates the more Indirect means by which the playmright enforces recognition within the play: namely, by illustrating his moral in contrasting serious and comic moods. The structural use of contrast and alternating casts, which as Devid M. Bevington demonstrates imo parts distinctive pattern to the supposediyoformless morality plays. rases issues beyond the scope of this study. ${ }^{16}$ But the thematic use of comedy is an important aspect of revealing evil In its true nature, and thus an indirect source of irony. Various critics have objected to the coarse humor and slapstick of the plays, or have considered it only insofer as it leada tomard rarcical comedy in later dram. The cloming activities of the Vice have instigated a critical controvergy as to whether the Vice is identical with the pool. ${ }^{17}$ The episodes of low comedy
are undoubtediy in part a concession to popular taste and to the Vice ${ }^{\circ}$ developing role as star actor in the literal sense; and in some later plays as suggested above, the Vice as buffoon at times seems to take over. But as Spivack describes it, the comedy of the vices 15 essentially the mcomedy of eviln $\frac{18}{8}$ often grotesque, crude, obscene, but thus allegorically justified in revealing the ugly reality behind the appearance of gravity, piety, respectability, or "innocent merriment." For example。 the traditional vulgar brawl between the vices becomes highly ironic when they then turn to harmonious plotting and approach their victim as pious "Charitym or affectionate ariendship." In other scenes, the point at which the victim laughs at the vices buffooneries becomes an allegorical sign of his domfall.

A representative selection from early, intermediate, and later plays may serve to demonstrate these principles in action. Since the plot of deception has been discussed at some length in the preceding chapters, it might be stressed retrospectively that the irony is driven home to the audience each time the hero ignores Virtue ${ }^{0}$ earnest but ineffectual preachments and each time he yields to the blandshments of the virtuouslymisguised Vice who has previously informed them of the "realitym with his usual homiletic frankness. But rather than reiterate a long list of expository monologues thich Spivaci has extensively documented. the following discussion will for the most part center on the concluding scenes which may best sumarize the theme of recogo nition a and nonarecogntion as it arfects the actors and the audience.

Everyman (c. 1495) will first be mentioned briefly and out of its chronological sequence since it may be taken as the exception which proves the rule. Although it differs from most moralities in containing no clear vice rigure and concentrating on the Coming of Death as the endoproduct of the Psychomachla conflict, the playwright constantly stresses the treacherous false appearance of $\operatorname{man}^{9} \mathrm{~s}$ worldiy estate if he trusts in it exc clusively. Cosyn warns the deluded Everyman against herself in words foreshadowing the Vice's speech as moral expositor: "Trust not to mez for, so God me spedeg/ I wyll deceyue you in your moost nede ( 35708 ) ; and the later words of Knowledge seem dellberately intended to point up the ironic contrast between false and true guides: weueryman. I wyll go with the and be thy eyde./ In thy moost nede to go by thy sydem (52203). An exchange between Everyman and his (worldiy) Goods again stresses the theme of deo ception and strongly suggests the Vice's jeering speech of triumph ovex his despairing victime 19

| Everyman | O false Good. cursed thou be, |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Thou traytour to God, that has deceyued me |
|  | And caught me in thy snare? |
| Goods | Mary thou brought thy selfe in care. |
|  | Wherof I am gladde. |
|  | I must nedes laugh; I can not be sadde. |

After Goods derlsive departure, Everyman ruefully acknowledges the truth of the chares; and the audience, already informed of the moral position by the opening apeech of God and by the warnings of the false friends themselves, would appreciate the lrony of his belated racognition: 20
Fyrst Felawshyp sayd he wolde with me gone:
His wordes were very pleasaunt and gaye.
But afterwarde he lefte me alone.
Than spake I to my kynnesmen, all in dyspayre.
And also they gaue me wordes fayre;
They lacked no fayre spekynge.
But all forsake me in the endynge.
Than of my selfé $I^{\circ}$ wa ${ }^{\circ}$ ashamed ${ }^{\circ}$
And so I am worthy to be blamed:
Thus may I well my selfe hate.
(465-78)

In these speches, the allegory of selfodelusion 18 clear. Every. man has brought himself to this pass, and the personified abo stractions of his "fayre spekynge worldiy estate only represent this fact externaliy. He is rescued from the incipient sin of despair by Knowledge, who may represent melfoknowledge ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{21}$ followed by Confession. He receives the sacraments purging his ain and. in a scene notable for its restrained dramatic power and dignity, descends into the grave accompanied only by his Good Deeds.

This seifocontained sequence of recognition followed by repentance and spiritual regeneration (to use Creeth ${ }^{\circ} s$ terms) may be contrasted and compared with the death of Mankind in The Castie of Perseverance (c. 1405-1425). Strlcken by Death ${ }^{\circ}$ s blows, he lronically cries out to the World for help (the alleo gorical meaning of course duplicates Everyman's appeals to his false friends): and in World ${ }^{\circ}$ s reply we hear the familiar Vice ${ }^{0}$ s blend of jeering triumph and moral homily:

I wold thou were in the erthe beoloke. \& aonother hadde thyne erytagef

> now schal the werld on thee be wroke, for thou hast. done so gret outrage: thl good thou schalt rorogoo. werldiys good thou hest forogon. s with tottys thou sehalt be torng thus haue I seruyd here beoforn. hundryd thousand moo.
> (2872082)

Gleefulis Norld calls his Boy ("Garcion or min net nere who to seize the herod zichesp gained by fraudg which he had hoped his family would inherit. Creeth notes the aimilarity of this scene to the deaths of the Worldy Man and Macbeth: he also notes the fact that Mankind s oorai injunction that the audience profit by his example 18 cchoed in many leter plays. 22 Almost too late. mantind is forced to bitter recognition of his follys

```
- I wot neuer'e who so wele say.
    now an I sory of my lyf:
            God kepe ne fro dyspayrs
    al my good. withoout fery fayle.
    I haue gadryd with gret trauayle.
    the werld hathe ordeynyd of his entayle;
            I wot neuere who to be myn eyr.
now good men, takythe example at med
    do for youre self whyl ye han spase8
            I deyé certeyniys
    now my lyfe I haue lore:
    myn hert brekyth; I syhe sore:
    a word may I speke no more:
            I putte me in Godys mercy.
                        (2970-3008)
```

The play in fact comes close to tragedy. Mankind dies wnhouselod。 disappointed. unaneled $\mathrm{m}^{\mathrm{m}}$ and is carried off to Hell, but his soul 18 redeemed after death in the tradithonal allegorical Debate of the Heaveniy Greces. 揹nkind ${ }^{\circ}$ unredeened death mould become berable to the audence only after Man in the abstract nas been
replaced by man the individual. 23
But the verbose debate rollowing the powerful and ironle death scene seems dramatlcally antiwelimactic when contrasted with the conclusion of Everymano The castle of Perseverance also contains in the most schemetic alfegomical form many other devices of recognition which appear much compressed in later plays. The full company of Deady sins and Cardinal Virtues and their masters God, the World. the Flesho and the Devil: each nes his selfoidentifying monologue. Two conventions of the later comedy of evilw here reveal most ciearly their allegorical validity. The traditional quarrel betweon the vices is foreshadowed in the braml emong the forces of evil (instigated by Bactriteros slanderous remerks) over who should be blamed for Mankind es escape. The device of setting virtue in the stocks is of course a survival of the extended open bettle between hankind ${ }^{\circ}$ s personified vices and Virtues which constitutes the Psychomachim in its ordginal pormo

A third eariy play Hisdom tho Is Chrsst (co 1450-1500). is interesting for sts presentation of Lucifer in the role of disguiser. "reasoner. ${ }^{m}$ and moral empositor later to be taken over entirely by the Vice. ${ }^{24}$ His introductory monologue has been discussed in the first chapterg after corrupting lind, will and Understandingo he again tums to the audience and exults over hle triumpho promseng that he will transform the Soul EWyn lyte to rende of hell (line 539) and ending on the fo miliar note of sententious warning againat himself:

His promise is fulfilled in a striking and powerful scene of silegorical pageantry which Creeth describes as whe theological prototype ${ }^{m}$ of the recognition scenes in later playso ${ }^{25}$ wisdom (Christ) forces the deluded Mind to loek into the depths of his derormed Soul:

> Yat raynde. I sey [to] yow, beothynke In what perell ye be nows take hede:

> Se howe ye haue dy[s]vyguryde yorur soule:
> Beoholde yomur selff; loke veryly in myndes (903©6)

As the stage directions specify, Anima then appears, win the most horrybuil wyse. fowlere than a fendea From beneath her "horrybyll mantyll run out wul small boys in the lyknes of Dewillys, \& so retorne egeyn. ${ }^{\infty}$ The three ${ }^{\text {mpowers }}$. of the Soul cry out in horror and confess their sins, but only after the soul has wept for sorrow and awakened from her delusion do the devils withdraw from her:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { I wepe for sorow, Lorde\& I be-gyn awake, } \\
& \text { I that this longe hath slumberyde in syne. } \\
& (981-2)
\end{aligned}
$$

The visual allegory concludes with the stage direction accomo panying these lines: misc recedunt demonesom Although the theatrio cal method differs from that of Everyman and Perseverance, all three plays clearly present the allegory of selfodelusion. The protagonist is forced to see the Reality, and the audience to perceive the irony of his belated recognition.

Among the intermediate moralities. Skelton's Magnificence (c. 2515) is of particular dramatic interest. The long conspiracy
scene is a thearrical eourodeoforce skilifully combining several functions of audienceorecognition while it advances the plot of deception. The conventional "moral pedigrees of the courtiero vices (two of which have been quoted in the first and third chapo ters) are made lively and varied by Skeltones poetic virtuosity. The conspiratorial monologue of the leading Vice in other pleys is here presented more realistically in series of dialogues which give the audience further information while eliminating the need for showing the entire sequence of Magnificence ${ }^{0}$ temptac tion; his later rementry in his cormpeed state thus tales on additional itonic impact. A comment by Bevington in connection with Skelton ${ }^{\circ}$ s structurel use of contrast and alternating casts sums up the theatrical efiect of this seene as well as indicating the moral function of its comedy:

This repeated variation in llagnificence. - creates an atmosphere of intrigue during the phase of conspiracy and delum sion. Conspirators appear and disappear. giving the impression that something mysterious is going on behind the scenes. . . The locus of the dialogue is some indeterminate meeting place of the villains. where we overhear them plotting further moves and glosting over recent achievements. The conspiretors insinuate themselves one by one into the service of the prince, return and disappear. consult one another, and generaliy augment the mischier until Magnificence s delusion $\&$ complete。. . As in other moral plays the key to this symmetry is that evil is the reverse of good, and as such o like the bearded women in liacbeth gailing in a sieve o is seen as grotesque iudierous. comic through exago geretion and distortiong and yet ultimstely fearfulo 26

In connection with comedy the roles of Fancy and Folly should be mentioned since in this play although vice and court rool are identical, 27 the rool is clearly an evil fool. The connection of Fancyos name with the power of delusion and his
role in procurlng the banishment of feasure have been discussed In the first chapter. But his ${ }^{\circ}$ brotherm Folly is equally impore tant: and one should remember that in The world and the Child (c. 1508) the vice Folly is described as a summetion of the Seven Deadiy Sing. Folly himself makes the position clear. He tricks his omn colleagues Fancy and Crafty Conveyance in an exo tended series of crude animl jokes and on the surface o mere buffoonery. The latter is finaliy forced to mait that he has been mado and wonderingly comments: "And for a role a man wolde hym take. Folly's reply, though not directly aimed at the audio ence, sums up the natter cleariy for their benefit:

Nay it 18 I that roles can make
For be he casser or be he kynge
To felowshyp with roly I can hym brynge (sig. D2 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ )

Thus warned. the audence could scarcely rall to appreciate the irony in the serious counterpart to this slepstick scene. The Prince, having banished Measure, is now so totaliy deluded that he can laugh at Folly's crude antics and 18 unable to catch the ${ }^{\circ}$ gleam of truthm mich Folly ironically offers him:

| Mangra | By cockes harte thou arte a fyne mery knaue |
| :---: | :---: |
| Folly | I make god auowe ye wyil none other men haue. |
| Miagn. | what seyst thou |
| Folly | liary I pray god your maystershyp to saue ( $\mathrm{sig} . \mathrm{FV}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ) |

At this stage in the play illustrations of the hero ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ delusion follow fast upon one another. The audience, remembering the conspiracy scene and the princeg initial noble and vertuous harte (Elyot), might well laugh to see him adore his errors and
strut to his confusion (to paraphrase Mark Antony's words of bifter recognition: Antony and Cleoparre, IIIoxisi.114015). But the laughter would not be all merriment; for the spectacle of e splendid prince so debased would also produce that painful clash of emotions which is at the heart of irony. 28 specific actions contribute to thls spectacle: bis yielding of Felicity to Fancy and Liberty; the banishment of measure; his blindness to the flattery of Courtly Abusion; and his boasting speech in the tradition of the Herodian tyrant. ${ }^{29}$ His laughing at Folly is the final demonstration. Almost immediately Fancy enterg in the role of jeering truthoteller to inform the Prince that the four courtierovices (whose true names he now reveals) have run off with his worldiy wealth, or Felicity:

> Magn. what hath sadnesse begyled me so Fancy Nay mednesse hath begyled you \& many mo For lyberte is gone and also relycyte

> Magn. why is this the largesse that I naue vsyd
> Fancy Nay it was your fondnesse that ye haue vsyd
> Magn. why who nolde haue thought in you suche gyle
> Fancy what yes by the rode syr it was I all this whyle That you trustyd and fansy is my name And foll my broder that made you moche game

(sig. F2)
"Marys thou brought thy aelfe in eare." These words of Goods in Everyman, and the ironic, gioating speech of World in Perse verance, are allegorically identical with Fancy's revelations; and his reference to "madnessem and "your fondnesse should be
 previously appiled to Fancy himself. Although this scene might on the surface seem purely seeular in its lesson, 1 ts roots reach
back to the cheological concept of worldiy wealth ag a treacherous dilusion to the man who puts in it his whole trust. Magniflcence, ตbeten downem by Adversity and despoiled by Poverty is rescued from the cardinal sin of Despair and Mischlef (sulelde) and restored to his former seate by the counsels of Good Hope and Redress. followed by Sad Circumspection. 30 Agaln the lesson might seem purely secular not to say materialiso tic, since he is also restored to his rormer prosperity. But Its theological beckground might best be indicated by noting cerm tain general similaritieg to the recognition sequence in R. Wever ${ }^{9}$ Lusty Juventug (e. 1550) Just as Magnificence had demonstrated his mpllyw to the audience. so Juventus shows them his "hypocrisy" by slandering Good Counsel with the proverbial sophism which (as they would not forget) was first taught him by the Vice Bypocrisy:

Your minde therin I do well understande.
You go about my iluing to digpise,
But you 11 not see the beames in your ome eyes. (sig. E2V)

In this play, to note an important contrasig it is virtue as deusmexmaching rethor than the jeering Vice who undeceives the hero. Good Counsel replies bluntly and perheps when the scene Is acted. with \& humn note of hurriness: 31

The deuell hath you decelued which 18 the autor of lies, And trepped you in his snmre of wicked hipocrysys (sig. E2 $2^{\text {) }}$

After very inttie furtiner urging, Juventus mbrupely yields to his allegorical better nature. He glyeth dome (stage direction).
weeps and curses himself. Noting that he is still dressed in his frivolous clothes and (as stated in the third chapter) has entered this scene expecting a jolly dice game, the audience would again appreciate the comicopainful contrast between expeco tation and event.

Alas, alas what haue I wrought and done? Here in this place $I$ wyll fall downe desperate. To aske for mercy now I know it is to late.

Alas. alas, that euer I was becat. I would to God I had neuer bene borne. All faythfull men that behold this wretched state. May very iustiy laugh me to scorne.

Thus in my first age to worke myne own destruction, [sig. E3]

There is in these ilnes a note of anguished selforecognition which also appears (though at far greater length) in the despairo ing outcry of Magnificence:

Alasse that euer I sholde be so shamed
Alasse that euer I Magnyfycence was named
Alasse my foly alasse my wanton wyll
I may no more speke tyll I haue wept my fyll
(sig. $\mathrm{F3}^{\circ}-[\mathrm{F} 4$ : italics mine)

Like the Prince ${ }^{\circ}$ s good counselors, Good Counsel (aided by God ${ }^{\circ}$ s Merciful Promises) warns the hero against the additional delusion of despair and refusing to accept God's mercy. Their long sermons scarcely differ in import except for Wever ${ }^{\circ}$ s explicit citations of Biblical chapterandoverse. (This point of community between a Cathoilc and an eariy Protestant play additionally suggests the strong Medieval inheritance of the Reformers.) Spiritually restored. Juventus turns to the audience and ruefully warns them
not to be trapped, as he was, by false appearances: ${ }^{32}$

0 subtyll Satan, full decelefull is thy snare. Who is able thy falsehod to disclose?

Ere I was weare thou hadest decelued me And brought me into the path, which leadeth unto hell
All Christen people, which be here present fiay learne by me hipocrysy to know. With the which the deuill, as with poyson most pestilent Dayly sekech all men to ouerthrow:
Credite not all thynges vnto the outward show.
(sig. [ELV] F )
Hypocrisy himself piays the role of moral expositor in a highly developed style which, to avold undue repetition, may be taken as typical of most intermediate moralities. In his introo ductory moral pedigree he boasts of his worldowide fames "The tyme were to long now to deciare, the numbers of men whom he has deceived "since the world began. ${ }^{\infty}$ He then proceeds to a doggerel catalogue of "Holy ${ }^{\text {m }}$ Cathollc frauds which recalls both the poetic methods of skeliton and the satirical methods of Bale [sig. B4 - C]. His meonspiratorial monologue. ${ }^{\infty}$ as Spivack puts 1t, shows in framiliar style and cadence the woralizing Vice "standing forward among the audience on his pulpiteering platiorm of a stage, reaching for the device that will ensnare the play's nero: 33

| I will be with Iuventus anone |
| :---: |
| And that ere he be ware |
| And I wys if he walke not straight. |
| I will vse such a gleyght. |
| Thet shail trap him in a snare. |
| How shall I bring thls geare, to pas? |
| I can tel now by the meso |
| without any more adulsement: |
| I wil infect him mith wicked compeny. |
| hose conuergation shalbe so flest |

```
yea, able to ouer come an innocent.
Thus wyll I conuey,
My matter I say.
Somewhat hand somely.
Trudge \({ }^{\circ}\) Hipocrisy, irudge.
Thou art 2 good drudge,
To serue the Deuy11:
    ( \(\mathrm{sig} \cdot \mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{C} 2^{\mathrm{V}}\) )
```

He then turns and composes his features to approach Juventus under the guise of ${ }^{\text {Grlendshipon and employs all his skill as }}$ ${ }^{m} a c t o \boldsymbol{m}^{m}$ and ${ }^{m}$ reasoner" to lure the hero away from his virtuous companionso Juventus, like Magnificence, signifies his state of delusion and the assent to his cowing downall when (agreeing to accompany him to the tavern), he laughingly exclaims. . . . . by my trouth you are merely disposed (sig. $D^{V}$ ). Later, when he has enbraced Abominable Living (mittle Bessm) Hypocrisyos coarse aside to the audience reminds them that his plot has been accomplished.

Hypocrisy and most other Vices up to this time fade out of the dramatic picture once their plot has succeeded. But in three plays of this period, the Vice for the first time is uno maskedw in the the theatrical as well as the allegorical sense。 and condemned to death or punishment. It seems significant that Bale ${ }^{\circ}$ King John (1538ه1562), Lindsey"s Satire of the Three Estates (1540-1554), and Respublica (1553) are all polenical *estates moralities ${ }^{\text {w }}$ in which the authors might particularly wish to demonstrate the consequence of crimes against the state. Of these plays. Respublice may be taken as a representative example. 34

The sequence leading up to the unmashing scene in this play is also interesting for its suggestion of future dramatic development which never quite takes place within the morality genre. More than once the vices nearly give the show away by their om blunders, ${ }^{35}$ as when Respublica overhears Avarice como plaining about pickpurses who would steal his bags of gold; or when Avarice and Adulation whisper aside for so long that Reso publica seems momentarily suspicious and sharply asks. "Salde ye aught to h2m, that mase not be tolde to me? (12ne 1327). People continually tells her that her trusted administrators are mdec vourersp and at one point she signsficantly debates with herself:
what shoulde I quage of thisg waie $y t$ bee credible. or by ande reason maye yt be possible. that suche fowre as those in whom I have puit my truste shewing suche face of frendship, shoulde bee men viluste?
(977-80)
But Respublica is allegorically incapable of undeceiving herself. although her near approach might increase the tension and irony for the audience. This speach comes only after Avarice himself. In great alarm, has reported the coming of Lady Verity, the maughter of Timem; and Verity acts as deusaexamachine after Respublica has reiterated her trust in her excellent administratores
Ah good Respublica thow haste been abused,
whom thowe chosest are vices to be refused.
Than he that was pollcie, the chlere manne of price
In dede is moost silnking and filthie Avarice.
he firste enveigled thee and his purpose to frame
cloked eche of these vices, with a vertuous name.
(1369-78)

The unmasking scene which follows is frequently comic as Avarice tries every trick of flippancy, insolence, and ingenious evasion in a vein attempt to fend off the formidable array of indignant Virtue personifled by the four mladse Verity, peace. 36 Merey, and Justice. When sternly told that they come from Heaven, he quips, ${ }^{\text {Dell }}$ ye in heaven and so made to come hitherpm (line 1675). सhen he tries to claim that his gold is a bag of rye, Verity overwhelms him with a spate of Stritonic doggerel which gives her a certin human quality in the very exo tremity of her indignation:

Thou salest even trueth tis a bagg of Rye in dede. vsiree, periuree, pitcheree, patcherie,

Equally unsuccessful are his claims that this is all his wealth. gained by begging ( ${ }^{\text {The }}$ worlde is harde and the bag ys but verale smale. a ilne 1748), or that he had taken them from pickpurses and was even now about to bring them to Respubllea. He is finally forced to turn his gown revealing the other purses; and Verity then turns to the other conspirators:

Ver. Een suche ilke counterfaictes shall all the rest appere. Sirs doe of your vtmoste robes eche one even heare. Now what these are yee see plaine demonstration.
Resp. Insolence. Oppression. Adulacion. 0 lorde howe have I bee vsed these five yeres past?
(1772-6)
T. W. Craik suggests that since nothing speciric has been reo vealed about their costumes, each vice may have worn name label which Respubilca reads off. ${ }^{3 ?}$

Worldiy punishment follows exposure. Avarice is sentenced to be ". . . pressed. as men doo presse a spounge (1ine 1903) so that he will divulge all his hidden loot; Insolence and Opo pression are given over to the custody of people to be tried by Justice. Adulation departs from his allegorical role when he begs for mercy and promises to amend. His request is granted. although Nemesis shrewdiy comments that he might do so out of fear or ${ }^{\oplus}$ 。. . too lyve in ease ${ }^{m}$ (line 1887). This relatively tolerant attitude might be contrasted with the savagery of Bale ${ }^{0} \mathrm{~s}$ King John where Sedition (whose falsehoods are also exposed by Verity) is sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered after previous promises of clemency. The transformation of allegorical vice into human frailty is also of obvious dramatic interest. Worldiy punishment for human sin is first visited upon the manind hero $e$ body in such plays as Nature and Magnificence: but up to the late $1550^{\circ}$ g he is always allowed (as Faustus later is not) to "repent and save his soul." In The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art (c. 1559) and Enough Is as Good as a Feast (c. 1560), both by W. Weger, mankind for the first time dies in the full flowering of his delusion and is carried off to Hell. In the latter play, the cerrible irony of the heroos apiritual blindness and the Vices part as jeering moral commentator give rise to a scene of dramatic power perhaps unequalled among the moralities.

Like Magnificence, the worldiy Man with unconscious irony propares the sudience for his downfall by boasting of his fellcity. 38 Almost immediately the voice of the "Proptiet withoutw is heard in
ominous warning. Despite the scoffing of Covetous, the hero is sufficientiy disturbed to send him for his chaplain to explain this mysterious event; but the irony is given a further twist, for the audience already fnows that "Devotion" is really Ghostly Ignorance. Awaiting their return, the forldiy Man feels strangely 111 and lies down to sleep. Godes plague silently enters, blows upon him, and strikes him with his sword. The sinister impact of this eplsode, which bears obvious similarities to the entrance of Death in Perseverance, is suggested in the stage directions ${ }^{m}$ Enter Gods plague and stande behinde nim a while before he speak ${ }^{n}$ (sig. $F^{V}$ ). This Nemesis ilgure, like World, tells the nero that mstraungers and those whome thou didst neuer knowe, / Shall possesse that, whiche by framd thou hast got:m (sig. FV). The element of hallucination continues. God's plague is directed to ${ }^{\text {GO }}$ out and stand at the door (sig. $\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{V}}$ ) while Covetous and Ignorance (who is also "Sir Nicolas," the conventional roistering village priest) enter and exchange bentering jokes, ignoring the dying man; the "comedy of evil" here achleves its full ironic contrast. The Worldiy Man suddenly draws their ato tention when he cries out to the unseen figure:

Oh I would if I could, but now it is to late: Hold thy peace I pray thee and doo me no more rate. (s1g. F2)

Covetous wonderingly asks him to whom he speaks, but the worldy Man can only repeat that there is no remedy." (One is reminded of Claudus ${ }^{\circ}$ even more terrible agony: ${ }^{(0 .}$. . what can it when one can not repent ${ }^{\circ}$ - Hamiet. III.1i1.66.) But this is the closest he comes to recognition, and from this point on he turns,

ILke Macbeth, to frantic effort to escape his fate.
In the scene which follows: virtually every word or action of the characters on stage directiy or indirectly reveals to the audience the irony of the hero* delusion that "Policy can help himg that Ignorance can snstruct himg or that the physician can heal him. The helpless chaplaing who can do nothing but babble in illiterete Lating bustles off to ietch the physician while the dying man desperately tedis nia to hurry. He then turns to his stemerds

Oh policy sick, neuer so sick, oh holde my head: Oh sire, what shalbe come of all my goods when I am dead? [sig. F3]

Coverous in his ironic aside to the audience fully exposes the nero ${ }^{\circ}$ terribie ignorance of the sickness in his souls

Lo, see you not how the worldiy men showeth his kinde? As sick as he $1 s_{0}$ on his goods 18 all his minde.
[s1g. F3]
The physician enters and tries to mend his body while Covetous reinforces the irony by harrassing him with coarse jokeso when he admits thet he can offer no remedy. ${ }^{\text {me }}$ is angrily sent off without his fee. The Worldiy Man then attempts to dictate his will, but dies unable to complete the significant sentence beo


Before Satan has gleefully entered and carried the hero $s$ body and soul off to Hell. Covetous (as Spivack puts it) wiands over the corpse and expounds to the audience the meaning of the tragedy. his homsletic candor prescriptive for his role: 39

> This 28 the end almaies wher I beging For I am the root of all wickednes and sino I neuer rest to teach and anstruct men to euill: Til I bring them bothe body and soule to the Deuil. Come iet vs go hence, heer is no more to be said: Faremel my masters our partes we haue playd.
(sig.G)
Drametlcally, there is indeed "no more to be saidn or as Erasmus phrased $1 t, a l l$ appearances have been stripped away and for the Worldiy Man the plase can no more be plaied. The concluding moral summey by his virtuous counterpart the Heaveniy lan and the good counselor Enough seems theatrically anti-cilactics alo though interesting for its similarity in function to Malcolmes concluding speech in Mebeth. The Tudor audience, however, would expect and approve this finel tyingeup of the moral theme.

This pley as Creeth and others have pointed out, 18 of Vital Importance from literarymistorical vierpoint in the developing tragedy of the individual. 40 In this connection, one further play should be mentioned briefly as a transitional proc duct. No woodes ${ }^{5}$ The conflict of conselence (c. 1572) is ino teresting both for its scene of ironic nonorecognition similar in some respects to Wager ${ }^{\circ} \beta_{0}$ and for its revolutionary concept of applying the Psychomachia structure to the concrete moral tragedy of an historical individual. In two issues of a single edition, the author first adpances this concept and then retreats from it: on his title page first offering and then mithdreaing the nistorical name of one Francis Spira, an Italian lawyer and recusant who, under pressure of the ingussitiong renounced his 42 Protestant faith and later committed suicide in despair.

Woodes also alters the conclusion by the dramatically naive but economical device of changing a few vital words in the messenger ${ }^{9}$ s final speech to nake his hero die a joyful penitant rather than a despairinf suicide. As Bevington remerks, "Philologus could be saved or damed until the last moment. ${ }^{42}$ The same conment could apply to the worldy Man at the point where he halfrecognizes his peril, which would be fully clear to the audience; and although both plays may be said to lack the element of tragic inevitability, the tension and suspense from the audience ${ }^{\circ}$ s viewpoint is consistently maintained in both scenes.

Like the Worldiy Man, Philologus falls from the height of his delusion, a point twice emphasized by the symbolism of the flattering mirror offered by Sensual Suggestion. At the end of the trial scene, Philologis eulogizes over the "peerlesse pleasures ${ }^{\text {m }}$ and "1oyes vnspeakable ${ }^{*}$ which he sees reflected and resolves to follow forever ${ }^{\text {whis }}$ glasse of delight . . . . (1594-1605); his only worry now is lest his neighbors will rebuke him. Hypocrisy reassures him, remarking with an irony which the victin can no loncer appreciate but which would be clear to'the audience: way that the reading of the workes of S. Selfloue,/ And doctor Ambition did your errours remoue" (1614-15). This moral comment he follows up with the traditional triumphant aside: "He haue now caught him as Birde is in line [sic] (line 1618). The moral is repeated later when Philologus, assalled by the invisible voices of Spirit and Conscience (equivalent to the voices of the Prophet in Warer's play), is forced once again to look into the glass and admits that he can see ${ }^{\text {maught els but }}$
pleasure, pompe, and wealth .-. . (line 1689). He rejects the voice of Conscience and tells him that he argues in vain. ${ }^{\omega}$ And to indoye these worldiy loyes.... ${ }^{\circ}$ he will put all in jeopardy (line 1907). But his expectation of joy leads him only to Horror: and again the spectators would see the ironic diso crepaney.

The quality of hallucination in wagers scene is repeated in the voice of Horror, unheard by the heros children who feare fully ask him to whom he speaks. His inability to pray and his despairing vision of an angry God bear obvious resemblances to the agonies of claudius and Faustug. 43 His later outcry to his friends Theologus and Eusebsus, whose roles are similar to those of the Scholars in Faustugg further emphasizes the theological point that despair is another illusion based on self-delusion:

The deuils to be about me rounde, whiche make great preparation. And leepe a stirre, here in this place, which only is for mee. Neither doe $I$ conceiue, these thinges, by vaine imagination. But euen as truly, as mine eyes, beholde your shape and fashion. (2182ه5)

Theologus begs him to turn his mind from the illusion to the reality:

Your minde corrupted dooth present, to you, this false illusion, But turne awhle, vnto the spirit of trueth, in your distresse. And it shall cast out from your eles. all horror and confualons (2189-91)

The play, however, ends in an impasse. Philologus, persisting in his despair. is led off in care of his children while his friendes persist in hoping that he will be saved; the conclusion, as stated above, could go either way. As Bevington puts it:

The mportant fact $0.1 s$ not that moodes could produce the difference by changing so few words. but that the alteration 18 symbolic of the manner in which the entire body of gsychomachia dram was able to adapt itseli to a tragic patterng simply by terminating its usual progression of spiritual domifall and reo covery before the final phase. The earliest of psychomachla drama contained in its phases of comic and grotesque degeneracy the matertals for a tregic resolution. The phenomenon developed in plays like - Confifet of Conscience and reached its fullest maturity in the comic degeneracy of Doctor Faustus omn decline. 44

This comment points up the progression from tragic recogo nition to tregic nonarecognition which is bound up both with changing religlous attitudes and with the novement of the morality plays cowerd the Psychomachla conflict of an individual man rather than Mankind. But whatever the religious or drametic positiong the morality playwrights consistently mantain the structural method of morml and dramatic arony by which the audience (even if not the victim) is led to recognize the difference between appearance and reality.

FOOTNOTES, Chapter IV

1
Desiderius Erasmus, The Praise of Folly, trans. Sir Thomas Chaloner, 1549 (London, 1901) © Cited in Sidney Thomas. The Antic Hamlet and Richard III (New York, 1943). pp. 2I-2. Thomas notes the relevance of this passage to the bewildering social changes of the Tudor era (see Chapter III, note 2 above) and to the role of the Vice as actor. But he seems to interpret it in terms of "ambivalence of personality" and the breakdown of moral absolutes in an age when the old allegorical concepts of static personalities were giving way to a new faith in the infinite variety of human character. $\circ \cdot \circ$ (pp. 20-22) 。This argument might be questioned. As suggested in the previous chapter, an important distinction should be made between the undeniable moral confusion wrought by these changes and the moral absolutes set forth by the morality playwrights. The Vice's mambivalence of personality should not be dissociated from its theological background of disguised evil.
${ }^{2}$ Shakespeare and the Idea of the play (Lond on. 1962) pa 26. 3rbido po 28. This comment illustrates a transitional point between the fusion of play world with real world in the miracies and the growing emphasis in Elizabethan drama on the play as illus sion ( $p_{0} .57$ ) or The world and the Stage (pp. 64-86) . But the objection does seem to ignore the distinctive function of irony in the morality plays.
other critics have more uncompromisingiy condemned the use of audienceaddress. Robert $L$. Ramsay, edoo Magnyfycence by John Skeliton, Early English Text Society (London, 1906) Intro. po xviv, calls the vices monologues wan essentially allen feature. They are, however, an almost universal feature of the moralities, and Skelton's are surpassed in length and dullness by many in the other plays - © Ao S. Downer The British Drama (New Yorko 1950). po 51, dismisses the device with the comment that medious lectures are delivered at frequent intervals by allegorical como mentators. W1111am Archer. The Old Drame and the New (Boston. 1923). po 42, commenting on Elizabethan drama in general, condems audienceadaress as algn of sheer artistic helplessness for which there is no possible - . Justiflcation.
${ }^{4}$ The popularity of these plays during the period immediately preceding the full flowering of Elizabethan drama is suggested in the following statistics extracted by Bernard Spivack (pp. 251-2): In the period 1560-1589, more than 60 extant or lost plays out of nearly 300 dramatic works listed in Harbage s Annalis of English Drama are designated as moral or interlude a according to Chambers ${ }^{\circ}$ statistics in The Elizabethan Stage, 17 out of 42 plays printed between 1565 and 1585 were moralities, as were 14 out of 65 recorded court performances during the same period.

5The Dry Mock: A Study of Irony in Drama (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948) ppo 10\%19。
${ }^{6}$ Or Ironx. Especially in Drame (Toronto 1935 [1948]) po 9.
In the process of daming with faint praise, another critic seems to have hit on a similar concept in reluctantly attempting to explain the popularity of the moralities: ". . the appeal of the moralities to their audiences, which apparently preferred them to miracleaplays, seems mysterlous. possibly one reason was that the authors were committed to the devising of a plot, the changes in which could not be foregone conclusions. . For the rest, there was the appeal of the edoubleness of the action, which of ten involves seeing through the equivocation of appearances: as, for instance, in following the tricks of plausible vices, eno gaged by their rascality, but morally certain that the pot must too often go to the well, that pride goeth before a fall, that fine feathers don ${ }^{\circ} t$ make fine birds - or some other such evergreen platitude." A. P. Rossiter, English Drama from Early Times to the El1zabethans (London, 1950), pp. 89-90.

7 The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Berkeley, Cal1f. 1936 ) pp. 177-9, 193, 229032, 246-7. The major steps toward tragedy, which Farnham summarizes in these pages, may be described as follows: (1) a story 18 more or less invented and not taken from Scripture; (2) man is ${ }^{m}$ simply man. not divine or saintly, and free to choose between good and evil; (3) the ending shifts from mercy to retribution, reinforcing the idea that human suffering is dictated by divine order rather than irrational chance; (4) the hero, first fragmented into class abstractions and types, is later replaced by an individual protagonist taken from history or legend, a method already used in Medieval me Casibusn tragedy.
$8_{\text {moral }}$ and Tragic Recognition: The Uniqueness of Othello, Macbeth, and King Lear, Papers Michigan Acad. Selo Arts and Leto ters, XIV (1960), 381094. Creeth also notes the important shift from a merciful to a catastrophic ending: but he argues that one must distinguish between the rudiments of regeneration through tragic selfoknowledge in the early plays, and the tragedy of retribution as an object lesson beginning with W. Wager ${ }^{9}$ s plays and typifying most Elizabethan tragedy. One might dispute Creeth's treatment of Macbeth as a play of spiritual regeneration and remark that selforecognition may also be followed by despair: a theme in some of the moralities to be discussed in this chapter. But he makes the important point that although previous critics have discussed various aspects of the continuity between the moralities and later drama, "it has not hitherto been seen that the morality structure and tragic recognition are bound up together....." (p. 39.3)。
${ }^{9}$ Although these sermonizing speeches are dramatically flat, it would seem that the extreme aversion of some critics to the morality plays is largely based on a modern antipathy to didactio cisms, and to a refusal to consider the plays as a whole.

Two such opinions may be taken as typical. John A. Symonds, Shakspere's. Predecessors in the English Drama (rev. ed. London, 1900), p. 118, remarks that the Morality must . o be regarded as the schoolmaster which brought our drama to selfaconsciousness.

It has the aridity and mortal dullness proper to merely translo tional and abortive products.n $C_{\text {. }}$ F. Tucker Breoke the Tudor Drame (Boston, 1911), pp. 47. 110. and passim, appliesto the genre
 stages) composed by mprogressive lelsurely poetasters who apo pear to haye belonged largely to the elerical profession and Whose object wis more frequently edifseation than musement. $m$

See also Katharine Lee Bates. The English Religious Drama (New York and London. 2893), pp. 20100; Rossiter English Dramap p. 105.
${ }^{10}$ por discussions of the theory that the morality developed from the Medieval sermon mith its allegorical exemplap just as the miracle developed from the liturgical elements of the Mass, sees
 Transactions Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences. XIV (1910). 293-311; Go $\mathrm{R}_{\text {. Owst }}$ Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (Cambridge, 1933) : ppo 56-109, 526-14.

11 English Religious Drama of the M1ddle Ages (Oxford, 1955). pp. 341-2.

12 Creeth (moral and Tragic Recognitiong p. 387) points out Emilias role as a virtue ilgure who chides othello to enlightenment.

$$
13 \text { pp. 167०71. } 176093
$$

14p. 178.
15 The vice is exposed and sentenced to punishment (execution, imprisonment, or exile) in: King John Nice Wanton, Wealth and Health. Applus and Virginia, Horestes. The Triail of Treasure, and The TIde Tarrieth No Man. In three further plays, such punishment is prea ceded by a scene of symbolic disrobings. Respublica. Satire of the Three Estates. Virtuous and God2y Susanna.

16
From Mankind to Marione: Grovth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, Massog 1962 ). These structurall elements, which Bevingion discusses in detail as a prelude to their use by Marlowe, involve the continual altemation between the good and evil sides of the Psychomachsa, and the symmetrically balanced use of different casts in "progressive suppression" to illustrate the allegorical movement of the theme.
${ }^{17}$ E. K. Chambers. The Mediaeval Stage (Oxford, 1903), II, 204, states that whe charecemp of the vice 18 derived from that of the domestic fool or jester. ${ }^{\circ}$ He 18 foreed to add, however, that oddly enough he is rarely called a rool. 0 . Ramsay in his Introo duction to Magnyiycence (ppo cxcoczciv) tater a similar position. A. W. Ward coments: As to the origin of the Vice, no reasonable doubt remains. Inasmuch as he mas ordinerily dressed in a fool ${ }^{\circ}$ habit, and occasionally asumes the part of a jester pure and
simple，it is obvious that the invention of this popular character was first suggested by the familiar custom of keeping an attendant fool＂（A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne，rev．ado．London and New Yorkp1899， 110 ．Among other critics who have discussed the Vice primarily as．Fool and farcical comedian are：Ola Elizabeth Winslow，Low Comedy as a Structural Element in English Drama from the Beginnings to 1642 （Menasha． W1scoo 1926）：Symonds．Shakspere it Predecessors．pp．119－20．

The opposite view is taken by Lo Wo Cushmang The Devil and the Vice in the English Dramatic Literature Before Shakespeare （Halle，Germany：1900）© Cushman（pp．68－71）summarizes earlier critical theories on the Vice ${ }^{9}$ origin and argues that most are based on misleading＇seventeenth－century accounts rather than on the plays themselves．He defines the Vice as＂an allegorical representation of the Deadly Sins：he 18 the antithesis of piety and morality and 18 the friend of an unrestrained worldiy 11 fe 。．．． The formula；devil became Vice and Vice became clowng does not apply to the facts in the case＂（pp．63，71）．Two critics who have supported Cushman as against Ramsay and Chambers ares Thompo son，＂English Moral Plays，＂p．396；and Charles Mo Gayley，edos Repreo sentative English Comedies（New York， 1903 ［1907］），Intro．，pp． xIvimilv。

18p．121：On the same page，Spivack stresses the roots of this concept of comedy in Medieval theology and psychology．He also discusses in detail the complex question of the Vice ${ }^{0}$ s relam tionship with farce and the elements of the fool in his nature： see especially pp．113－23，134m，196－200；314－15．331－9。
${ }^{19}$ Spivack（ $p_{0}$ 194）notes the aimilarity of this exchange to the Vice ${ }^{9}$ characteristic deceit and laughter．Gayley（opo cito． p．1111）and A．C．Cawley，edo．Everyman（Manchester，Eng．1961）． Intro，$p_{0}$ Ixi，also note the general similarities of Everyman ${ }^{9}$ false friends to the later vices．
${ }^{20}$ In connection with exposition in the morelity genre，Symonds （Shakspere s．Predecessors，p．141）remarks that not infrequentiy a Doctor surviving from the Expositor of the Miracles，interpreted its allegory as the action proceeded．A Doctor does in fact pero form such a function at the end of Everyman，but $I$ can find no other evidence for this statement．The possibility that this critic did not carefully read the plays he is discussing should be set against his general condemnation of their aridity and mortal dullness ${ }^{\text {m }}$（see note 9 above）．
${ }^{21}$ Cawley（op．citog po xxi）argues that the character Knowledge signifies the understanding of God which cannot be attained without selfoknowledge．Helen S．Thomas．The Meaning of The Character Knowledge In Everyman，Mississippi Quarterly，XIV（1960），7，11， suggests that the word would have signified a mapience or wisdom figure＂who offers good counsel．whether human or divine．

22 ${ }^{\text {moral }}$ and Tragic Recognition，pp．388－9。
23
3Sp1vack．pp．242050．

24
A brlef reference should be made to the subsequent absence of Satan from the moralities until in a few later works starting with Lusty Juventus（c．2550）he reappears only as a minor comedian． unassociated whth the mankind hero and a grotesque target for the Vicer wit．Spivack（ $\mathrm{pp}, 130-34$ ）attributes this phenomenon to the Vice＇s theatrical superiority and the traditional conception of Satan as an anthropomorphic and nonalaliegorical figure．

Spivack．however，does seem to slight Luciferog role in Wisdom when he describes it as slight and of secondary importance（po 130）．

25moral and Tragic Recognition po 386．
$26_{\text {iplankind to karlowe pp．136．7．}}$
27Ramsey（Magny fycence，Intro．ppo xlvoxivi）offers convincing evidence that pancy and Folly were dressed as court fools．He further distinguishes between pancy as the natural fool a dwarf who combines the attractions of diseased mind and stunted bodyo and Folly，the allowed fool－－a shrewdo witty fellow who has assumed the $\mathrm{col}^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ dress and part the better to serve hls own ends o．－（ppococi）。

28Thompson，Dre Mock：pp． 15 ff。
$29_{\text {Magnificence exults in his．princely state and his immunity }}$ to Fortune and compares himself to such famous tyrants as Alexander and Caesar（sig．$E^{\nabla}$ ）．The audience would probably recognize at once the MHerodian image，as suggested by＂Wo O．Harris skeltones Magnyfycence and the Cardinal Virtue Tradition（Chapel Hillo ${ }^{\text {No }}$ Cog 1965）po 1150

30 Although the subject of Despelr raises theologlcal questions which cannot be fully discussed here，one might note three studies which discuss the widespread appearence of this theme in liedieval and Renalasance literature and the fact that Despair was itself considered as temptation and delusion：Theodore Spencer．Death and ELizabethan Tragedy（Cambridge．Massoo 1936）pp． $160-70$ ； Frederlc Ives Carpenter，©penseris Cave of Despair．MLNO XII （1897）．258ar 74；and Arieh Sachs，The Religious Despadr of Doctor Faustus：JEGP．LXIII（1964），625047．
${ }^{31}$ The humanizing of the virtuous comment on man ${ }^{\circ} s$ folly appears more strongly in $W$ ．Wager ${ }^{\circ}$ s two plays．In The Longer Thou Livesto Plety，Discipline and Erercitation lament Moros willul stupldity in terms amusingly suggesting a group of schoolmesters beweiling a Mhopeless pupil．In Enough Is as Good as a Feast，the rejected counselor Enough takes ningelf off with an entirely human note of annoyances i cannot think but those that of me holde scornes／ Wll be glad of me or euer the yeer be half wornem（gig。 D3＊）．

32Although the parallel 18 not eract．one might compare juo ventus rueful werning with the even more extreme position of Jenkin Careaway in Jack Juggier，who is 80 beguiled by the outward
show that he loses faith in his own ldentity. The darker imo plications of this seemingly farcical situation and its conneco tion with human gulilbility, are suggested in the epilogue wheres after disclaiming any ${ }^{\text {fin }}$ urther meaning to his mififiling playo the author goes on to say:

> Sueh is the fashyon of the worlde now dayes That the symple fnnoseintes ar deluded And an hundred thousand diuers wayes By suttle and craftye meanes shamefullie abused

33p. 187
34 The long scene of symbolic disrobing in the Satire of the Three Estates might be mentioned briefly for its forceful presen tation of the vices as moral commentators. After Flatterieg Falset. and Dissait are stripped of their clerical disgulses by the deuse exomechina figures of John the Commonweal and Good Counsel. the latter two sre hanged (in a scene of relentless cheatrical realism) and each gives long seapfold speech warning against his omn falsehoods. Flatterie, who has escaped punishment by turning hangman $s$ assistant exits with etrlumphant speech to the audience boasting of his treachery and cleverness and inviting them to judge motters for themselves:

> Quhen I had on my Trelrs hude All men beleifit thet I was gudes Now ludge ye gif I be. Thocht thay be blak or blew: Quhat halines is thair within: Ane wolfe cled in ane wedders skino Iudge ye gif this be trewo
> (425l-65)

35 This approach to recognition at a literal plot level apo pears also in Gealth and Mealth (c. 1554) and Garter ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$ Virtuous and Godiy Susanna (c. 1569). The vices of the former play contin. ually arouse the suspicions of their mastersw Wealth and Healtha but final recognition and repentance comes only with the aid of Good Remedy. In this rather clumsy work. it is hard to judge how deliberetely the author may have intended these hints. But in Susanna, a better constructed play. the author also provides but never employs the machinery for isteral undeceiving. The servant True Report, whose name might suggest a defense of his slandered mistress, is ilmited to the aliegorical function of apprehending Ill Report after the trial scene. The judges give themselves away by contredicting one another in their evidence: but this happens only after God has raised whe spirite of Danyellm who in true allegorical iashion reveals their wickedness and rebukes the foolish populace for their gulidbilityo In both plays. it would seam that the hold of allegory was too strong for the authors to take the
final step. Man cannot recognize evil without the aid of his better nature: and the authors were not yet sufficiently skilled at literal plotting to combine allegory and realism.

This scene 18 of course comic version of the Heaveniy Parliament which among the exiant moralities makes its only other appearance in The Castle of Perseverance. But here the purpose is to expose the vices as socialopolitical criminals rather than to save the soul of Mankind.

The Tudor Interlude (Leqcester, 1958) , p. 92. The scenes of symbolic disrobing in Respublice and the Satire involse the question of whether the vice might wear beneath his disguise some conventional costume which the sudience would recognize. of particular significance: was he dressed as a proo fessionsl pool? Unfortunately the evidence is inconclusive. that there is has been sumarized by Craik (pp. 69ه72), who suggests that he probably wore a garment and/or beard of varlegated colors (as indicated by ines in the Satire, King John, and Three Ladies of London), but that this was not ldentical with the roolsomotiey. WThe essence of the vice ${ }^{\circ}$ dress is its reckless disreputability. - - A grotesque combination of the flashy and the shabby was evidently aimed at: the effect evoked by Hamlet ${ }^{\circ}$ a abuse of claudius as a ${ }^{9}$ vice of Kings ${ }^{\circ}$ and ${ }^{9}$ a King of shreds and patches." (pp. 71-2)

38
The worldiy Man exclalms: woh pollcy, how glorious my buildings doo ghane:/No gentlemans in this contrey like vnto mine. © Lsig. E4 J. As Farnham points out (Medievel Heritage, po 240), this evokes the same effect as the conventional "De casibus" herois bellef in his own uniqueness: mat boast to dram the tragic destroyer. ${ }^{\infty}$

39
p. 175。

In connection with this scene, it should be stressed that the protagonist is carried off to Hell on the Devilis back: not the Vice Covetous as stated by E. K. Chambers. The Elizabethan Stage (Orford. 1923). III, 505.

40
Creeth ("Moral and Tragic Recognition, p. 381) points out that the munenlightened" death of the worldiy Man 18 "unprecedented ${ }^{\text {a }}$ in the moralities up to this time; but typical of most Elizabethan tragedy. He calls this endine unsatisfactory, since it lacks a denouement and me knot of the Worldiy Man ${ }^{\circ}$ a folly remains tied." This comment illustrates an important distinction between two kinds of tragedy (see also notes 7 and 8 above), but it would seem to ignore the powerful irony of the hero s deluded death.

Three other critics also discuss the various tragic aspects of thes play: Spivack, pp. 174m5, 249; Bevington, wMankind to Marlowe, pp. 158-63; Farnham, Medieval Heritage, ppo 237-42. In View of the historlcal importance and dramatic effectiveness of Enough Is as Good as a Feast, It seems unfortunate that no separate critical studses and no modern edition have so far been published. the text being avallable only in the Huntington Library 8 facsimile reprint of the original.

41
The history of Francis Spira (or Francesco Spiera) is expanded in an article by Celesta kine on Nathaniel Wood. sesc] Conilict of conselence pricho l (1935) , 663070.

For details of the merations to title page, Prologueg and final speech, see: Spivact, ppo 236mi Bevingtong mpantindm to Maxlomen ppo 246a7: Celesta vine. Woodesis [sie] Conflict of Consçence, TLS Nov. 23. 1933, p. 840; Wo Wo Gres. woode 8 Conflict of Conscience ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{m}$ TLS. Oct. 26s 1933. po 732: william A. Jectsons woodes conilget of consciences TLS Sept. 7. 1933. p. 592.

42
ตqgangind to Parlowe. p. 251.
43 Bevingtion (00. cit. pp. 245051) examines in detail the structural and phslosopiscal sinilarities of this play to Doctor Faustug parciculariy the hero s spiritual degeneration and has despais. Lily B. Campello poctor Faustusg A Case of Conscience, PMLA: LXVII (1952). 230a31. also notes the resembiances betmeen the two plays. although she soribes thss to both authorso use of comon sources rather than to direct influence.

44 mignesnde to marlowe p. 247.

The major aim of the preceding discussion has been to sugo gest that the vitality of the morality plays for their audiences may be largely based on their dramatic presentation of evil as faise appearance. Inherent in the Vice s counterfeiting of Virtue, his plausible arguments, his social frauds, is an infinite variety of pretense and knavery laid bare to mankind in the audiencem at the expense of pfankind on the stage. The spectators would enjoy the feignyng and counterfeityng both for its own sake and because it is based on the archetypal human problem of recogo nizing evil in its true nature. Vice may appear virtuous, or Virtue may be "provyt . . . wymaydnes. ${ }^{\text {m }}$ Man is given freedom to choose between them。 but his earinly witw cannot always perceive the difference between these warring forces in his soul:

> And whether that my angel be turnid ilend Suspect I meyo yet not directiy tell: But being both from me, both to each friend, I euess one angel in another's hell: Yet this shail I ne er know, but ilve in doubt, Till my bad angel fire my good one out. (Shakespeare, Sonnet CXIIV)

If 80 confused within his own selfodeluding mind Man may be equally gulled by the fairoappoaring social evils surrounding nim. Shakespeare ${ }^{\circ}$ lines point up the vital change in the problem of recognition as seen from the mankind hero ${ }^{\circ}$ point of view. In the earlier piays, he may at last perceive the difference between the angel and the fiendi aided by his higher Knowledge or Good Counsel. Later the momentary doubts ralsed by his better
nature may prove too weak, and he may die belleving that evil is good. But to his counterpart in the audience, this terrible igo norance of the reality takes on additional tension and irony. Men still are capable of penetrating the mask of evil. but the individual man may fail. Let mall Christen people, which be here presentem take due warning.

For the Vice, the problem of recognition also changes its aspect. Once he has taken on a semi-independent theatrical ideno tity, he is often unmasised and punished ilke any human criminal. thus bringing the plot of deception to a more theatrically satisfying conclusion. To punish Man ${ }^{\circ}$ s Vice athout inflicting the same punishment on pan himself is a metaphorical anomaly similar to the illogical position of Man as character in his om alle gory. But mithout these departures from rigid allegorical logic. the psychomachia conflict might never have progressed from the drama of abstractions to the drama of individual men.

Whatever the Vice ${ }^{0}$ allegorical position or his fate within the play, his methods of deception remain remarkably cono sistent despite certain theatrical refinements; and the devices of deception as outiined in the first three chapters provide the inveliest dramatic episodes of the plays. Whether evil is visuac lized as an external force (Satan, the Vice, the Evil Angel), as social fraud and injustice, or as a quality within the human heart, its mode of operation as seen by Medieval theologians offers a supreme opportunity for a drama based on intrigue and deception.

Since this way of looking at evil 18 not restricted to the morelity plays. but would be widely familiar to Tudor and Elizabethan audiences, it was too durable to vanish merely beo cause the plays became secular in content or the external devices of allegory disintegrated. Although it has not been the aim of this thesis to discuss extensively the continuance of morality themes in the later drama, the examples given may at least sugm gest that there is scope for further study following the example of such critics as Spivack, Bevington, Salingar, and Creeth. The existence of a native body of plays based on intrigue and deception helps to explain why the later drametists were able to assimilate, rather than merely to import, intrigue plots and characters from foreign sources. The allegorical altitude of mind ${ }^{m}$ induced by familiarity with the Psychomachia as deception in dramatic and nonodramatic works would prepare the Elizabethan audience to recognize the metaphorical mask of evil when transo figured by the alchemy of poetic imagery.

The same sense of familiarity would increase the audience $s$ enjoyment of the morality plays themselves. Dramatic conventions based on archetype (or stereotype) may for this very reason be all the more effective. In the lesser moralities, convention may degenerate into static cliche. But in the hands of the beto ter playwrights, the traditional devices associated with deception and recognition give rise to a lively and varied form of theatrio cal presentation based on the use of drametic irony for moral ends.
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[^0]:    yea but fyrst of all. I mvst chaunge myn apparell vnto a bysshoppe, to maynetayene with my quarell to a monke or pryst, or to sum holy fryer

[^1]:    It is trim indeed, by the masse in that Gown:
    me thinks you be worthy to be playor of a town.

[^2]:    Mary syr. yet I conuey my matters cleane; Like as I haue a visour of vertue,
    So my impes, whiche vnto my person do leane, The visour of honestie doth endue;

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (London. 1961). P. 16.

    ## ${ }^{8}$

    ${ }^{8}$ Spivack (p. 305) contrasts the ${ }^{m}$ moral voidm of mankind in the early moralities with the human figures in the plays of the last quarter of the sixteenth century representing the decline of

[^4]:    -     - lived in a period of repid change, when old forms of ife and behavior were being replaced by new ones .-. and when fortunes sheel was beginning to revolve at a dizzy pace. The medievel speculations on shadow and substance took on new meaning. When man can assume so many different guises. how is one to know which 1 s real and which is merely transitory? Or must all be considered equally felgned? 2

[^5]:    - . . the most flourishing empires of the greatest kings have been overthrown by the tongues of flatterers. Nowhere do we read of a state which has been oppressed under a great tyranny in which flatterers did not play the leading roles in the tragedy. 43

[^6]:    My wit is nought o I cannot leme the waye. With the neryst vertue to cloke alwaye the vise:

