INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7913044

BRITTAIN, MARY GATES
"THIS IS NO WORLD IN WHICH TO PITY MEN": A STUDY OF THOMAS HEYWOOD AS A JACOBEAN SOCIAL CRITIC.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO, PH.D., 1978

University Microfilms International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

MARY GATES BRITTAIN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

"THIS IS NO WORLD IN WHICH TO PITY MEN":
A STUDY OF THOMAS HEYWOOD AS A
JACOBEAN SOCIAL CRITIC

by

Mary Gates Brittain

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1978

Approved by

Christopher Spencer
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser ______________________

Committee Members ______________________

____

____

____

November 7 1978

Date of Acceptance by Committee

BRITTAIN, MARY GATES. "This Is No World in Which to Pity Men": A Study of Thomas Heywood as a Jacobean Social Critic. (1978)
Directed by: Dr. Christopher Spencer. Pp. 408.

The purpose of this study is to place Thomas Heywood and his works in the mainstream of Jacobean drama rather than in the ebb tide of the Elizabethan. Traditionally, beginning with Lamb in 1808 and continuing to the present, Heywood has been extolled by critic after critic as the kindly, genial spokesman for middle-class morality and ideals. To most critics, Heywood appears to be an optimistic Elizabethan playwright with a staunch faith in human nature as well as a view of the world in which good ultimately triumphs over evil.

In opposition to these commonly-held and seldom-questioned assumptions, this study attempts to show that Heywood is actually an instructive and constructive social critic not only of middle-class morality and ideals but also of contemporary English life in general. Moreover, he is a pessimistic Jacobean dramatist with a realistic, and sometimes satiric or ironic, view of man and of evil in a world where evil, not good, generally dominates as a sinister, brooding, and pervasive force.

Heywood's social criticism becomes immediately apparent when his works are examined thematically and chronologically by type. Of the twenty-four extant plays generally included in the Heywood canon, this study deals

with a representative selection of eleven with brief attention to two others and occasional references to the rest. The selected plays are divided into three groups (by chapter) with each related in terms of type, characterization, and/or plot, and with each group chronologically covering a period of twenty or more years between the composition of the early and later plays. A chronological examination of one of Heywood's principal themes--the confusion of appearance with reality--with each related group plainly reveals the darkening of Heywood's vision over the years and his increasing awareness of folly and vice in the world and in human nature. An examination of theme and chronology thus provides a focal point for a more inclusive analysis of the nature of the men and women who inhabit Heywood's world. This, in turn, reveals the nature of his social criticism of the life and manners in seventeenth-century England and establishes more clearly his increasing affinity with his fellow Jacobeans as his long and prolific dramatic career progressed.

After a general introduction to the playwright and his work in Chapter I, the next three chapters are devoted to a close reading of the three groups of individual plays. Chapter II examines Heywood's most important works, the realistic domestic tragedies. Chapter III takes up the realistic-satiric comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life and manners. Chapter IV discusses the romantic

comedies and tragicomedies of adventure and intrigue. Chapter V treats briefly the other dramas, mainly chronicle-histories or classical plays, followed by a summation and conclusion to the study.

This final chapter concludes that the world as depicted by Heywood, the Jacobean social critic, is patterned after the corrupt, decadent world portrayed by his fellow Jacobeans, not the orderly, harmonious world of the Elizabethans. Generally, there is no restoration of order and harmony; and, usually, good does not overcome evil or virtue triumph over vice in the conclusion to his plays. Heywood's world may sometimes appear to be one in which chastity and virtue, friendship and honor, kindness and Christian charity flourish; but, in reality, "This is no world in which to pity men" or women. This is a world in which people and their actions are not what they seem to be, for in Heywood's dark vision, appearances may be easily mistaken or confused for reality.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude the helpful assistance of my doctoral committee, especially of the director, Dr. Christopher Spencer, whose invaluable guidance, prompt assistance, and perceptive suggestions were of more help than I can acknowledge.

I also wish to acknowledge with love the unending encouragement of my family, especially of my husband, C. Eugene Brittain, without whose continued patience, constant support, and unflagging interest this dissertation would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPROVAL PAGE ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

CHAPTER

I. THE DARK VISION OF A JACOBEAN SOCIAL CRITIC 1

II. REALISTIC DOMESTIC TRAGEDIES 47

Edward IV, Parts I and II 51
A Woman Killed with Kindness 82
The English Traveller 144

III. REALISTIC-SATIRIC COMEDIES AND TRAGICOMEDIES 181

How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad 185
The Wise Woman of Hogsdon 211
The Late Lancashire Witches 245

IV. ROMANTIC COMEDIES AND TRAGICOMEDIES OF ADVENTURE AND INTRIGUE 271

The Four Prentices of London and *The Challenge for Beauty* 272
The Royall King and the Loyall Subject . . 279
The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II 311
A Mayden-Head Well Lost 343

V. "THIS IS NO WORLD IN WHICH TO PITY MEN". . . 372

BIBLIOGRAPHY 398

CHAPTER I

THE DARK VISION OF A JACOBEAN SOCIAL CRITIC

> As the world growes in yeares ('tis the Heauens curse[)]
> Mens sinnes increase; the pristine times were best:
> The Ages in their growth wax worse & worse.
> (*The Brazen Age* III.171)[1]

In Thomas Heywood's masterpiece of domestic tragedy, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Old Uncle Mountford dryly

[1] Thomas Heywood, *The Brazen Age*, in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood* [ed. R. H. Shepherd] (1874; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), III, 171. This standard work is referred to as "the Pearson Edition," originally printed by John Pearson. The citations from this edition are by volume and page numbers. All subsequent references from Heywood's plays in the text are from the Pearson edition unless stated otherwise below. Where later and better editions are available, I have quoted from them instead of from the Pearson edition. In this study, all act, scene, and line references from *The Captives* are from the edition edited by Alexander Corbin Judson (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1921); all act, scene, and line numbers from *The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II* are from the edition edited by Robert K. Turner, Jr., Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967); all line references from *How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad* are from the edition edited by A. E. H. Swaen (1912; rpt. Vaduz: Fraus Reprint, 1963); all line references from *The Rape of Lucrece* are from the edition edited by Allan Holaday (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950); all act and line references from *The Royall King and the Loyall Subject* are from the edition edited by Kate Watkins Tibbals (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1906); and all scene and line references from *A Woman Killed with Kindness* are from the edition edited by R. W. Van Fossen (London: Methuen, 1961).

informs Susan, his suppliant niece, that "This is no world in which to pity men" (ix. 5). Probably no other aphorism written by Heywood expresses as succinctly and accurately the Jacobean playwright's dark vision of the nature of man and of evil in the world he depicts throughout his dramatic works. Yet traditionally, beginning as far back as Charles Lamb in 1808 and continuing down to the latest major critic Marilyn Johnson in 1974,[2] Thomas Heywood (c. 1574-1641) has generally been extolled by critic after critic as (1) a kindly, genial, tolerant, and lovable playwright; (2) the spokesman of middle-class morality and ideals; (3) a dramatist with a staunch faith in human nature and a desire to depict the better side of life; and (4) the last of the Elizabethans with a view of the world in which good ultimately triumphs over evil--an optimistic view which sets him apart from his fellow Jacobean dramatists in an age of profound pessimism, insecurity, anxiety, and doubt. It would seem fruitful, therefore, to review briefly each of these four traditional assumptions about Heywood as a preface to a new study of this playwright as a pessimistic and realistic critic of society.

[2] See Charles Lamb, _Specimens of English Dramatic Poets_, in _The Works of Charles and Mary Lamb_, ed. E. V. Lucas (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), IV; and Marilyn L. Johnson, _Images of Women in the Works of Thomas Heywood_ (Salzburg, Austria: Universität Salzburg, 1974).

The origin of the first misconception may be traced to Charles Lamb's view of Heywood as a kindly and genial playwright, "a sort of prose Shakspeare."[3] In his Specimens of English Dramatic Poets (published 1808), Lamb sets the keynote for the traditional praise of Heywood as the most lovable Elizabethan dramatist outside of Shakespeare when he writes:

> If I were to be consulted as to a Reprint of our Old English dramatists, I should advise to begin with the collected Plays of Heywood. He was a fellow Actor, and fellow Dramatist, with Shakspeare. He possessed not the imagination of the latter; but in all those qualities which gained for Shakspeare the attribute of gentle, he was not inferior to him. Generosity, courtesy, temperance in the depths of passion; sweetness, in a word, and gentleness; Christianism; and true hearty Anglicism of feelings, shaping that Christianism; shine throughout his beautiful writings in a manner more conspicuous than in those of Shakspeare, but only more conspicuous, inasmuch as in Heywood these qualities are primary, in the other subordinate to poetry. I love them both equally, but Shakspeare has most of my wonder.[4]

Katharine Lee Bates, an early twentieth-century editor of Heywood, points out that "From Lamb to Swinburne, from Hazlitt to Ward, our dramatic critics have felt something very like a personal affection for Heywood." They have felt ". . . amid the granted imperfections of his work, the

[3] Lamb, p. 95.

[4] Lamb, p. 419.

touch of a spirit so merry, tender, generous, humane, that Lamb crowned Heywood with no less a praise than 'a prose Shakespeare.'"[5] Swinburne thinks that Heywood "shows signs now and then, as occasion offers, of the sweet-tempered manliness, the noble kindliness, which won the heart of Lamb"; Hazlitt feels that Heywood's imagination "is a gentle, lambent flame," for among other things, . . . he describes men's errors with tenderness"; and A. W. Ward maintains that "tenderness of feeling" is one of ". . . Heywood's most distinguishing characteristics as a dramatist."[6]

In terms of personality and outlook on life, Heywood is frequently associated with Shakespeare and/or Dekker. Gamaliel Bradford proposes that Heywood and Dekker "both have, at their best, a peculiar sweetness and humanness, a breadth of sympathy which brings them on one side very near to Shakespeare," while Emile Legouis thinks it is Heywood's "tenderness and pity" which bring him nearest to Dekker." J. A. Symonds contends that Heywood "has a sincerity, a tenderness of pathos, and an instinctive

[5] Katharine Lee Bates, Introd., _A Woman Killed with Kindness_ and _The Fair Maid of the West_, _by Thomas Heywood_ (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1917), p. xliv.

[6] Algernon Charles Swinburne, _The Age of Shakespeare_ (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908), p. 225; William Hazlitt, _Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth_ (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845), p. 44; and Adolphus William Ward, _A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queene Anne_, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1899), II, 589.

perception of nobility, that distinguish him among the playwrights of the seventeenth century. Like Dekker,"he says, Heywood "wins our confidence and love"; Agnes Mackenzie believes Heywood has "the same sunny geniality" as Dekker; and Clark feels that Heywood "and Dekker should be for ever placed together in the company of the other lovable writers of English, with Chaucer and Goldsmith, Lamb and Scott and Stevenson," while Stevenson himself affectionately thought "the old boy," Heywood, "had such a sweet, sound soul. . . ."[7]

Following the cue of the nineteenth-century writers Lamb, Hazlitt, Swinburne and Stevenson, most subsequent critics have continued to extoll Heywood's tenderness, tolerance and kindness; for as Crofts relates, Heywood's "apologists hasten by his delinquencies as an author to linger upon the sweetness of his nature." Praise in this same vein has continued down to the present with such critics as Marilyn Johnson, who extolls Heywood's modesty, kindness, tolerance, geniality, and good-humor (1974); and Robert Ornstein who calls Heywood "the earnest homilist

[7] Gamaliel Bradford, Elizabethan Women (Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1936), p. 112; Emile Legouis and Louis Cazamian, A History of English Literature (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. 487; J. Addington Symonds, "Thomas Heywood," in [Plays] Thomas Heywood, ed. A. Wilson Verity, The Mermaid Series (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), p. viii; Agnes Mure Mackenzie, The Playgoer's Handbook to the English Renaissance Drama (New York: Cooper Square, 1971), p. 105; Arthur Melville Clark, Thomas Heywood: Playwright and Miscellanist (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931), p. 251; and Robert Louis Stevenson, The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson, ed. Sidney Colvin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), II, 92-93.

and sentimentalist," and who distinguishes the "sentiments" expressed in _A Woman Killed_ as "charitable" and "tender-hearted" (1976).[8]

Ornstein further maintains that Heywood's plays _The English Traveller_ and _The Rape of Lucrece_ "proclaim the perfection of bourgeois virtues."[9] This recent view echoes the traditional one of Heywood as a highly moral and didactic playwright who continued throughout his exceptionally long career to write for and cater to his audience (particularly the middle class) of the public theatres such as the Red Bull, Curtain, and Rose.[10] Primarily because of the critical writings of such major twentieth-century Heywood critics as A. M. Clark, Mowbray Velte, and Otelia Cromwell, and because of Heywood's association as an author for several years with the Lord Mayor's pageants, the critics have come to consider Heywood the middle-class poet. As Duane Nichols reminds us, "Almost every non-technical study mentions his slavish efforts to flatter the merchants and the middle-class

[8] Alfred Crofts, "The Canon of Thomas Heywood's Dramatic Writing," Diss. Stanford Univ. 1935, p. 122; Johnson, p. viii; and Robert Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality and Dramatic Convention in _A Woman Killed with Kindness_," in _English Renaissance Drama: Essays in Honor of Madeleine Doran & Mark Eccles_, ed. Standish Henning, Robert Kimbrough, and Richard Knowles (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1976), pp. 128, 131.

[9] Ornstein, p. 136.

[10] See, for example, Clark, _Heywood_, p. 209.

morality that must have accompanied them." Heywood's biographer Clark, as noted, proposes that "Of all the dramatists [of his age] he is the kindest to the citizen class and the most thoroughly bourgeois . . ."; Velte labels Heywood "the playwright for the bourgeoisie"; Michael Leonard speaks of him as "London's spokesman for the middle class"; and L. B. Wright calls Heywood "the greatest theatrical spokesman of the bourgeois ideals of his age"; while Cromwell stresses Heywood's "sympathetic attitude toward his creations, drawn generally from the middle class, an attitude as sincere as it is consistent."[11]

Furthermore, according to Cromwell, the source of Heywood's sympathy towards the characters he depicts is found in "a fixed design": his "desire to reveal his faith in man's better nature," in his ". . . staunch belief in the sturdy virtues of man." She feels that Heywood "deliberately, consistently, and continuously [writes], in the main of the better side of life." In the conclusion to her full-length study of Heywood's drama, Cromwell

[11] Duane C. Nichols, "Dramatic Convention in the Plays of Thomas Heywood," Diss. Univ. of Kansas 1964, pp. 63-64; Clark, Heywood, p. 112; Mowbray Velte, The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood (1924; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1966), p. 29; Michael Heaton Leonard, "A Critical Edition of Thomas Heywood's The Wise Woman of Hogsdon With Introduction and Notes," Diss. Univ. of Southern California 1967, p. 78; Louis B. Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1935), p. 650. See also pp. 637-38; and Otelia Cromwell, Thomas Heywood: A Study in the Elizabethan Drama of Everyday Life (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1928), p. 206.

makes the observation that "In his belief in man's better nature," Heywood ". . . turns deliberately from the sordid conditions of life, and presents a realism tinged with idealism; there are no false lights in the background, but character is conceived as well-nigh faultless." She further concludes that Heywood is presenting ". . . wholesome types of Elizabethan men and women in a rich and varied atmosphere of Elizabethan life."[12] Most of Heywood's critics have continued to express similar beliefs.

And, finally, with few exceptions, the critics have portrayed Heywood as the last of the optimistic Elizabethans and as a veteran playwright who stands apart from other Jacobean writers of comedy and tragicomedy, such as Jonson, Middleton, and Fletcher, and from other Jacobean writers of tragedy, such as Chapman, Tourneur, Webster, Middleton, Marston, and Ford. And this idea persists despite the fact that Heywood's long dramatic career spanned the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles: "Heywood seems never to have forgotten that he was of the age of Elizabeth," says Wright, who also points out that Heywood ". . . has been called the last of the great Elizabethans"; Tucker Brooke classifies Heywood as "the last of the old Elizabethan school of bourgeois dramatists"; and Clark tags him as "the most typical" of the Elizabethans, "though not one of the greatest"; Hudson contends that Heywood "remained

[12] Cromwell, pp. 109, 103, 206.

'old fashioned' and Elizabethan," while Katharine Bates maintains that "He kept to the end that Elizabethan zest of life, still fresh and winsome in his plays . . ."; and Irving Ribner argues that "Heywood remained the apostle of a Renaissance cosmic optimism throughout his long career."[13]

In concluding this review of criticism, it should be noted that these four traditional beliefs and assumptions concerning Heywood as a dramatist, treated above, have become so accepted and so commonplace that since Lamb, few critics have seen any reason to question them or to take a second look at Heywood and at his dramatic work under a different light. Moreover, he has been excluded from most of the major works on Jacobean drama. Una Ellis-Fermor and Robert Ornstein omit Heywood in their studies of Jacobean drama, while Irving Ribner characterizes Heywood as a conservative, optimistic playwright who stands apart from the other Jacobean tragic dramatists. It is

[13] Louis B. Wright, "The Male-Friendship Cult in Thomas Heywood's Plays," Modern Language Notes, 42 (1927), 511; Tucker Brooke, "The Royal Fletcher and the Loyal Heywood," in Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds, Univ. of Colorado Studies, Series B. Studies in the Humanities, Vol. 2, No. 4 (Boulder: Univ. of Colorado, 1945), p. 192; Arthur Melville Clark, "Thomas Heywood as a Critic," Modern Language Notes, 37 (1922), 223; Robert Jackson Hudson, "A Critical Edition of Heywood's The English Traveller," Diss. New York Univ. 1962, p. xlix; Bates, p. c; and Irving Ribner, Jacobean Tragedy: The Quest for Moral Order (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1962), p. 50.

important to note, however, that Ribner qualifies his remark somewhat when he says that Heywood "is the more keenly aware of the evils of his age . . . than most critics have been willing to allow."[14]

A few critics have noted, in passing, the hardening of sensibilities in some of Heywood's later works, or have noted his somber view of human nature in his tragedies _A Woman Killed_ and _The English Traveller_.[15] And one perceptive critic, Allan Holaday, has suggested that although Heywood "was a creature of the theatre" most of his life,

> He seems, in fact, to have been better suited to the Church or perhaps to a career in one of the universities. Intellectually he was a teacher, as well as a social, religious, and political reformer; and although he remained throughout his entire life an ardent royalist, he sometimes expressed surprisingly democratic opinions on the worth and virtue of humble man. . . . General moral decadence as well as unconcealed corruption, particularly at court, evoked detailed chastisement from Heywood. Time after time in his plays, poems, and histories he momentarily draws one aside for a mild tirade against immorality. Often his allusions are veiled; presumably he refers to ancient

[14] See Una M. Ellis-Fermor, _The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation_ (London: Methuen, 1936); Robert Ornstein, _The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy_ (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1965); and Ribner, p. 58.

[15] See Crofts, pp. 32-34, 104; Frederick S. Boas, _Thomas Heywood_ (London: Williams & Norgate, 1950), p. 153; Patricia Meyer Spacks, "Honor and Perception in _A Woman Killed with Kindness_," _Modern Language Quarterly_ 20 (1959), 322; and Michel Grivelet, "The Simplicity of Thomas Heywood," _Shakespeare Survey_, 14 (1961), 65.

> Greece or the gods on Olympus; but inevitably the thrust is toward his own England.[16]

Moreover, Holaday reports that Heywood retained "characteristics of the teacher and reformer" throughout life. Even in Heywood's last years, 1636-1641, the attitudes and opinions of his earlier years persist. During these last years, the old poet and playwright is still the devoted royalist and at the same time "mildly democratic reformer criticizing the court and the government"; he is still ". . . the loyal Anglican castigating corrupt churchmen, yet angrily denouncing Puritanism. . . ."[17] And one may add, he is still the social critic exposing the follies and vices of his society and his time.

Heywood's prodigious output of histories, poems, pamphlets, and plays attests to his unflagging interest in history and politics, in religion, and in the social and domestic life of his age. A sampling of some of his titles will indicate the breadth of his interests: a translation of _Sallust_ (1608); _Troia Britanica_ (1609); _An Apology for Actors_ (1612); _Gunaikeion: or, Nine Bookes of Various History Concerninge Women_ (1624); _England's Elizabeth_ (1631); _The Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels_

[16] Allan Holaday, "Thomas Heywood and the Puritans," _Journal of English and German Philology_, 49 (1950), p. 196.

[17] Holaday, pp. 199-200, 203.

(1635); Philocothonista, or, the Drunkard, Opened, Dissected, and Anatomized (1635); A Curtaine Lecture (1637); The Exemplary Lives and memorable Acts of nine the most worthy Women of the World (1640); The Life of Merlin (1641); The Black Box of Rome Opened. From whence are revealed, the Damnable Bloody Plots, Practises, and behaviour of Iesuites, Priests, Papists, and other Recusants in generall: Against Christian Princes, Estates and the people in those places where they have lived. &c. (1641); The Rat-Trap: Or, The Iesuites taken in their owne Net, &c. Discovered in this yeare of Jubilee, or Deliverance from the Romish faction (1641); and Reader, Here you'l plainly see Iudgement perverted By these three: A Priest, A Iudge, A Patentee (1641).[18]

The reader can "plainly see" too from the subtitles of Heywood's pamphlets published in the year of his death (1641) that he remained a social critic to the end.

Although Heywood may have been motivated by the zeal of the reformer in writing some, if not all, of his pamphlets, it would be more correct in speaking of his plays to call him a "social critic" rather than a "reformer."

[18] For a complete listing of Heywood's works, see Arthur Melville Clark, "A Bibliography of Thomas Heywood," Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings & Papers, 1 (1922-26), 97-153; and Samuel A. Tannenbaum, Thomas Heywood (A Concise Bibliography), in Elizabethan Bibliographies, No. 6 (New York: Tannenbaum, 1939).

In his plays, Heywood portrays the social ills, abuses, and corruptions in "Court, Citty, Camp, and Country" (The Royall King III. 185) and depicts the follies and vices of the men and women who inhabit this fallen world. As a critic of his society, Heywood uncovers the social, political, and religious problems of the period chiefly through providing illustrative examples. In other words, he presents the problems, but generally he does not propose the solutions as one might expect in the case of a reformer of society. For example, Heywood depicts the problem of the erring wife in his domestic tragedies; but, as will be apparent in our discussion in Chapter II, he does not posit an acceptable solution for dealing with this domestic ill. In Heywood's domestic tragedies Edward IV, A Woman Killed, and The English Traveller, the unfaithful wife simply dies in the end as in the case of most of the other Jacobean dramas which treat the problem of adultery.

In Heywood's belief that drama should teach a moral or ethical lesson as well as entertain or delight, he is closely akin to such fellow Jacobeans as Jonson and Massinger (and to such classical writers as Horace). This is clear in Heywood's motto "Aut prodesse solent, aut delectare," which is similar to Horace's "Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae."[19] It is further evident

[19] Heywood's motto is affixed to the title page of many of his plays.

in Heywood's conceptions about the "vses" of drama as outlined in "The Third Booke" of An Apology for Actors. Here, Heywood points out that "playes haue made the ignorant more apprehensiue, taught the vnlearned the knowledge of many famous histories, instructed such as cannot reade in the discouery of our English Chronicles . . ."[20] And concerning the "Vse of Comedyes," Heywood relates that

> Sometimes they discourse of Pantaloones, Vsurers that haue vnthrifty sonnes, which both the fathers and sonnes may behold to their instructions: sometimes of Curtesans, to diuulge their subtelties and snares, in which yong men may be intangled, shewing them the meanes to auoyd them. (pp. F3v-4)

And nothing could be clearer than Heywood's admission that

> We present men with the vglinesse of their vices, to make them the more to abhorre them, as the Persians vse, who aboue all sinnes, loathing drunkennesse, accustomed in theire solemne feasts, to make their seruants and captiues extremely ouercome with wine, and then call their children to view their nasty and lothsome behauiour, making them hate that sin in themselues, which shewed so grosse and abhominable in others. The like vse may be gathered of the drunkards so naturally imitated in our playes, to the applause of the Actor, content of the auditory, and reprouing of the vice. (p. G)

Drama then is clearly meant to serve the useful purpose of

[20] Thomas Heywood, An Apology for Actors (1612; rpt. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1941), p. F 3. Subsequent references from this edition will be cited parenthetically in the text.

moral and ethical instruction as well as to provide entertainment. As Heywood concludes: "Briefly, there is neither Tragedy, History, Comedy, Morrall or Pastorall, from which an infinite vse cannot be gathered" (p. F 4). Heywood's dramatic works do reveal a moral and a didactic strain; but, in this, he is not so different from other Jacobean dramatists. Jonson's didactic plays, for example, are infused with an ethical and a moral earnestness, Massinger's sometimes teach a moral lesson, and both Chapman and Webster are fond of moralizing comment.

As a Jacobean social critic-playwright, Heywood portrays all classes of society in his dramas; he paints vivid, realistic pictures from contemporary life illustrating and exposing such social ills as drunkenness, prodigality, wenching, and gambling, and such social and domestic evils as murder, rape, adultery, and suicide. In either his short sketches or full portraits of folly and vice, his audience could recognize its own errors or faults or see at first hand the effects and results of the various sins to which man is heir, the purpose being, of course, that each could improve or correct the fault or error accordingly or eschew or renounce the vice or evil. Thus for Heywood, drama was a vehicle for social criticism and the stage was a platform for instruction and entertainment. In his delightful realistic-satiric comedy *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*, for instance, Heywood exposes some of the actual

tricks employed by frauds and charlatans for the edification of the superstitious and unenlightened while at the same time delighting them with the lively actions and cunning schemes of a colorful character, a bogus white witch, the Wise Woman of Hogsdon herself.

Similarly, the groundlings were no doubt instructed in the "evils" of Puritanism as well as entertained by the pious hypocrisy of a Timothy Thinbeard. In rebuttal to Clark's assumption that Heywood "became in the last years of his life an aggressive Puritan, particularly a Presbyterian," Allen Holaday argues that Heywood "detested Puritans" and consequently took "Brief jabs" at them as in Wendoll's "Fie, fie, you talk too like a Puritant" in _A Woman Killed_ (xi. 109); he also made "several more elaborate attacks" as well, in the appearance of Timothy Thinbeard as "a pious-speaking, text-citing, hypocritical Puritan, wholeheartedly given to dishonesty and lasciviousness" in Part II of _If You Know Not Me_, and again in the masque _Love's Mistress_ where

> Heywood attacks the stupid, un-gracious, un-artistic Puritan attitude in his portrayal of Midas, the ass-eared. And in _How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad_, one character tells a ribald, mocking story about his affair with a woman Puritan. [21]

[21] Holaday, "Heywood and the Puritans," pp. 192;199.

In his perceptive short article "Thomas Heywood and the Puritans," cited earlier, Holaday also mentions Heywood's The Royall King where "Corruption at court, arouses his ire," and The Golden Age where, according to Holaday, Heywood expresses anti-war sentiments.[22]

By and large, however, this critic is primarily concerned with Heywood's pamphlets and other non-dramatic works, rather than with the plays. And although Holaday did not develop the implications of his insights beyond this brief article, his discerning observations are nevertheless significant for a study of Heywood which attempts to explore and expand beyond what he has implied. The idea that Heywood was intellectually or by nature, "a teacher, as well as a social, religious, and political reformer" prepares the way for a new view of Heywood as a Jacobean social critic especially of middle-class domestic and social life, and to posit a new view of his drama which delineates the playwright's dark vision of human nature and of evil in the contemporary world of seventeenth-century England--a vision depicted not only in Heywood's tragedies but also in his tragicomedies and comedies as well--a vision which grows progressively darker and more pessimistic in the period between his first and last plays.

[22] Holaday, pp. 197-98.

In the general discussion of Heywood's dramatic works to follow and in the more specific discussion of individual plays in subsequent chapters, this study will further maintain that (1) Heywood is not by nature a kindly, genial, tolerant, and lovable playwright; instead he is a constructive and instructive critic of society; (2) he is not the spokesman for or of middle-class morality and ideals; instead he is a critic and satirist of both the middle class and the upper class; (3) he does not maintain a staunch faith in human nature or portray the better side of life; instead he presents man in the often unflattering light of realism with emphasis upon his vices rather than upon his virtues; and (4) he is decidedly not the optimistic Elizabethan; instead he is a pessimistic Jacobean who stands with, not apart from, his fellow Jacobeans in an age of anxiety, doubt, and dark pessimism; moreover in Heywood's world good does not generally triumph over evil, and virtue is usually not rewarded nor vice punished in accordance with poetic justice, despite some critical assertions to the contrary.[23]

[23] Velte, for example, maintains that Heywood "extols and assails vice, and always makes virtue triumphant over evil. This, too, is to the taste of the bourgeoisie" (p. 99). See also Wright, _Middle-Class Culture_, p. 640, and Marvin T. Herrick, _Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England_ (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1962), p. 283.

We will begin this study by focusing our attention on the personality of the playwright which emerges from a general study of his dramatic works. Here we will perceive that the image projected by Heywood in play after play does not square with the traditional stereotyped views of his personality or his purpose. One could pile up a list of reasons for this, but a glance at several will serve. For example, Heywood's penchant for depicting violence, horror, and the macabre, and his choice of dark, gloomy imagery suggest that he was not by nature the kindly, good-humored, cheerful playwright he is generally assumed to be. On the question of violence, Holaday believes that Heywood hated war and hated violence; Agnes Mackenzie argues that "he is free from any craving for far-fetched violence"; and, more specifically, George Sampson asserts that there is "no deed of blood" in _A Woman Killed_.[24] One wonders what Sampson would call Sir Charles Mountford's "vile murder" (iii. 51) of two men, Sir Francis Acton's Falconer and Huntsman, if not a "deed of blood"? As a matter of fact, as in the case of the other more typical Jacobean dramatists, Heywood's plays are also steeped in blood and gore--in violence, horror, and the macabre. He depicts murders and wars by the score, tavern brawls,

[24] Holaday, "Heywood and the Puritans," pp. 197-99; Mackenzie, p. 111; and George Sampson, _The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature_, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1961), p. 310.

slaughters, assassinations, parricides, fratricides, suicides, rapes, assaults, decapitations, hangings, and madness, among other things. Heywood also reveals an interest in the macabre in his plays although his characters are generally not as immersed in horror as those of Webster or Tourneur. Tullia, in _The Rape of Lucrece_, is an obvious example. One of Heywood's strongest women, she is a villainous monster who, like Lady Macbeth, spurs her husband on to evil and violent deeds,[25] such as the assassination of her own father. When Servius is dead, Tullia stains her shoes as she treads upon his skull; she then "sparkle[s] his braines upon her Chariot wheele" and washes her ". . . Coach-naves in [her] fathers blood" as she purposely rides over his body (ll. 919. 351).

Macabre mutilations and decapitations abound in Heywood's plays: As banquet fare, Lycaon serves Jupiter the limbs of Epyrien men taken as hostages and slain in revenge for war in _The Golden Age_; Medea scatters the head and mangled limbs of her brother Absyrtus in the way of her father's pursuing ship as she flees Colchos with Jason in _The Brazen Age_, and Amphitrio delivers an enemy's head to King Creon in _The Silver Age_. Pyrhus kills the Amazon Queen, Penthiselea, and enters with her head as a trophy in The Brazen Age; Roughman decapitates the bandit chief,

[25] See Allan Holaday, Introd., _Thomas Heywood's The Rape of Lucrece_ (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950), pp. 38-39.

who attempted to ravish Bess and brings in the head to collect his reward in The Fair Maid, Part II; and Clem is castrated in Part I of the same play. Mrs. Generous, in Lancashire Witches, loses her hand like Mutius Scevola, in The Rape of Lucrece, but in quite different circumstances. Scevola cuts off his own hand in a heroic act of defiant revenge, whereas a soldier turned miller chops off a cat's paw which is then translated back into the human hand of the witch Mrs. Generous before it is found. The now undeceived husband Mr. Generous carries his wife's severed hand around with him; he discusses the wedding band discovered on the ring finger, and he confronts the ailing woman with the ghastly evidence of her guilt. And finally, a grisly ruse is sometimes used to feign death, as in The Golden Age where Sibilla and Vesta, to save the infant Jupiter, send Saturn the bleeding heart of a kid as evidence of his son's death, and in Challenge for Beauty, the dissembling Petrocella tricks Valladura into believing she has slain Mont-Ferrers by showing him a bloody knife dipped in the blood of a turtle to simulate his friend's blood.[26]

Along with macabre incidents and objects in Heywood, we also find imagery of sickness, disease, and putrefaction, such as the diseased state imagery in The Rape of Lucrece

[26] Nichols also lists some macabre objects and incidents in his structural analysis of Heywood's plays (pp. 248-49).

where "The state is full of dropsie, and swollen big / With windie vapors . . ." and "infected blood" (ll. 221-23), for ". . . the common-/ wealth is sicke of an Ague . . ." (ll. 155-56),[27] and find imagery of diseased people, as in The Captives where Mildew, the ". . . father of fornication and merchant of nothinge but miseryes and myscheife . . ." is described as a "dun[g]cart of diseases" and a "gally-foyst of galls and garbadge!" (I. i. 157-60). Heywood's plays are not rich in imagery; consequently, it is significant that when he does use it, he has a predilection for dark, gloomy, somber images. As Michel Grivelet notes:

> Non seulement, nous fait-on remarquer, les images chez lui sont rares et sans grande vigueur originale, mais encore elles ont tendance à se cantonner dans un registre sombre, sévère, presque repoussant parfois. Sans doute on rencontre dans ses ouvrages les références traditionnelles au soleil, au matin, à l'alouette; à la rosée, aux roses et à quelques autres aspects aimables de la nature. Mais le plus souvent c'est comme s'il en ignorait les sourires et la paix, ciels, bois, cours d'eau, pour n'en connaître que les noirceurs et les brutalités: bourrasques, et tempêtes, vents déchaînés et mers turbulentes, rigueurs de l'hiver, éclairs et tonnerre, neige et glace. L'airain, le silex et le fer, le hibou, l'aigle, le lion et le serpent, le serpent surtout, sont aussi des termes de comparaison dont il use volontiers.
>
> La prédominance de ces images sombres est incontestable.[28]

[27] See also Crofts, pp. 79-80, and Louis Charles Stagg, An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Heywood's Tragedies (Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the Univ. of Virginia, 1967), p. 50.

[28] Michel Grivelet, Thomas Heywood et le Drame Domestique Élizabéthain (Paris: Didier, 1957), p. 243. See also Stagg, p. 54.

And, according to Otelia Cromwell, "It is in his delineations of human character that he has recourse to those unpleasant if not distinctively repellent sides of nature. Especially prominent is the serpent."[29] It seems incongruous that a playwright noted for his merry spirit, good humor, sweet temper, gentle disposition, cheerfulness, and sunny geniality should reveal a decided preference for such dark somber imagery or should stress the more "repellent" rather than the more genial sides of nature, especially "in his delineations of human character."

Two images of frequent occurrence in Heywood are fire and water used generally in their destructive rather than their beneficent aspects. In _How a Man May Chuse_, for example, Anselme describes his illicit passion for Mrs. Arthur in terms of drowning and burning, as he feels himself plunging into river waters past his depth and falling headlong into a great flame (ll.344-48). In listing "Heywood's favorite and most oft repeated comparisons," Crofts notes that "'Fire' connotes destruction in most cases, and may be found contrasted with ashes."[30] It is also often associated with lust, as when Mullisheg is "wrapp'd" in the fiery flames of lust for the beautiful Bess Bridges (Pt. II _The Fair Maid_ I. i. 211-12); Geraldine's

[29] Cromwell, p. 145. See also p. 146.

[30] Crofts, pp. 83-84.

own "fiery loue" for Mrs. Wincott leads to his discovery of her affair with Dalavill (The English Traveller IV. 69); and Sextus is ". . . lust-burnt all, bent on what's bad" (The Rape of Lucrece l. 1962), when his ". . . thoughts are all on fire" (l. 1989). Moreover, Lucrece's attempts to implore him to curse his "hot lust" (l. 2048) and to let her chaste tears ". . . quench [his] fierie lust" (l. 2051) only succeed in fanning the flames. As Sextus retorts: "No, those moist teares contending with my fire, / Quench not my heat, but make it clime much higher" (ll. 2052-53).

Water, especially the sea, is a favorite image of Heywood, but it is usually represented as life-destroying or sterile rather than life-saving or fertile. The sea is the scene of shipwrecks and the separation of people in such plays as Four Prentices, Part II of The Fair Maid, and The Captives. Furthermore, between the "two Currents" of "Vertue and Vice," one's honor can easily be shipwrecked (The English Traveller IV. 46. Cf. The Wise Woman V. 287). It is fitting, therefore, that Mildew's house of prostitution is described in imagery of rotten and leaky ships (The Captives I. i. 71-76). The sea is also the setting for bloody sea fights with pirates and sea battles between warring countries. Sea and water also figure as significant imagery in Heywood's domestic tragedies. In The English Traveller, for example, Norman Rabkin notes the importance of sea imagery where "Heywood seems to be presenting the

world as a sea in which what appears to be a safe harbor may not necessarily be so."[31] Heywood further reveals a fondness for water and sea imagery,[32] sometimes combined with figures of blood or tears as in A Woman Killed where a contrite Sir Charles Mountford feels that his soul is drowning in "a sea of blood" after he kills two men in a rage (iii. 43-44), while Wendoll, fighting against his passion for Anne Frankford, feels that his soul "Lies drench'd and drowned in red tears of blood" (vi. 7), and in Edward IV Part I, where the "zeal" of Edward's mother (her disapproval of his marriage to John Gray's widow, Elizabeth) is like a swollen, flooding river (I. 5). Water thus symbolizes the destruction and violence of stormy seas, seas of blood, and flooding rivers, not the beneficence and peace of calm seas, peaceful rivers and babbling brooks as one would expect from a gentle, merry, good-humored writer.

Moreover, it is actually a misnomer to call this writer a "middle-class spokesman" because Heywood is more often critical, if not satirical, in his treatment of merchants and shopkeepers, schoolmasters or pedants, lawyers, goldsmiths, and other middle-class representatives of London

[31] Norman Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception in Heywood's The English Traveller," Studies in English Literature, 1 (1961), 15.

[32] See Crofts, pp. 79-80, and Stagg, p. 54.

life as well as of the bourgeois members of English country life in his plays. In his vision of man in society, for example, Heywood is more like his fellow dramatists, the satirists, Jonson and Middleton, than the critics are willing to concede. Heywood uses satire and irony in portraying social injustice and the materialistic, selfish, rapacious nature of the characters who inhabit the world--a world debauched by lust, avarice, and selfish self-interest. But most critics will allow Heywood little if any talent for satire. Cromwell believes he is almost entirely free from satire; Grivelet argues that in opposition to Jonson, Heywood "n'est pas équipé pour la satire," and Philipp Aronstein feels that "Heywood ist nicht ein sozialer satiriker wie Jonson."[33] On the other hand, Nichols argues that Heywood's depiction of London's middle-class citizenry is far from enthusiastic in Four Prentices of London, in Part II of If You Know Not Me, and in Lancashire Witches. Heywood is not flattering the bourgeoisie in these plays, he is satirizing them.[34] In Part II of If You Know Not Me, Heywood satirizes the legal profession, depicts apprentices in anything but "glowing terms," and presents merchants in a thoroughly unflattering light. Discussing Hobson, the shopkeeper, Nichols concludes that a merchant

[33] Cromwell, p. 109; Grivelet, Heywood, p. 255; and Philipp Aronstein, "Thomas Heywood," Anglia, 37 (1913), 243. See also Crofts, pp. 595-56.

[34] Nichols, pp. 62-77.

has seldom "been pictured to be so gullible, ineffective, and ridiculous" and Sir Thomas Gresham, the hero, "is not much better." As Nichols notes, it is difficult to accept the premise "that this is a drama extolling the virtues of English tradesmen when those tradesmen are consistently made to appear ridiculous, inept, excessively proud, and seldom accurate judges of customers or employees." Actually, both men ". . . often remain no more than mere butts of satire."[35]

Heywood has not received his due as a writer of satire, although there has been some recognition of his talent in The Wise Woman, as we shall see in Chapter III. In this satiric-realistic comedy written in the spirit of both Middleton and Jonson, the life portrayed is that of the London middle class with its lively assortment of gallants, rioters, knaves, gulls, fools, and charlatans. The Plautine subplot of The English Traveller, another satiric-realistic comedy, also belongs in tone and temper to the Jacobean age. Heywood, moreover, is not deficient in the satiric spirit in other plays as well, for he employs satire in Edward IV, How a Man May Chuse, Fortune by Land and Sea, The Royall King, The Captives, Love's Mistress, A Mayden-Head Well Lost, A Challenge for Beauty, and the Four Ages (a cycle of five plays) in addition to the works previously cited

[35] Nichols, pp. 64-66, 69. See also 67-71.

by Nichols, The Four Prentices of London, If You Know Not Me, Part II, and Lancashire Witches.[36]

Since satire is an important tool of the social critic, a listing of examples would be in order at this time, with fuller discussions and other examples to follow later. The hypocrisy of Puritans has already been touched upon; similarly, the ignorance of the schoolmasters Sir Aminidab and Sir Boniface is humorously exposed in Heywood's satire on pedantry in How a Man May Chuse and The Wise Woman. With tongue-in-cheek, Heywood occasionally writes satirically of women's inconstancy, especially in such plays as How a Man May Chuse and the Four Ages, and he pokes fun at the laughable cuckolds, like Vulcan, in The Brazen Age and Love's Mistress. Heywood satirizes the gullibility of ignorant and superstitious people who think themselves wise in The Wise Woman, and he exposes the vanity of Londoners, especially the courtiers, in his satire on foppishness and extravagance in fashions, in such plays as The Royall King, Edward IV, and Challenge for Beauty. He even lightly satirizes an actual person, his fellow dramatist, Ben Jonson, in Love's Mistress.

On a more serious note, the playwright satirizes the court and exposes the self-conceit and hypocrisy of

[36] A few of Heywood's critics have briefly commented on Heywood's satire. See Cromwell, p. 160; Velte, p. 83; Holaday, "Heywood and the Puritans," p. 197; Clark, Heywood, pp. 133-34; and Nichols, pp. 62-77.

sycophants and fawning courtiers in such plays as The Royall King, A Challenge for Beauty, and Edward IV, while he satirizes politics and the machinations of dishonorable politicians in the latter play and in A Mayden-head. He satirically and realistically depicts the corruption in the law courts and in its law officials and/or the ineptitude and dishonesty of lawyers and judges in such plays as How a Man May Chuse, If You Know Not Me, Part II, and The Captives. He is also critical of the courts and law officials in Fortune by Land and Sea, and in the subplot of A Woman Killed. And finally, Heywood deals with the greed and depravity of procurers, bawds, and prostitutes as in How a Man May Chuse, the subplot of The English Traveller, and especially in The Royall King and The Captives. Furthermore, as in Jonson's realistic comedies, the satire in Heywood is corrective; its purpose is to instruct and to improve.

Heywood is likewise proficient in using irony. This fact, too, has not been sufficiently recognized or acknowledged by Heywood's critics.[37] There is not a single play

[37] The few critics who have noticed any irony in Heywood's plays have mentioned it only parenthetically. Only one critic, Nichols, has pursued the subject at all. Using Northrop Frye's classification in Anatomy of Criticism, Nichols discusses Heywood's use of irony and satire in three plays, The Four Prentices, If You Know Not Me, Part II, and Lancashire Witches. Nichols, however, thinks that Heywood has only a "slight ironic inclination" for he is normally non-ironic. See Nichols, pp. 62-63, 77, 85, 249, 340.

credited to Heywood that is entirely devoid of irony, especially verbal or dramatic, although he employs it more sparingly in some plays and more extensively in others. His tragedies _Edward IV_, _A Woman Killed_, _The English Traveller_, and _The Rape of Lucrece_, for instance, are permeated from beginning to end with a subtle and powerful irony, as the discussion (of all except _The Rape of Lucrece_) in the following chapter will disclose. As a rule, Heywood relies heavily on irony in portraying character, constructing plot, developing theme, and writing dialogue, particularly in his better plays where one can discern the ironic light that often colors Heywood's characters, their speech, and their actions. This is especially true of his middle-class _dramatis personae_. The present discussion, it is hoped, will make it apparent that Heywood is not flattering the bourgeoisie in his characterization. As a social critic, he is holding up the mirror for the middle class to see themselves as they really are, not as they might wish themselves to be.

The more one studies Heywood, the more one is likely to realize that he is not the optimistic observer of human nature he is traditionally assumed to be. Heywood's dramatic works do not support the idea that he was a man with an abiding faith in man's better nature. This is not to say, of course, that although Heywood seems to have had little faith in man's better nature or little confidence in

human nature in general, he is not always unsympathetic. Heywood himself often appears to have pity and sympathy for the unhappy lot of humanity, and he is especially sympathetic with his tragic heroines Lucrece, Jane Shore, and Anne Frankford; but few of his characters themselves display any pity, sympathy, kindness, or Christian charity for their fellow man, as our discussion in the following chapters will clearly reveal. This is an important distinction to bear in mind, and here it is necessary to separate the playwright from his _dramatis personae_. It is, of course, through his delineation of the characters, their actions and speech that we must determine Heywood's overall dramatic vision of the world and of human nature--a vision which emerges from the pages of his plays as dark, pessimistic, and sometimes cynical or disillusioned. For Heywood portrays the world as a cruel, revengeful, almost pitiless place of corruption, suffering, and death, a world peopled by a flawed and often degenerate humanity.

Patricia Spacks, in a discerning analysis of _A Woman Killed_, concludes that "Outside the context of Elizabethan convention, the import of the play is likely to suggest anything but a basic faith in man's better nature." Indeed, as she notes, "There are areas of darkness here too somber to be destroyed by the apparent sentimentality of the conclusions to both plots." Grivelet similarly feels that "the view" which Heywood "takes of human nature in _The_

English Traveller does not appear to be unreservedly encouraging."[38] We will find, in the following chapter, that in Edward IV, Heywood takes extraordinary pains to portray his first erring wife, Jane Shore, sympathetically. But in The English Traveller, written over a quarter of a century later, Heywood presents his last adulteress, Mrs. Wincott, in a most unflattering light and does little if anything to evoke any sympathy for her. The obvious contrast in the characterization of the two unfaithful wives denotes a hardening of sensibilities in the author in the intervening years. Likewise, in a chronological analysis of his other plays in Chapters III and IV, we shall find a similar pattern. Heywood became increasingly more disillusioned and pessimistic about the world and about human nature as time passed in the interim between his earlier and later plays, in the period when the optimistic age of Elizabeth becomes only a memory.

It is surprising then that critics have generally delineated Heywood as the last of the optimistic Elizabethans and as a playwright who stands apart from the other Jacobean playwrights. Irving Ribner, for one, contends that "Heywood is one who doggedly continued to assert the moral values of an earlier age in a new world in which they no longer had great meaning." He goes on to say that Heywood's tragedies ". . . are concerned with evil as a

[38] Spacks, p. 322, and Grivelet, "Simplicity," p. 65.

violation of . . . order, and they end with the restoration of order by the working out of evil itself in accord with a divine providence." In Heywood evil "appears as a temporary disruption of the natural goodness of the world," says Ribner, but the typical motif illustrated in Heywood's tragedies is that of ". . . love and Christian charity destroying evil and restoring harmony on earth."[39] This is the general view of Heywood's tragedies, but it is not supported by the domestic tragedies. Ribner's thesis works relatively well for _The Rape of Lucrece_, but not for _Edward IV_, _A Woman Killed_, and _The English Traveller_.

Although order and harmony are restored and some good does triumph over the evil unleashed by the Tarquins in _The Rape of Lucrece_, they come through personal revenge and a bloody internecine war, not through "love and Christian charity" as Ribner suggests; indeed, there is precious little of either in the corrupt, degenerate Roman world of the Tarquins and their foes. It is a world in which pride and revenge are the motive forces controlling the actions of even the more honorable Romans. Then too, if "love and Christian charity" are destroying evil and restoring "harmony on earth," if good is overcoming evil at the conclusion to this play, Heywood's "optimistic" point would be more obvious if Brutus, the principal agent for

[39] Ribner, pp. 50-51, 55.

good throughout the play, did not succumb along with Sextus, the chief antagonist and agent for evil in the play. Brutus' death weakens Ribner's argument considerably as even Ribner himself admits:

> There are extraneous elements in The Rape of Lucrece [says Ribner]. The mutual destruction of Sextus and Brutus, for instance, while it serves the needs of stage spectacle and adds a moment of dramatic tension at the end, does not further the theme, for it would have been more suitable in this respect had the play ended with Brutus still alive.[40]

Lucrece is revenged, but she is dead, a suicide; and Collatine, her uxorious husband, who ironically helped to bring about the dishonorable and tragic calamity which befell her because of his prideful boasts and his wager, now assumes the consulship of Rome. One can only wonder about the future of the ship of state entrusted to such weak hands. And in the other tragedies, Edward IV, A Woman Killed, and The English Traveller, if order and "harmony on earth" have been restored in the end, it is only in the sense that the adulterous wife is dead, while in all cases except that of Matthew Shore, the others, heroes and villains alike, continue to flourish.

Like his fellow Jacobeans, Heywood presents the inextricable tangle of good and evil in a corrupt world where "harmony on earth" is seldom restored by "love and

[40] Ribner, p. 70.

Christian charity" except in rare instances. But Ribner suggests that while other Jacobean tragedians are wrestling with the great questions concerning the meaning of evil and suffering in this world, Heywood posits Frankford as his answer: "As Heywood's answer to the fact of evil in the world," says Ribner, "we have Master Frankford, a model of the Christian gentleman held up for the audience as an example of how one must act if evil is to be thwarted."[41] It is the contention of this study, however, that Ribner is wrong on both counts, for (1) like other Jacobean writers of tragedy, Chapman, Tourneur, Middleton, Webster, and Ford, Heywood is also wrestling with the question of good and evil in the world; he is trying to come to terms with ethical and moral values or ideals in a degenerate world of corruption, suffering, and death; but (2) like the other dramatists, Heywood found no answer, least of all in the actions of Frankford, as Ribner proposes. If Frankford is Heywood's "answer to the fact of evil in the world," if his actions are to serve as "an example of how one must act if evil is to be thwarted," then this is the greatest irony of all in a play filled with irony. So much praise of Heywood as the kind, genial, lovable, and optimistic observer of human nature is, in fact, based on this one play, and especially on the traditional conception of Frankford as the kind, forgiving husband of an unfaithful wife. But,

[41] Ribner, p. 52.

as we shall see in Chapter II, Frankford is not the kind, magnanimous, Christian gentleman he appears to be.

Ribner concedes, however, that although

> Heywood never ceases to proclaim his traditional Christian morality, to preach the power of love and honour to work a reformation in the world, . . . he is more keenly aware of the evils of his age--perhaps of the contradictions inherent in its very code of morality and honour--than most critics have been willing to allow. In this he shows that in his own peculiar way he is very much a part of his Jacobean milieu.[42]

Although Ribner does not develop the implications of this perceptive observation, what he states here is significant for any re-examination of the dramatic works of Heywood, especially an examination which takes not only his tragedies into account, as in Ribner's chapter on Heywood, but also his comedies and tragicomedies as well.[43] It needs to be stressed here, moreover, that Ribner's concession does not go far enough, for Heywood is indeed "more keenly aware of the evils of his age," more aware than Ribner himself is willing to allow. In reality, Heywood is "very much a part of his Jacobean milieu," but not "in his own peculiar way." There is little peculiar or singular about

[42] Ribner, p. 58. See also p. 50.

[43] Although _The Rape of Lucrece_ may be analyzed as a Roman tragedy, like Jonson's _Sejanus_ and _Catiline_, as Ribner has done in his discussion of Heywood, other critics classify the play as a chronicle-history. See Clark, _Heywood_, p. 221; Holaday, "Introduction," p. 37; Nichols, p. 9; and Willard Thorp, _The Triumph of Realism in Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1612_ (1928; rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1970), p. 101.

Heywood's affinity with his fellow Jacobean dramatists. Heywood's world is seldom far removed from that of the other playwrights of the period; it is a world where evil, not good, generally dominates, where even in the rare situation when evil meets retribution in the end, as in The Rape of Lucrece, it is nevertheless present as a sinister, brooding, and pervasive force throughout the action. In Heywood's plays vice is seldom punished and virtue is not always rewarded. The primary reason may be that there is actually little real virtue in most of Heywood's characters, only its outward show or appearance, rather than its substance or reality.

Heywood's social criticism, as well as his characterizations, is closely interwoven with the theme of appearance versus reality. In his dramatic works this theme is the most frequently re-worked conception; it is, in fact, the thread that binds his plays together.[44] As a social critic, Heywood stresses the contrast between appearance and reality in order to condemn the false appearances or to reveal the consequences (usually unhappy if not tragic) of the failure to perceive people and their actions in a true light. As a consequence, one crucial problem in Heywood criticism is to

[44] A few critics have noted the theme of appearance and reality in some of Heywood's plays, such as The Royall King, A Woman Killed, and The English Traveller. See Spacks, p. 326; Ribner, pp. 55-56; Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception," p. 3; and Norman Rabkin, "The Double Plot: Notes on the History of a Convention," Renaissance Drama, 7 (1964), 59.

distinguish between what a man seems to be and what he is, because one often bears little or no real relation to the other. For instance, Captain Bonvile, in The Royall King, is concerned with the ironic discrepancy between appearance and reality when he says: "'Tis geenrall thorow the world, each state esteemes / A man not what he is, but what he seemes" (III, 259-60); and Geraldine confesses to Prudentilla, in The English Traveller:

> I should be loath
> Professe in outward shew to be one Man.
> And prooue my selfe another. (IV. 12)

but, ironically, as we shall see, so many of Heywood's hypocritical or self-deceived characters "Professe in outward shew to be one Man," and yet "prooue" themselves "another." And in the world of these characters, as Captain Bonvile has discovered, there is an inordinate concern with honor or with the world's esteem and with outward appearance--with name, position, land, money, or wealth, and especially with the appearance if not the reality of chastity, honor, or friendship, and of kindness, pity, and Christian charity for both heroes and heroines alike. It is a world which demands the appearance, not the reality, of these virtues. This further implies a vision made even darker by the realization that weakness, folly, and vice are an inherent part of human nature. As a result, Heywood's vision undergoes a persistent disillusioning and darkening which is clearly apparent in his

portrayal of mankind in the period between his first and last plays.

There is a natural division of Heywood's dramatic career into three periods: early, c. 1595-1615; middle, c. 1622-1630; and late, c. 1631-1636.[45] In his long career as a dramatist, Heywood's work becomes less Elizabethan and increasingly Jacobean. The Shakespearean influence in some of his earlier dramas, such as _The Rape of Lucrece_ is superseded by the influence of Jonson and Middleton apparent as early as _The Wise Woman_ (1604) and as late as the comic-satiric subplot of _The English Traveller_ (1624-27), and finally beginning around 1620 with the influence of Fletcher in such later plays as Part II of _The Fair Maid of the West_, _The Captives_, _A Challenge for Beauty_, and _A Mayden-Head Well Lost_. In the period between 1613-15 and 1622-24, a period in which we have no extant play, Heywood became, for some undetermined reason, even more pessimistic, cynical, and disillusioned. When he resumed writing for the stage after 1620 his dramas show a decided darkening in his vision; the characters are more flawed or corrupt, as a rule, and the world is more degenerate. He reached the height of pessimism and darkened vision in the years between 1626 and 1636 at the end of his long dramatic career.

It should be remembered that Heywood's career as the most prolific writer of the combined Elizabethan-Jacobean-Caroline period, covers almost half a century, from the

[45] See Crofts, pp. 18-35.

closing years of Elizabeth's reign through all of James's reign and most of Charles's. When Heywood published The English Traveller in 1633, he had had, by his own account, "either an entire hand, or at least a main finger" in two hundred and twenty plays ("To the Reader" IV.5). When he died in August 1641, he had added a few more to the list. Of these, twenty-four plays, either signed or ascribed, are generally included in Heywood's canon.[46] Since a full analysis of twenty-four plays does not seem feasible, the number of plays discussed has been limited to a representative selection of eleven works with brief attention to two others and only occasional references to the rest. The selected plays include

[46] The twenty-four plays, including approximate dates of composition followed by dates of publication, are as follows: (1) The Four Prentices of London (1595; 1615); (2-3) Parts I and II of Edward IV (1596-99; 1599); (4) How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad (1602; 1602); (5) The Royall King and the Loyall Subject (1600-03; 1637); (6) A Woman Killed with Kindness (1603; 1607); (7) Part I of The Fair Maid of the West (1600-04 or 1609-10; 1631); (8) Part I of If You Know Not Me, You Know No Body, or The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth (1603-04; 1605); (9) The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (1604; 1638); (10) Part II of If You Know Not Me, You Know No Body (1605; 1606); (11) The Rape of Lucrece (1606-07; 1608); (12) Fortune by Land and Sea (1607-09; 1655); (13) The Golden Age (1610; 1611); (14) The Silver Age (1611; 1613); (15) The Brazen Age (1611; 1613); (16-17) Parts I and II of The Iron Age (1612-13; 1632); (18) The Captives; or, The Lost Recovered (1624; 1885); (19) The English Traveller (1624-27; 1633); (20) Part II of The Fair Maid of the West (1630; 1631); (21) A Mayden-Head Well Lost (1632-33; 1634); (22) Love's Mistress (1634; 1636); (23) The Late Lancashire Witches (1634; 1634); and (24) A Challenge for Beauty (1630-36; 1636). There is little real controversy over the dates of Heywood's plays. Although the exact date cannot always be precisely defined, the order of composition is generally agreed upon.

tragedy, tragicomedy, and comedy and cover Heywood's three periods. The other dramas, mainly chronicle-histories or classical plays, will be considered briefly in the concluding chapter. In this study the representative selection of plays is divided into three groups[47] with each group related in terms of type, characterization, and/or plot, and with each group chronologically covering a period of twenty or more years between the composition of the early and later plays. By tracing the same theme, that of appearance and reality, through each of the three groups of plays and by noting the chronological changes (as far as the dates can be determined)

[47] There is no consensus on the classification of Heywood's plays, since there is no clear-cut division. In fact, there is considerable overlapping between some groups, as, for instance, the two parts of _Edward IV_, as a whole, are generally classified as chronicle-histories because of their episodic structure and subject matter drawn from the English chronicles. But the triangular love story of Edward IV, Jane Shore, and Matthew Shore, which provides the major focus and interest in the two plays, is generally classified as domestic tragedy. On the classification of Heywood's plays, see Nichols, pp. 2-11; Tucker Brooke, "Jacobean Drama: I. Dramatists of the Old School," in _A Literary History of England_, ed. Albert C. Baugh et al., 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), pp. 544-47; Thomas Marc Parrott and Robert Hamilton Ball, _A Short View of Elizabethan Drama_ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 117; and Velte, pp. 65-66. The classification adopted by this study is a combination of several of these, although it follows most closely the divisions proposed by Velte and those suggested by Parrott and Ball. In this study their grouping of plays of contemporary life has been further divided into two groups by type (1) realistic domestic tragedies, and (2) realistic-satiric comedies and tragicomedies of English life and manners. Also the two parts of Edward IV have been classified as domestic tragedy rather than as chronicle-histories.

in theme, characterization, action (or plot), and tone, one may observe the darkening of Heywood's vision over the years and may perceive the social critic's increasing awareness of folly and vice in the world and in human nature. In other words, in the next three chapters, an examination of both theme and chronology with each group of plays will provide a focal point for a further more inclusive analysis of the nature of the men and women who inhabit Heywood's world; this, in turn, will reveal the nature of Heywood's social criticism of the life and manners in Jacobean England. Such a study will also help to establish more clearly Heywood's increasing affinity with his fellow Jacobeans as his long dramatic career progressed.

Heywood's most important plays, the domestic tragedies _Edward IV_ Parts I and II (1596-99), _A Woman Killed with Kindness_ (1603), and _The English Traveller_ (1624-27) will be examined in Chapter II. These form a unique or a natural group in Heywood's canon in their similarity in plot and in the characterization of the adulterous wife. In each of these plays, Heywood is dealing with a similar problem, that of the fallen woman as the heroine; and, after some variation in plot, each is resolved by her untimely but convenient death. Furthermore, since _A Woman Killed_ and _The English Traveller_ are generally regarded as Heywood's two greatest works, any serious study of the playwright would naturally include them for analysis.

A second group, the realistic-satiric comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life and manners, will be analyzed in Chapter III. This will include How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad (1602), The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (1604), and The Late Lancashire Witches (1634). In period of composition, these plays cover a span of thirty-two years. The Wise Woman is one of Heywood's best plays, his masterpiece in the realistic-satiric comedy in the mode and manner of Jonson and Middleton. How a Man May Chuse and The Wise Woman are related to the prodigal son-patient Griselda dramas, and The Wise Woman and Lancashire Witches are related by the motif of witchcraft, white and black. Furthermore, How a Man May Chuse and Lancashire Witches provide a good basis of contrast in the characterization of wives as saints or devils (witches).

Heywood's romantic comedies and tragicomedies of adventure and intrigue will be discussed in Chapter IV. Beginning with brief comments on The Four Prentices of London (1595) and A Challenge for Beauty (1630-36), this study will proceed to make a detailed examination of The Royall King and the Loyall Subject (1600-03), The Fair Maid of the West, Part I (1600-04 or 1609-10) and Part II (1630), and A Mayden-Head Well Lost (1632-33). Heywood's interest in politics is particularly evident in these plays which are ostensibly set in earlier times or in exotic lands in which the criticism of the court and the courtier is unmistakable. In this group,

Heywood blends romantic adventure and intrigue with a more realistic depiction of contemporary life and manners, although there is progressively less realism and more romance in the composition of the plays between the earlier and later ones. They are further related through the use of similar devices and conventions such as testing plots and contests of courtesy and honor as well as by the employment of plotting intrigues, deceptions, and mistaken identities. The Fair Maid, Part I is the foremost example of Heywood's early plays of adventure, while The Fair Maid, Part II, and A Mayden-Head are later plays of intrigue written under the influence of the Fletcherian romance. The two parts of The Fair Maid form one continuous action although written in different periods. Also relevant to our purpose is the marked contrast in tone and tenor between the original play and its sequel, and the contrasting characterization of chaste and unchaste heroines between these two plays and the earlier The Royall King and the later A Mayden-Head. A perusal of this significant group of romantic plays will reveal conclusively the progressive pessimism, cynicism, and disillusionment of Heywood as time passed. This change is apparent in the darkened vision of the old playwright as he returned to his romantic story of Bess Bridges and Spencer in writing the sequel to The Fair Maid after a lapse of over twenty years, and it is obvious in the even more jaundiced and cynical vision of A Mayden-Head, one of the last plays written a few years later.

The three central chapters, II, III, IV, will contain a brief introduction and a plot summary for each of the eleven plays under consideration. The analysis of each play will include a discussion of Heywood's social criticism and satire to be followed by a general comment on the theme of appearance and reality and a more specific study of setting and characterization as it relates to both the social criticism and the theme of appearance and reality. Each discussion will conclude with a summary analysis of Heywood's vision of the nature of man and of evil as delineated in the play.

Heywood's remaining dramas (the eight chronicle-histories based either on English history or on classical history and myth, and two other plays inspired by the classics, a royal masque and a Plautine drama) will be briefly touched upon at the beginning of Chapter V,[48] to be followed with a summation and the conclusion to this study. Finally, by the end of this final chapter, it is hoped the reader will be convinced that one should take a fresh look at Heywood as a Jacobean social critic with a dark vision of the nature of man and of evil, and a second look, too, at Heywood as a playwright who is more akin to his fellow Jacobean dramatists

[48] This fourth group of plays includes the chronicle-histories, based on English history, _If You Know Not Me_, Part I (1603-04) and Part II (1605); and those based on classical history and myth, _The Rape of Lucrece_ (1606-07), and the cycle of the _Four Ages_: _The Golden Age_ (1610), _The Silver Age_ (1611), _The Brazen Age_ (1611), and _The Iron Age_, Parts I and II (1612-13). Two other plays inspired by the classics are _The Captives_ (1624) based on the _Rudens_ of Plautus; and the story of Cupid and Psyche related in the royal masque _Love's Mistress_ (1634).

and whose plays have deeper roots in their world than is generally assumed or conceded. It is now time to place Heywood and his work in the mainstream of Jacobean drama rather than in the ebb tide of the Elizabethan.

CHAPTER II

REALISTIC DOMESTIC TRAGEDIES

> *Y. Ger.* I should be loath
> Professe in outward shew to be one Man.
> And prooue my selfe another.
> (*The English Traveller* IV. 12)

Realism is the characteristic hallmark of domestic tragedy, a type of drama popularized by Heywood in *Edward IV* Part I and II, and especially in *A Woman Killed with Kindness* and *The English Traveller*.[1] The realistic action in these plays centers upon the family because the plots are inevitably concerned with "the everyday problems of the 'common' hero," says H. H. Adams, who defines domestic tragedy as

> a tragedy of the common people, ordinarily set in the domestic scene, dealing with personal and family relationships rather than with large affairs of state, presented in a realistic fashion, and ending in a tragic or otherwise serious manner.[2]

[1] See John Addington Symonds, *Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama* (New York: Cooper Square, 1967), p. 337: "These plays are studies from contemporary life, unidealised, unvarnished with poetry or fancy. . . ."

[2] Henry Hitch Adams, *English Domestic Or, Homiletic Tragedy 1575 to 1642* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1943), pp. 1-2. See also Keith Sturgess, Introd., *Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1969), p. 14; Madeleine Doran, *Endeavors of Art* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1954), pp. 142-47; and Symonds, *Shakespeare's Predecessors*, pp. 327-86.

This realistic domestic tragedy is a new kind of drama which appeared in the last decade of the sixteenth century and includes such plays as _Arden of Feversham_, _A Yorkshire Tragedy_, _A Warning for Fair Women_, _The Miseries of Enforced Marriage_, _Two Lamentable Tragedies_, _The Witch of Edmonton_, _The Vow Breaker_, and Heywood's contributions to the genre listed above.[3] For us, of course, domestic tragedy, with its emphasis on the common man and on the relations between the sexes, has become the greatest achievement of modern drama under the guidance of such playwrights as Ibsen, O'Neil, Miller, and Tennessee Williams.[4] In Heywood's day, however, the writers of domestic tragedy seemed to be aware that they were inaugurating something entirely new and unconventional.[5] But, according to Powell, only Thomas Heywood, of the Elizabethan dramatists, "gives evidence of a realization of the great possibilities of the domestic drama, although others, Shakespeare especially, at moments rise to heights of unfulfilled promise in this field."[6] Although Heywood was not "the father of the English domestic drama," as his biographer Clark points out, he did make "the style his own

[3] See Adams, _English Domestic_, for a listing of domestic tragedies (pp. 216-20).

[4] Cf. Adams, p. 2.

[5] See Sturgess, p. 16.

[6] Chilton Latham Powell, _English Domestic Relations 1487-1653_ (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1917), p. 203

and in it achieved his greatest success,"[7] A Woman Killed, which is not only the most famous example of domestic tragedy but is also the earliest extant play of the form to deal almost exclusively with marital relationships without the usual sensationalism of homicide. And in commenting upon "the remarkable realism, the remarkable Englishness of Heywood's art," in this well-known domestic tragedy, A. S. Downer observes that no other play of the period "yields so detailed a picture of provincial life in Elizabethan times," while H. H. Adams further remarks that it "gives as realistic an impression of early seventeenth-century England as do the comedies of Jonson."[8] In the plays of a social critic of contemporary society, one is not surprised to see such fidelity--such realism--in depicting the life and times; and in this play as well as in Heywood's other domestic tragedies, one can perceive that the playwright is the critic, and not the spokesman, of bourgeois morality. Here Heywood's dark vision of man and of evil is clearly pronounced; moreover, his perspective becomes increasingly more pessimistic as he deals critically and realistically with man and his relationships both social and domestic successively over a period of more than twenty-five years--from Parts I and II of Edward IV (1596-99) through A Woman Killed with Kindness

[7] Clark, Heywood, p. 227.

[8] Alan S. Downer, The British Drama (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950), pp. 131-32; and Adams, English Domestic, p. 158.

(1603) to The English Traveller (1624-27). His pessimism is indelibly imprinted on characterization, action, and theme.

At the center of Heywood's domestic tragedies is the heroine--the sinful and suffering woman, the adulterous wife. Through the development of these three women--Jane Shore, Anne Frankford, and Mrs. Wincott--Heywood presents his major social criticism that "This is no world in which to pity" mankind. In these domestic tragedies, the playwright is preoccupied with suffering and death, not with life, and in this, he is akin to his fellow Jacobeans, not the Elizabethans.[9] Moreover, in Edward IV, A Woman Killed, and The English Traveller, it seems clear that the dramatist is dealing with a problem--the problem of the fallen woman--the dishonored wife--who must inevitably suffer death in consequence of her adultery. For in this period, as Leonora Brodwin relates, an unfaithful wife "is doomed to tragedy by a societal morality which infuses her own spirit as much as her husbands."[10] With an unfaithful husband, however,

[9] Una Ellis-Fermor, writing of the period just prior to the death of Elizabeth and after the accession of James, reports that there "is a preoccupation with death where the Elizabethans had been in love with life" (p. 2).

[10] Leonora Leet Brodwin, Elizabethan Love Tragedy 1587-1625 (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1971), p. 103.

the case is otherwise, says Grivelet, for "les infidélités du mari ne sont que peccadilles."[11]

In the actual practices of Heywood's time adultery was "not an offence under the civil law, but subject only to ecclesiastical prosecution"; and "the usual punishment for adultery," as Van Fossen relates, ". . . was public penance in one form or another, whether in the church, in the pillory, or with the sinner wrapped in a sheet exposed to the jeers of passers-by,"[12] as in the public ignominy of Jane Shore's penance in Part II of Edward IV (I. 161). In the drama of Heywood's time, however, the fate of most of the adulteresses was death, not public penance. Like his fellow Jacobean dramatists, Heywood ends each of his domestic tragedies with the death of the erring wife,[13] beginning with the first, Jane Shore, in Edward IV.

Edward IV, Parts I and II

In his earliest portrayal of an adulterous wife, the two-part play Edward IV (1596-99; 1599),[14] Heywood combines

[11] Grivelet, Heywood, p. 202.

[12] R. W. Van Fossen, Introd., A Woman Killed with Kindness, by Thomas Heywood (London: Methuen, 1961), p. 202.

[13] Heywood also depicts the deaths of Hellen of Troy and Clitemnestra in Iron Age, Part II. Of the unfaithful wives portrayed by Heywood, Venus does not die, but then she is not mortal and subject to death.

[14] The two parts of Edward IV were probably written between 1594 and 1599 when they were entered on the Stationers' Register (August 28, 1599). The date of

chronicle history, comic realism and satire as well as domestic tragedy. The first part contains three well-defined plots: (1) the chronicle-history of the siege of London by the rebel Falconbridge; (2) the comic ballad narrative of Edward IV and Hobs the Tanner of Tamworth; and (3) the amorous seduction and fall of Jane Shore. The sequel begins with Edward's campaign in France and ends with the accession of Richard III.[15] In the interim, the domestic tragedy of Matthew and Jane Shore dominates both the action and the interest of the playwright and his audience/reader.

In Part I, all three plots are loosely knit together through the character of Edward IV, who, at the beginning

---

composition is generally set at 1596-99. The two plays were published in 1599 and were reprinted in 1600, 1605, 1613, 1619, and 1626. Although published anonymously, there seems to be little doubt among critics or editors as to Heywood's authorship. See, for instance, Clark, _Heywood_, p. 16; Irving Ribner, _The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare_ (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 273-74; and Alfred Harbage, _Annals of English Drama 975-1700_, rev. by Samuel Schoenbaum, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1964), pp. 70-71. All citations from _Edward IV_, Parts I and II in the text are from the Pearson edition by volume and page numbers.

[15] As Ribner notes, Heywood undoubtedly went to Holinshed for his historical sources, "although it is possible that he referred to Hall and Stow as well. . . . For the Jane Shore story he apparently supplemented Holinshed with an old ballad, _The Woeful Lamentation of Jane Shore_. He probably consulted also Thomas Churchyard's account in _A Mirror for Magistrates_, and he allowed his own imagination richly to color the story. For the tale of Hobs, he went to another ballad, _King Edward the Fourth and the Tanner of Tamworth_" (_History Play_, p. 274). For a further discussion of the sources for _Edward IV_, see Velte, pp. 22-24, 28; Johnson, pp. 61-62; and Yucheng Irving Lo, "A Critical Edition of _Edward IV_, _Parts I and II_, Ascribed to Thomas Heywood," Diss. Univ. of Wisconsin 1954, I, xlix-lii.

of the play, has recently wed Lady Elizabeth Woodville the widow of John Gray. As the disapproving queen mother censures her son for his hasty and ill-advised marriage, a messenger arrives with news of the rebellion of Falconbridge in the name of the Lancastrian Henry VI imprisoned in the tower. Falconbridge and the rebels are subsequently routed and the rebellion put down by London's citizenry led by Crosby, the Lord Mayor; Josselin, an alderman; Urswick, the Recorder; and Matthew Shore, a goldsmith. While the others are knighted by Edward in recognition of their gallant defense of the city, Shore humbly declines the honor. His unhistoric part, as a heroic defender of London, serves to link the chronicle-history plot with the Jane Shore story. Edward, for instance, later has occasion to remember the goldsmith when he sees Shore again and meets his beautiful wife Jane for the first time at a banquet given in the king's honor by the Mayor of London. Then shortly afterwards, disguised as a chapman, Edward visits the goldsmith's shop and begins his prolonged seduction of the proprietress Mistress Shore under the very nose of her husband Matthew. The king is assisted in his amorous efforts by Mistress Blague who outlines for her friend Jane all of the advantages that would accrue to her as Edward's mistress. Finally acceding to the king's importunities, Jane leaves her husband and assumes her place in society as ". . . the kings beloued;" and ultimately as "A special friend to suitors at the court" (I. 81).

Meanwhile Shore deeds his property to Jane's brother Frank Emersley and resolves to leave England. As he prepares to embark, he fortuitously meets Jane who is accepting petitions from worthy suitors seeking her aid as intercessor with the king. After Jane recognizes her husband, she proposes to leave the court and go with him; but Shore, spurning a reconciliation, bids his wife farewell and leaves, persisting in his plans for a self-imposed exile.

Interspersed between these two plots in Part I is the comic folk tale of Hobs, the tanner of Tamworth, whom the king chances to meet in the woods while hunting. Passing himself off as Ned, the king's butler, Edward whiles away some pleasant hours bantering with the plain-spoken Hobs. The tanner and his daughter Nell later provide dinner for the disguised king and for Sellinger, disguised as Tom Twist, at Hob's humble cottage; then at the end of the play, Hobs journeys to the court to seek a pardon for his wayward son, which is granted after the tanner learns to his chagrin that Ned is none other than Edward IV himself.

Part II begins with an account of Edward's French campaign, which concentrates primarily on the traitorous perfidy of the Duke of Burgundy and the Constable of France. After the campaign in France of the king and the foreign travels of his subject Matthew Shore, a chorus wafts each back to England again where the latter, an unfortunate ship

passenger, is imprisoned along with Captain Stranguidge and his English crew. The prisoners are accused of piracy for their unwitting capture of a French vessel as a prize of war after the conclusion of a peace treaty. Meanwhile, Mistress Shore, pursuing her charitable works, arrives at Marshalsea prison and promises to seek a pardon for these men from the king on his impending return; she does not recognize her disguised husband who has assumed an alias, Matthew Flood (Flud). Ironically, Jane's last beneficent act as the king's mistress is to secure a reprieve from her lover which saves her husband from the gallows. After Edward's untimely death, Jane leaves the court and seeks refuge with her old friend Mistress Blague at her inn in Lombard Street. There Jane unknowingly saves her husband a second time when he repairs to the inn gravely injured in defending the young princes in the Tower where Shore had secured employment after his release from prison. Jane has scarcely finished binding up Matthew's wounds when she receives word of Richard's proclamation that she must do public penance after which no one is to succor her "On paine of death" (I. 158). Now as Mistress Blague refuses to harbor her, Jane undergoes a shameful public penance, and she is turned out of the city condemned to die by exposure and starvation. When a few men attempt to aid their former benefactress, they are beaten by the beadles (Jane's servant Jockie), arrested but pardoned for helping his wife

(Matthew Shore), and apprehended and hanged (Ayre). Only Sir Robert Brackenbury's charitable assistance escapes the detection of the revengeful spy Rufford, and Brackenbury lives to bury Jane and Matthew Shore at his own expense when they both succumb in a place afterwards known as Shoreditch. The news of the tragic demise of the Shores is subsequently reported to the hypocritical self-serving Richard III shortly after his coronation as King of England in the concluding scene of this two part play based on history and folklore.

As Irving Ribner notes in his study of _The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare_:

> Heywood was seriously interested in history, as we know from his translation of Bodin's _Methodus_ and from his own authorship of several prose histories [and dramatic chronicle-histories]; he was, in fact, among the most diligent popularizers of history in his age. But Heywood had other concerns which in drama often interfered with his execution of the serious purposes of the historian [such as] . . . his interest in sentimental romance which in _Edward IV_ caused him to emphasize the story of Jane Shore out of all proper proportion.[16]

Thus in this first domestic tragedy, Heywood blends historical fact and folklore with poetic license to suit his artistic and critical purpose. Furthermore, it would seem that the serious purposes of the social critic

[16] Ribner, _History Play_, pp. 272-73. See also Louis B. Wright, "Heywood and the Popularizing of History," _Modern Language Notes_, 43 (1928), 287-93.

sometimes conflicted with "the serious purposes of the historian" (noted by Ribner above). For despite the serious nature of his heroine's sin of adultery, and despite the somewhat tarnished reputation of the legendary Jane Shore, Heywood took extraordinary pains to portray her sympathetically: he foreshortens and manipulates time in relating historical events; he omits historical facts and references which would detract from the character of his heroine, such as her affairs with Lord Hastings, the Marquis of Dorset (son of Edward's queen, Elizabeth Woodville), and Thomas Lynom, the solicitor of Richard III; and he also omits her unrepentant death many years later. Heywood further adds scenes of his own invention to other versions of the stories (such as those found in More, Drayton, Holinshed, and Churchyard, and also in other dramatic works), especially the scene where Edward's queen Elizabeth forgives Jane, and the death scene where Matthew forgives his erring wife, and they die together almost simultaneously (Matthew follows Jane in death after one short farewell speech). The latter is Heywood's most obvious change, because Jane Shore actually lived until around 1527, long after the deaths of the other characters in Heywood's play. Jane is also never presented "as a creature of lust or pleasure," says H. H. Adams, and when she finally agrees to accept "the favors" of Edward IV, she does so "as one caught by forces beyond

her control. Fully conscious of her sin, she bows to the will of her sovereign."[17]

Most critics, in fact, agree with Adams that she has little or no real choice in yielding to the king's desires. Willard Thorp suggests that the "one motive" Heywood "perhaps added himself" to the other accounts of Jane's fall was "the compulsion exercised by Edward." This seems apparent in Jane's capitulation to Edward's thinly veiled command: "If you inforce me, I haue nought to say; / But wish I had not liued to see this day" (I. 76).[18] Ironically, of course, she soon lives to regret "this day," and this is in keeping with both the legendary version and with Heywood's critical purpose.

Heywood makes every effort, in other words, to present his heroine in a more flattering light. As Adams observes, "Heywood's alteration of the story as he found it in More, in Holinshed, and in his dramatic predecessors indicates that he was willing to suppress any facts which might cost her the sympathy of the audience."[19] Heywood portrays Jane with such care as a naturally good but weak woman presumably

[17] Adams, English Domestic, pp. 96-97, 90. See also Johnson, pp. 66, 69-70; and D. F. Rowan, "Shore's Wife," Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966), 453-58.

[18] Thorp, p. 111. See also Brodwin, p. 118, and Johnson, p. 64.

[19] Adams, English Domestic, p. 97.

because the audience would be less likely to lament the fall and death of a naturally bad woman of loose morals, such as the usual courtesan or mistress. But the tragic fall and death of sympathetic heroines like Jane Shore and Anne Frankford would be more likely to evoke pity and empathy if not terror and likewise would point up more graphically "the monstrousnesse of their sin"; in fact, Heywood plainly declares his dramatic and critical purpose in dealing with the problem of the "unchaste women," the erring wife, in his _An Apology for Actors_:

> The vnchaste are by vs shewed their errours, in the persons of _Phrine_, _Lais_, _Thais_, _Flora_: and amongst vs _Rosamond_, and Mistresse _Shore_. What can sooner print modesty in the soules of the wanton, then by discouering vnto them the monstrousnesse of their sin? (G 1^v)

Heywood's conception of drama as a vehicle for social and moral commentary--for critical and ethical instruction by way of example--could scarcely be made more clear. And in _Edward IV_, he is putting his theory into practice at the beginning of his dramatic career in the last decade of the sixteenth century. As a playwright-social critic, he is portraying Jane Shore's "error" so that others will not follow along the same primrose path. He makes his point loud and clear in this early play and again, as we shall see, in his other domestic tragedies, especially _A Woman Killed_ depicting Anne Frankford as another sympathetic sinner. In Part II of _Edward IV_, Jane Shore speaks

directly to the women in the audience when she says, "Fair dames, behold! let my example proue, / There is no loue like to a husbands loue" (I. 175); and similarly her husband Matthew points the moral when he laments:

> O, see _weake womens imperfections_,
> That leaue their husbands safe protections,
> Hazarding all on strangers flatteries,
> Whose lust allaid, leaues them to miseries.
> See what dishonour breach of wedlock brings,
> Which is not safe, euen in the arms of kings.
> Thus do I _Jane_ lament thy present state,
> Wishing my tears thy torments might abate.
> (I. 126 [my italics])

Shore's speech verbalizes the Renaissance view of woman as a weak creature wholly dependent upon the protection of a father, husband, or other family member. According to Renaissance psychology, woman is innately weak and prone to err. In a study of Elizabethan women, Carroll Camden reports that women were believed to be weak in every way, or as they theorized, "since women are weak physically, they must be weak morally and mentally" as well.[20] Jane Shore herself blames her fall on her lack of wit. She confesses to the queen, whose place she has usurped, that "womans weaknesse" was the cause of her fall: "To plead my womans weaknesse, and his strength, / That was the onely worker of my fall" (I. 127). And this Renaissance belief is explicit in the queen's empathy for

[20] Carroll Camden, _The Elizabethan Woman_ (Houston: The Elsevier Press, 1952), p. 19.

her and in the queen's understanding of Jane's fall from grace. Edward's wife is a woman too and consequently weak though a queen, as she confesses to her rival: "Weep not (sweet Jane) alas, I know thy sex,/ Toucht with the self-same weaknes that thou art" (I. 129). In terms of Renaissance psychology, as Hardin Craig relates: "Women were frail and susceptible by nature. Hence a world of chaperonage and the doctrine of the removal of occasion." In this period, ". . . natural goodness was not regarded as a sufficient safeguard for women against the temptations of the flesh; for they were strong in passion, weak in reason. To be tempted was to fall." And when a woman is married, her husband must shield his weak wife from all temptation. As Ruth Kelso notes: "Husbands were admonished . . . of the heavy duty that lay upon them to keep their wives from temptation and opportunity to sully their chastity."[21]

Heywood's three adulterous wives, Jane Shore, Anne Frankford, and Mrs. Wincott are each afforded the opportunity by their husbands. The beautiful Jane Shore has been displayed in her husband's shop for all to see, as Shore laments after he recognizes a customer as the king in disguise (I. 68). Of all the treasures in the shop,

[21] Hardin Craig, The Enchanted Glass (New York:Oxford Univ. Press, 1950), p. 131; and Ruth Kelso, Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 98.

Jane is Shore's most precious ornament, his "fairest jewel" (I. 64). According to Charles W. Camp, the story of Jane Shore

> is concerned not only with a fair woman, but also with a fair woman who works in her husband's shop. This situation is a favorite one with the later dramatists, who often show the way in which this frequently builds up a craftsman's trade by attracting customers to his shop, and how it also often results in licentiousness and marital infidelity. This play represents both results of the attractive wife used partly as a worker and partly as a fascinating ornament in the shop.[22]

Edward IV further reveals, by example, that such an arrangement can and does result in "marital infidelity," as in the case of Jane and her amorous customer Edward IV. Furthermore, in the light of Renaissance psychology, it also suggests that in using his beautiful wife to attract customers to his goldsmith's shop, Shore is at least partially to blame for Jane's fall; he, ironically, even attempts to "driue the bargain" between his wife and her seducer, Edward IV, not knowing, of course, what the "bargain" is (I. 66). However, once the bargain is ultimately sealed, the tragic fate of the Shores is likewise sealed.

Coveting Shore's "fairest jewel" Jane (I. 64), Edward comes to the goldsmith's shop disguised--"Comes muffled

[22] Charles W. Camp, The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1924), pp. 108-09. See also Chapter III, pp. 192-93.

like a common seruing-man" (I. 77)--and confesses to Jane: "How for thy sake is maiesty disrobed! / Riches made poor and dignity brought low, / Only that thou mightst our affection know!" Whereupon Jane replies:

> The more the pity, that, within the sky,
> The sunne that should all other vapors dry,
> And guide the world with his most glorious light,
> Is muffled vp himself in wilfull night. (I. 75)

The irony of the situation is immediately apparent; it is a "Scandale suprême," as Grivelet points out. Edward "le souverain, image de Dieu, joue en l'occurrence le rôle satanique du séducteur, celui que tient Wendoll dans _A Woman Killed with Kindness_; c'est lui qui profane et pervertit ce qu'il a pour mission de sauvegarder."[23] The fine hand of the social critic is also clearly apparent here. The implied criticism of kings who act dishonorably in dealing with their loyal subjects is further evident in Shore's observation that he has no recourse, no option, but to let his wife go when he learns she has left for the court, for "Where kings are medlers, meaner men must rue." Shore will not "rage" against it, because ". . . To note offences in a mightie man / It is enough; amend it he that can" (I. 78-79).

It is ironic that the brave heroic defender of London, Matthew Shore, should subsequently become the self-effacing

[23] Grivelet, _Heywood_, p. 131.

Matthew Flood in disguise. Of course, the king has played a large part in precipitating Shore's transformation. And ironically, it is precisely because Shore was an honorable hero and consequently thrust, along with Jane, into the limelight, that his dishonor occurs. Had Shore remained in his goldsmith's shop, the chances are that Edward never would have met or been captivated by his beautiful wife. But fate decreed otherwise. The greatest irony of all, however, is that Shore declines the spurs of Knighthood and receives the horns of cuckoldry instead, as his reward from Edward for his heroism. When Shore declined the proffer of knighthood, Edward makes a promise to him that is undoubtedly one of the most heavily ironic statements in all of Heywood's works: "Well, be it as thou wilt; some other way / We will deuise to quittance thy deserts," says Edward, "And not to faile therein, vpon my word" (I. 33). Edward later recalls his promise to Shore at their next meeting--the fatal meeting at the Lord Mayor's house where Jane is serving as hostess for the widowed Crosby (I. 59-60). And finally, Shore himself recalls the king's promise as he determines to exile himself from England upon hearing that Jane has left him for Edward: ". . . England fare thou well, / And, Edward, for requiting me so well, / But dare I speak of him? forbeare, forbeare" (I. 79). Like Amintor, in Beaumont and Fletcher's _The Maid's Tragedy_ (ca. 1611),

who refrains from taking revenge on his wife and the king who betrayed him because of his loyalty to his sovereign, Matthew Shore is a wronged but revengeless husband who remains loyal. This, of course, makes Edward's betrayal of his loyal subject even more villainous.

The proud but timorous Shore further reveals his loyalty to his king when Jane proposes to leave England with him in his exile: "No, my dear *Jane*, I say it may not be." he says and then laments, "Oh, what haue subiects that is not their kings, / Ile not examine his prerogatiue" (I. 85). This submissive loyalty to an undeserving monarch also serves the larger purpose of the social critic-historian. Ribner puts it this way:

> In this Heywood is permitting his romance matter to support his historical purposes when he is able to do so. That is not at all surprising since Heywood himself had argued in his *Apology for Actors* (1612) that one of the functions of the history play was to teach obedience to the crown.[24]

Ribner then goes on to quote from the passage in Heywood's *Apology*:

> . . . Playes are writ with this ayme, and carryed with this methode, to teach the subiects obedience to their King, to shew the people the vntimely ends of such as haue moued tumults, commotions, and insurrections, to present thē with the flourishing estate of such as liue in obedience, exhorting them to allegeance,

[24] Ribner, *History Play*, p. 277.

> dehorting them from all trayterous and
> fellonious stratagems. (F 3v)

The insurrection led by Falconbridge and culminating in the siege of London "gives Heywood the opportunity to preach the horrors of rebellion," says Ribner, "and at the same time to assert the doctrine that the _de facto_ king must be obeyed, no matter what the justice of his claim to the throne." In Heywood's play, the rebel Falconbridge considers the Lancastrian Henry VI to be the lawful annointed king of England and the Yorkist Edward IV to be the usurper; and, as Ribner points out, this claim "is well substantiated by Holinshed's account." Nevertheless, Heywood plainly "condemns the insurrection in unequivocal terms. The _de facto_ king must always be supported."[25] Heywood underlines the point in the Lord Mayor's speech in anticipation of the rebels' siege of London:

> It cheeres my heart to hear this readi-
> nesse.
> Let neuer rebels put true subiects down.
> Come when they will, their welcome shall be such,
> As they had better kept them further off. (I. 11)

Again dipping into history, Heywood uses Edward's French campaign as a vehicle for political satire on

[25] Ribner, pp. 276-77. As Ribner points out, "The doctrine is further affirmed by the loyalty of Hobs, who will defend the king of England . . . no matter what the basis of his claim. It is also affirmed by Matthew Shore's patient submission to the terrible wrongs King Edward does him. . . ."

dishonorable politicians. In Part II of the play, Edward, in collusion with the French king, gulls his former allies, the Duke of Burgundy and the Constable of France in an amusing screen scene. "Here," says Nichols, in the unmasking of two traitors, the playwright "blends slightly the heroic with the ironic in that barely underlying the fun rests the treachery of ambitious politicians accompanied by the usual subterfuges of disreputable statecraft,"[26] as practiced by such hypocritical villains as the Duke and the Constable.

Moreover, through Rufford, another hypocritical political opportunist, and through Hobs, the honest tanner of Tamworth, Heywood levels his guns at a common abuse of his day, "The granting of monopolies to the Queen's favourites," that was, as Wilhelm Creizenach notes, "an economic abuse which called forth general discontent as well as parliamentary remonstrances. . . ."[27] In Heywood's play, as in his sources, Jane intercedes with Edward for petitioners, such as Ayre and Brackenbury, whose suits are just and who are worthy of support; but, on the other hand, when the suit or bill is unjust or opportunistic, such as Rufford's bill ". . . for a licence to

[26] Nichols, p. 32. See also Ribner, pp. 275-76

[27] Wilhelm Creizenach, _The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare_ (1916; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967), p. 177.

transport corne / From this land, and lead, to foraigne realmes," which would "wound the commonwealth," Jane is adamant:

> Ruf. Mistrisse, I fear you haue forgot my suit.
> Jane. . . . I had your bill; but I haue torne your bill;
> And twere no shame, I think, to teare your eares,
> That care not how you wound the commonwealth.
> The poor must starue for foode, to fill your purse,
> And the enemy bandy bullets of our leade!
> No, maister Rufford, Ile not speake for you,
> Except it be to haue you punished. (I. 83)

It goes without saying that by her actions Jane gains a revengeful enemy who will have no pity for her or for any who aid her after the death of Edward when Rufford serves as a spy for Richard III.

With Hobs, however, the situation is reversed. In this case, the honest tanner flatly refuses the letters patent to "transport hides or sell leather onely in a certain circuit." The criticism is clear in Hobs's conversation with Edward, who is disguised as the King's butler Ned:

> King. Go with me to the Court, and Ile bring thee to the King; and what suit soe'er thou haue to him, I'll warrant thee to speed.
> Hobs. I ha nothing to do at Court. Ile home with my cowhides: and if the King will come to me, he shall be welcome.
> King. Hast thou no suit touching thy trade, to transport hides or sell leather onely in a certain circuit; or about barke, or such like, to haue letters patent?
> Hobs. By the mass and the matins, I like not those patents. Sirrah, they that haue them do, as the priests did in old time, buy and sell the sinnes of

> the people. So they make the King belieue they mend whats amisse, and for money they make the thing worse than it is. Theres another thing in too, the more is the pity.
> King. What pity, John Hobs? I prithee say all.
> Hobs. Faith 'tis pity that one subiect should haue in his hand that might do good to many through the land. (I. 46)

Furthermore, the political satire here (as with Rufford's bill) is obviously intentional on Heywood's part; for, once again, Heywood manipulates time in the interest of his social message. As Creizenach points out, Heywood "transfers a grievance of his own day into a past period, and makes the honest Tamworth tanner refuse a proffered monopoly."[28]

Hobs also seems to refer obliquely to the practice of kings and queens to go on progresses through the realm. He is perhaps alluding, somewhat critically, to the extensive and elaborate progresses of Elizabeth I where she was lauded and lavishly feasted by her subjects, nobles and commoners, townsmen and country people as well:

> King. Prithee tell me, how loue they king Edward?
> Hobs. Faith, as poor folks loue holidays, glad to haue them now and then; but to haue them come too often will vndoe them. So, to see the King now and then 'tis comfort; but euery day would begger vs; (I. 45)

[28] Creizenach, p. 177. See also Velte, p. 28.

As we shall observe throughout this study, Heywood is fond of using clowns, servants, or such characters as Hobs the tanner, in Part I of Edward IV, or Tawneycoat, the country peddler in Part II of If You Know Not Me, to carry the burden of his satire and his political, social, and moral criticism.[29]

Other episodes with Hobs the tanner, in Part I of Edward IV, provide the dramatist with a golden opportunity for pointed political satire and social commentary on the court and the courtier--on the corrupt life at court and on the foppishness of the "slippery," self-centered "courtnol" (I. 48-49). When Edward IV and Sellinger, disguised as Ned and Tom Twist respectively, come to the tanner's humble cottage for supper, Hobs airs his views in the ironic dialogue which follows; he takes the pair to task for their "gay rags" and their unacceptable, futureless occupation:

> Troth I doubt ye ne'er came truly by all these gay rags. Tis not your bare wages and thin fees ye haue of the King can keep ye thus fine; but either ye must rob the king priuily, or his subiects openly, to maintain your probicalitie.

The tanner than asks "Ned" what he thinks of Nell, his daughter; and when the king replies: "I like her so well, I would ye would make / mee your son in law," Hobs declares:

[29] Cromwell mentions Hobs's political satire and quotes several passages from the play (I. 44-45) as examples (pp. 160-61).

> And I like thee so well, Ned, that, hadst thou an occupation (for seriuce is no heritage: a young courtier, an old begger), I could find in my heart to cast her away vpon thee. . . . (I. 50-51)

Later the frank host confesses that his guests remind him of his "vnthrifty" son who "spends all on gay clothes and new fashions; and no / work will down with him, that [Hobs fears] hele be hanged" (I. 52). And finally, when the "courtnols" are ready to depart, "Ned" assures Hobs that if he were to come to court and inquire for Ned or Tom, he should see what "welcome" they would give him there, to which Hobs retorts:

> I haue heard of courtiers haue said as much as you, and when they haue been tride, would not bid their friends drinke.
> Sel. We are none such. . . . .
> Hobs. Farewell to ye both. Commend me to the King; and tell him I would haue been glad to haue seen his worship heere. (I. 52-53)

Ironically, of course, Hobs has not only "seene his worship heere" in his home, but he has also unwittingly advised, criticized, and even insulted him as well. Later the tanner even calls the disguised king a "mad rascal" and a "mad rogue" when he visits the court in the last scene of the first play (I. 86). One can imagine the delight of the groundlings in Heywood's audience with the honest and plain-spoken tanner who frankly (and ironically) tells the disguised king some of the grievances and criticisms of the humble folk. For as Hobs says at

his first entrance: ". . . its a crooked world, and an vn- / thrifty . . ." (I. 39).

In Heywood's dark vision of the nature of man and of evil, as delineated in this and other domestic tragedies, the world is not governed by honorable principles. It is governed neither by a code of honor between gentlemen nor by a code of friendship between men. It is further a world where appearance and reality are at variance, a "crooked world" where people and things are not what they appear to be. Even the usually clear-sighted Hobs is not always able to distinguish the true from the false in a world where even the king is not what he appears to be because he has disguised himself as his own butler and has deliberately deceived his honest subject. Edward, of course, does keep faith with his subject the tanner by pardoning his son when Hobs comes to court, but the king does not keep faith with his subject the goldsmith. Thus Edward appears to be the honorable friend of his subjects, as in his merry-making with John Hobs, the tanner of Tamworth; but, in reality, in his requital of Shore, he is not honorable as a man or as a king. When Hobs first sees the disguised king, he thinks Edward "looks like a theefe" (I. 41). Ironically, the king will later prove to be a thief when he steals Shore's "fairest jewel" Jane (I. 64), this time while disguised as a customer, a chapman.

In the same sense, Edward's successor Richard III also proves to be a thief when he steals the throne itself from the rightful heir, Edward's son. Richard feigns honor and friendship for self-aggrandizement. Actually, he is a friend to no man or woman. He uses his "friends" and his own family as stepping-stones to the throne. One can view Richard's hypocrisy and dissembling at first hand in almost any scene in Edward IV in which he appears, as, for instance, in his dialogue with his brother Clarence. Here, his speech is doubly ironic because while he warns Clarence that he has enemies, in reality, the enemies are Richard himself and his confederates; and while Richard speaks the truth about the "wicked" way of the world, he is lying about his love for Clarence. Richard dissembles friendship and love for his brother, but he is actually plotting his death all the while:

> Glost. [Richard] Oh brother Clarence . . . .
> The world was neuer worser to be trusted.
> . . . where is that loue that was?
> Ah it is banisht, brother, from the world.
> Ah, conscience, conscience, and true brotherhood,
> Tis gone, tis gone. Brother, I am your friend,
> I am your louing brother, your own selfe,
> And loue you as my soule; vse me in what you please,
> And you shall see Ile do a brothers part,
> Send you to Heauen, I hope, ere it be long: aside.
> I am a true-stampt villaine as euer liued. (I. 133-34)

Richard's evil confederate, Doctor Shaw, confesses to Lord Lovell that "So I haue honour, let me swimme through bloud"

(I. 143). Richard's own philosophy could not have been better expressed. Outwardly, Richard appears to be a man of honor; inwardly, in Heywood's play, he is a "tyrant" (I. 164), a consummate hypocrite, and a perfidious villain. Richard's "outragious villaines" (I. 167) have been numerous, as the ghost of friar Anselme reminds Doctor Shaw:

> First, wronged <u>Clarence</u> drowned in the <u>Tower</u>;
> Next <u>Edwards</u> children murder'd in the <u>Tower</u>;
> This day at Pomfret noble gentlemen
> Three, the Queens kinred, lose their harmlesse
> heads. (I. 163-64)

And this is just the beginning for this dishonorable villain!

This unflattering portrait is in keeping with the usual portrayal of Richard III in the Elizabethan period, as, for instance, in Shakespeare's <u>Richard III</u>.[30] Heywood points out very clearly that ironically the hypocritical Richard is not the good and pious man whose "quiet thoughts" have always been far "From this so great maiestike souerainty." In his highly ironic coronation speech, in the last scene of the play, his true nature is patently clear. While he claims to be "As free and pure from an ambitious thought, / As any new born babe!" he adds in an aside:

> . . . Thus must thou <u>Richard</u>,
> <u>aside</u>.

[30] See Ribner, <u>History Play</u>, p. 275.

> *Seeme* as a saint in *outward show*,
> Being a very diuill in thy heart.
> Thus must thou couer all thy villanies,
> And keepe them close from ouerlookers eyes.
> (I. 184-85 [my italics])

There can be no doubt that in *Edward IV*, written near the beginning of his career, Heywood was already consciously working with the theme of appearance and reality in depicting his *dramatis personae*, like Edward IV and Richard III, who "Seeme . . . in outward show" to be one thing but prove in reality to be something entirely different.

The treacherous perfidy of the "dissembling friends" (I. 96) the Duke of Burgundy and the Constable of France is yet another case in point. Like Richard, these ambitious and dishonorable politicians would appear to be what they are not. These sly dissemblers feign friendship for Edward and for each other, while, in truth, it is all a matter of "outward showe" only:

> *Bur*. . . . Nay, I do knowe, for all thy *outward showe*.
> Thou hast no meaning once to looke on him [Edward IV]
> Brother dissembler, leaue this colouring,
> With him that means as falsely as thyself.
> *Con*. I, but thou knowst that *Edward* on our letters,
> And hoping our assistance when he came,
> Did make this purposed voyage into France;
> And with his forces is he heere arriued,
> Trusting that we will keep our word with him.
> *Now though we meane it not, yet set a face*
> *Vpon the matter as though we intended*
> *To keepe our word with him effectually*.
> (I. 98 [my italics])

Not content to deceive and betray Edward, these

deeply-dyed villains plot to betray each other. The Constable makes his own intentions clear in an aside:

> The rather Burgundy, because I aime — All this aside.
> At matters which perhaps may cost your head,
> If all hit right to expectation.
> In the meane space, like a good crafty knaue,
> That hugs the man he wisheth hangd in heart,
> Keep I faire weather still with Burgundy,
> Till matters fall out for my purpose fit. (I. 99)

Meanwhile, in turn, the Duke of Burgundy "doth hang his friend [the Constable], / Behind his backe, whom to his face he smothes" (I. 115). Once again, the historical matter reinforces Heywood's major critical point that "This is no world in which to pity men," while it likewise lends itself naturally to illustrating what becomes a major theme of his plays: appearance and reality. Other examples of this theme are also easily discerned in the character and actions of almost all of the *dramatis personae* of *Edward IV*. Edward IV and Richard III are not honorable men; Edward is lecherous[31] and Richard villainous. Mistress Blague turns her friend out into the street to starve, and Rufford vindictively desires Jane's death because she declined his selfish petition. Even Heywood's kindest and most charitable husband, Matthew Shore, refuses to reinstate Jane Shore, the playwright's most sympathetic fallen woman, in her role as wife again. In fact, Shore flatly refuses Richard's proposal that he reclaim his wife. Shore can forgive but not forget (I. 179-80).

[31] Rowan relates "that Edward IV was a notable lecher in an age distinguished for lechery" (p. 450).

The good-evil, black-white antithesis set up between an Ayre and a Brackenbury, on the one hand, and a Richard III, and a Doctor Shaw or a Rufford, on the other, results in the flat characterization of minor characters. With the hero, Matthew Shore, however, the author depicts a more fully rounded, three-dimensional character. Like Frankford, in A Woman Killed, for instance, Shore is a complex mixture of good and bad, selflessness and selfishness. Unlike practically all of Heywood's characters, he is not motivated by avarice or a desire for personal gain. On the contrary, he gives the bulk of his worldly goods to Jane's brother Frank Emersley before going abroad (I. 79); he spurns Jane's offer to make him wealthy and replies instead: ". . . I haue lost what wealth cannot returne" (I. 85). He had lost his wife, his honor, name, and reputation all in one fell swoop when Jane became mistress to the king and Shore's cuckoldry became a matter of common knowledge as a consequence. Afterwards, he constantly bemoans his fate and laments his "vnjust disgrace" (I. 122). As a malcontent, somewhat like Marston's Malvole but less cynical, Matthew Shore continuously inveighs against the world: "O world, what art thou? man, euen from / his birth, / Finds nothing else but misery on earth" (I. 181).

Shore is understandably bitter, but his brooding sense of wrong and his self-pity are pushed almost to the point of monomania in his self-centered death wish and

desire to martyr himself.[32] He incessantly wishes for death, as an escape from his dishonor. He even wishes Jane dead at times (I. 119, 122, and 125). When, however, he is able to move outside of himself--to go beyond his own self-pity and galling sense of shame--he can really begin to pity his wife Jane in her shameful and pitiful plight after the death of her lover and protector Edward IV (see, for example, I. 162). He will pity his wife and even risk death to aid her and to give her food to sustain her life, acting all the while in defiance of Richard's proclamation. Just prior to their deaths, Jane ironically asks, "Let me that good kind man of mercy know." She does not recognize Shore, who "hath so oftentimes relieued" her (I. 182). This is true Christian charity and pity, a rare example of such actions among the husbands and lovers in Heywood's domestic tragedies. And finally, of course, Shore achieves the martyrdom and the death he has incessantly longed for when he dies with his wife. In the final turn of Fortune's Wheel, the Shores have reached rock bottom. As Shore tells Jane: "Give me thy hand; thus we embrace our graue, / . . . Lower than now we are, we cannot fall!" Hand-in-hand they "embrace" their grave as they are symbolically remarried in death:

[32] See, for example, I. 122, 138-39, 142, 156-57, 176, 181, 183.

> *Jane*. Oh, dying marriage! oh, sweet married death
> Thou graue, which only shouldst part faithful friends,
> Bringst vs togither, and dost joine our hands.
> Oh, liuing death! even in this dying life,
> Yet, ere I go, once, *Matthew* kiss thy wife.
> *He kisseth her, and she dies.*
> (I. 183)

The heroine, Jane Shore, who has inspired true loyalty in Ayre, Brackenbury, her servant Jockie, and even in her dishonored husband is herself a model of kindness, Christian charity, and benevolence.[33] She regularly visits the prisons and hospitals and gives to the poor. She is a woman "Whose purse is open to the hungry soule; / Whose piteous heart saues many a tall mans life." Moreover, she is "Peerlesse in court, for beautie, bountie, pittie!" (I. 121-22). Whereas Anne Frankford starves herself as a penance, Jane Shore does charitable acts in expiation of her sin (I. 83, 139). Jane's charity serves as the redeeming quality employed by Heywood to gain sympathy for his first unfaithful wife. Motivated by selfless charity, Jane exemplifies a true Christ-like forgiveness. She not only pardons her false friend Mistress Blague, who had turned her out into the street to starve, but she also prays for her archenemy Richard III (I. 170).

In turn, Jane herself personally experiences real Christian kindness as she is forgiven by Edward's queen

[33] In emphasizing Jane's benevolence, Heywood is actually following his sources and literary tradition, according to Rowan (pp. 451-52).

when Elizabeth confronts Jane during the absence of Edward in France. Instead of the revengeful abuse Jane expects, the queen kisses her, forgives her, and loves her even as a sister. The queen's charity and love are remarkable in that Jane has ". . . robd [her] of King Edwards dearest loue" (I. 129). And since this is Heywood's own addition to the legendary story, one must conclude that he penned this scene to gain more sympathy for Jane, and perhaps also to provide a model of true Christian forgiveness for a fallen woman.

At the end of Edward IV, three kind and charitable people die--Matthew and Jane Shore along with Young Ayre--and it is superbly ironic that they die either as a result of doing a charitable act (Ayre) or while in the process of performing a charitable act (the burial of Ayre by Matthew and Jane). These three deaths say a great deal about Heywood's dark vision even at the beginning of his career. This is a world where a charitable woman is condemned to a death of starvation and exposure by a pitiless and ruthless man (Richard III), who has himself been a recipient of her pity and charity (I. 180-81), and when a loyal husband and a loyal friend die with the woman they have aided. "This is no world in which to pity men" when two are apprehended and one condemned to die for his act of Christian charity, when a man is branded "a traitor for doing good" (I. 174), and when a man, in fact,

loses his life for his "charity" (I. 181) because he would ". . . rather chuse to die for charity, / Then liue condemned of ingratitude." In response to this admission of Ayre, the incensed Richard retorts: "Your good deuotion brings you to the gallows: / He hath his sentence. Rufford, see him hanged" (I. 175-176).

But against the charitable and kind Ayre, Brackenbury, Jockie, Queen Elizabeth, Matthew and Jane Shore, are set Mistress Blague, Fogg, and the revengeful Rufford, as well as such villains as Richard III, Doctor Shaw, the Marquis of Dorset, Catesby, and the murderers of the young princes in the Tower, James Tirill, Dighton, and Forest, and the many others who make up the greater part of the population in Heywood's world. Moreover, there are no counterparts for Ayre, Brackenbury, or Queen Elizabeth in A Woman Killed and The English Traveller. After Edward IV there are few gratuitious acts of kindness and Christian charity.

Therefore, one can only conclude that there is no poetic justice in a world in which a king will reward a brave soldier and a loyal subject by stealing his wife; a woman will confiscate the property of her friend and benefactress and then turn her out into the street to starve; a vindictive man will harass, spy upon, and seek the death of a woman who refused his selfish petition; a faithful friend is branded a traitor and hanged for his charity to a woman who had saved his own life; a charitable

and benevolent woman is exiled outside of the city and denied food and shelter by any man, on pain of death, in accordance with the edict issued by a man whom she herself had aided in the past. At the conclusion to Edward IV most of the good are dead. Young Ayre is hanged; Matthew Shore dies with his charitable but unchaste wife Jane; Clarence has been drowned; three noble kinsmen of the queen have lost their heads, and the young princes, Edward's sons, have been basely murdered in the Tower by order of their own uncle and supposed protector; while the uncle, the evil, hypocritical villain Richard III, who is responsible for these and other deaths, reigns as supreme monarch and plots further villainies. It is patently evident that order and harmony have not been restored in the political, social, or domestic sphere in Heywood's recital of the old Jane Shore story. In this first domestic tragedy, the small disruption in the domestic sphere, the home, is mirrored in the larger disruption in the political sphere, the state.

A Woman Killed with Kindness

In the undoubted masterpiece, A Woman Killed with Kindness (1603; 1607),[34] Heywood limits his canvas to the

[34] A Woman Killed, written by general agreement in 1603 and first published in 1607, was the first play to bear Heywood's name as author. No copies survive of the second edition, and a third edition appeared in 1617. See Clark, Heywood, pp. 36-37, and Harbage, Annals,

domestic sphere. Here the realistic English setting has moved from the bustling city of London under siege, the hunting field of Bassets Heath, the glittering Royal Court, and Marshalsea prison in Edward IV to the country manors of Yorkshire, the hunting field of Chevy Chase, and the prison in York Castle. The time of the action has also shifted from the late fifteenth century reign of Edward IV to presumably the last years of Elizabeth's reign in the contemporary period of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century. A Woman Killed is composed of two plots: a domestic tragedy and a tragicomedy. The main plot begins on the happy occasion of a wedding celebration and ends some years later with the tragic deathbed reconciliation and symbolic re-marriage of the ill-starred couple. There is, in other words, an ironical contrast between the happy, hopeful beginning and the sad, calamitous conclusion--an ironical contrast between the wedding-sheets and the winding-sheets. The subplot, in contrast, begins with a wager that leads to a murder of two men and ends in a happy marriage between the murderer's sister and his sworn enemy, the master of the two dead retainers.

The play begins amid the country wedding festivities for both the master's guests in the "parlour" and the servants and their guests in "the yard" (ii. 4-5) in

---

pp. 87-87. All quotations from this play cited in the text by scene and line numbers are from A Woman Killed with Kindness, ed. R. W. Van Fossen (London: Methuen, 1961).

celebration of the supposedly perfect match between John Frankford and Anne, the sister of Sir Francis Acton. The very next day, the bridegroom impulsively takes Wendoll, a young gentleman "of small means" (iv. 32) into his household when the latter brings the news of the ill-fated hunting match between Sir Francis Acton and Sir Charles Mountford. Frankford promises to supply Wendoll with horse, table, servant, and money in exchange for male companionship. Wendoll graciously accepts Frankford's generous offer; he then immediately proceeds to partake of his benefactor's board and he will later proceed to share his bed as well, thus dishonoring himself, his patron, and his patron's wife. The adulterous liaison is discovered by the servant Nicholas who has disliked and distrusted Wendoll from the outset. Nicholas reveals the betrayal of wife and intimate friend to the incredulous Frankford who determines to discover the truth for himself. He dissembles ignorance while he devises a ruse to trap the adulterous pair through pretending to leave home on legal business. Returning at midnight, he surprises the guilty lovers in bed. Wendoll flees in his nightshirt, chased by the enraged husband, sword in hand. Providentially saved by the restraining hand of the maid, Wendoll escapes to pursue his fortune elsewhere. Next, instead of killing his wife outright, Frankford decides to ". . . torment [her] soul / And kill [her] even with kindness" (xiii. 155-56).

Anne is thus spared the disfigurement and death she had fully expected at her husband's hand; instead she is banished to one of Frankford's other manors seven miles distant where separated from home, children, family, and friends, the penitent adulteress resolves to starve herself in expiation for her sin. Frankford is ultimately prevailed upon to visit his dying wife; and at this death-bed reunion, in the presence of Sir Francis and the other assembled friends, the husband is moved to favor Anne with his eleventh-hour forgiveness. After Frankford weds his estranged wife again, in effect, with a symbolic kiss, she dies in his arms.

The subplot also begins amid the Frankford's nuptial celebration when Sir Francis Acton, the bride's brother, arranges with another knight, Sir Charles Mountford, to match hawks and hounds for a two hundred pound wager the next day at Chevy Chase. After Sir Francis loses the match but ungraciously refuses to accept defeat, a violent quarrel ensues which culminates in the killing of two of Sir Francis' men by Sir Charles. Arrested at the instigation of Sir Francis, the contrite Sir Charles is able to secure his release from the corrupt court by spending all of his patrimony except for five hundred pounds and a summer-house on the Mountfords' ancestral land. As he leaves the prison, Sir Charles meets Shafton, a cold-hearted moneylender who covets the Mountford land which adjoins his

own property. Shafton offers Sir Charles a loan of three hundred pounds under the guise of disinterested charity, and the knight accepts the seemingly generous offer. Later when he is unable to repay the loan with interest, Sir Charles is hauled away to prison again; this time, however, the impecunious young gentleman is in no position to purchase his freedom, so he is fettered in irons and cast in "the hole" in York Castle along with the condemned men (ix. 13-14, xi. 26). When the implacable Sir Francis hears of Sir Charles's second incarceration, he gloats over the new misfortune and resolves to add insult to injury by seducing the sister Susan Mountford. At first sight of the lovely Susan, however, Sir Francis is immediately "enchanted" (vii. 93), and he proceeds to woo her with gold and gifts. When the chaste Susan spurns all of his overtures, Sir Francis decides to ". . . fasten such a kindness on her / As shall o'ercome her hate and conquer it" (ix. 66-67); he settles all of her brother's debts and obtains his release from prison. In the meantime, Susan has appealed to both relatives and friends for aid but to no avail. She receives contempt instead of charity and maxims instead of money, as in the case of Uncle Mountford who declares that "This is no world in which to pity men" (ix. 5), or of cousin Tydy who says:

> Call me not cousin; each man for himself!
> Some men are born to mirth and some to sorrow;
> I am no cousin unto them that borrow. (ix. 34-36)

At liberty again, Sir Charles discovers to his dismay that Sir Francis is his benefactor, not his relatives or erstwhile friends as expected. Since his pride will not suffer such an obligation from an avowed enemy, he determines to repay this "strange kindness" (x. 119) with his sister's chastity; he will sacrifice her honor for his own. Susan reluctantly agrees but threatens suicide before loss of virtue. Fortunately for the Mountfords, the sacrifice of either life or honor proves unnecessary as Sir Francis decides to outstrip Sir Charles's "honourable wrested courtesy" (xiv. 121) by offering honorable marriage instead. Susan readily accepts Sir Francis, her hated enemy, as her husband, while Sir Francis, in turn, accepts Sir Charles, his former foe, as his "dear brother" (xiv. 146).

In this play of infidelity, false friendship, dishonor, and revenge, Heywood is not presenting simply a black and white antithesis of chastity versus adultery or of honor versus dishonor, as one might find in the moralities or in didactic drama, or as one might expect from an optimistic spokesman for bourgeois morality and ideals. On the contrary, in the dark vision of this social critic-playwright, there are grey areas which need to be illuminated in order to understand what Heywood is actually revealing about human nature and about the nature of the world; in this, he is much closer to his fellow Jacobean playwrights

than is generally supposed. For like Diogenes who walked the streets of ancient Athens looking for an honest man, one will look in vain for a true friend or a thoroughly honorable gentleman among the knights and landed gentry in Heywood's Yorkshire countryside. The moral corruption of the selfish, rapacious, grasping society is particularly well-defined in the subplot of _A Woman Killed_. Here too, Heywood's role as a social critic is most clearly evident, especially in his attack upon the corrupt law courts and penal system, and in his portrayal of the miseries wrought by usurious moneylenders; here too, his use of the theme of appearance and reality is readily apparent.[35] As in _Edward IV_, Heywood is again presenting his social comment in conjunction with his favorite theme that people and their actions are not what they appear to be in outward show. In reality, it is a world where friends and relatives alike are motivated entirely by hypocritical self-interest and self-seeking greed and avarice. A further examination of the subplot will fully illustrate the point.

Although the principal characters in the subplot are aristocrats (knights) and presumably honorable and chivalrous gentlemen, in reality, Sir Charles Mountford and Sir Francis Acton turn the ancient code of honor upside down, while Mountford's relatives and friends pervert the codes of kinship and friendship. With these men, it is all a

[35] Cf. Ribner, _Jacobean Tragedy_, p. 58.

matter of appearance, not substance. This is apparent from the outset when the ancient code of honor is broken at the hawking match as one knight reneges on paying a wager while the other dishonorably kills two men in the subsequent fight; it is clear in the experiences of Sir Charles in prison; and it is plainly evident in the contest of honor between Sir Charles and Sir Francis when the former is finally pardoned and set free through the long delayed "generosity" of the latter, his influential enemy.

After Mountford's murder of Acton's huntsman and falconer, a crime committed in his intemperate rage (iii. 49-52), Sir Charles finds himself bereft of both honor and friends (iii. 97-101). His heinous "error is a crime subject to criminal law in addition to being a sin" and consequently, "We soon learn what constitutes social retribution," says John Canuteson, "as the sheriff arrives and leads Sir Charles off to prison. . . ."[36] Heywood's role as a social critic is clearly evident here as he reveals that Sir Charles has enough money to buy his freedom although Sir Francis, an influential man with "great friends" (iii. 70), has labored hard "to take his life" (v. 5). The corruption of the law courts and penal system of the period could not be more apparent than in Sir

[36] John Canuteson, "The Theme of Forgiveness in the Plot and Subplot of A Woman Killed with Kindness," Renaissance Drama, n.s. 2 (1969), 129.

Charles's confession to Malby that his life has cost him "all the patrimony" his father had left him (v. 17-19).

Next, the social critic focuses the spotlight on revealing the deplorable practices of the avaricious usurers of the time who, like Shylock, demanded their "pound of flesh." For as Sir Charles leaves the prison, he meets the usurious moneylender Shafton who under the guise of friendship offers him a loan of "Three hundred pounds" (v. 32). Of course, the hypocritical Shafton is not motivated by friendship, honor, or charity as he confesses in an aside: "If I can fasten but one finger on him, / With my full hand I'll gripe him to the heart," says Shafton, for "'Tis not for love I proffer'd him this coin, / But for my gain and pleasure . . . (v. 50-53). He wants the Mountford house and land which "lies convenient" for him (v. 49), and he is not at all particular about how he attains his ends or who is hurt in the process. Later when Charles is arrested for the second time and has no patrimony to pay for better treatment, Shafton tells him gloatingly: "The Keeper is my friend; thou shalt have irons, / And usage such as I'll deny to dogs" (vii. 61-62). And indeed, young Mountford is well on his way to rotting in the hole at York Castle when Acton pays his way out of prison.

Prior to this, however, while Sir Charles is still languishing in prison, Susan canvasses their obdurate

friends and relatives in a futile attempt to raise money for her brother's release. And here, the social critic pens a most devastating portrait of the debased, dishonorable, and uncharitable men who refuse to aid their relative and friend. As Susan later reveals to Sir Charles:

> O brother, they are men all of flint,
> Pictures of marble, and as void of pity
> As chased bears. I begg'd, I su'd, I kneel'd,
> Laid open all your griefs and miseries,
> Which they derided--more than that, deny'd us
> A part in their alliance, but in pride
> Said that our kindred with our plenty died. (x. 64-70)

In this world "Rich fly the poor as good men shun the Devil" (x. 72); and bonds of kinship are dissolved by poverty and debt: "Money I cannot spare; men should take heed. / [Charles] lost my kindred when he fell to need" (ix. 16-17). "This is [clearly] no world in which to pity men," as Old Mountford advises his niece Susan (ix. 5).

We can almost feel sorry for Sir Charles in his period of distress until we remember that after all his trials and tribulations, he has not changed one jot. In fact, he is no more honorable or charitable than his friends and relatives. When he first thought the latter had deserted him (as indeed they had), Sir Charles, again in a rage, exclaims: "If it be so, shame, scandal, and contempt / Attend their covetous thoughts, need make their graves. / Usurers they live, and may they die like slaves" (x. 15-17). But honor and charity are meaningless concepts

for all of these base and unprincipled men. Furthermore, Sir Charles Mountford is not ennobled or improved by his suffering as Anne is; after his release from prison (and even at the close of the play), he is still the same shallow, selfish, self-centered young man he has always been. This becomes especially evident in the contest of honor between the two knights when the brother resolves to sacrifice his sister to Sir Francis in payment of his debt of "honor."

Susan's "honorable" brother Sir Charles Mountford, motivated by "love," selfishly plans to sacrifice Susan's honor in order to redeem his own. But as T. S. Eliot notes, "a man ready to prostitute his sister as a payment for a debt of honor--is too grotesque even to horrify us"; Van Fossen relates that Sir Charles "develops a monomania for repaying Sir Francis, and simply uses his sister, preposterously, as a final piece of negotiable property"; while Patricia Spacks points out that the knight's selfish, self-centered plan is even blacker than might appear at first glance. As payment for his debt of honor, Sir Charles prefers to sacrifice his sister's "precious jewel" (xiv. 53) or even her life rather than to sacrifice his house or property; for "If this were sold," he informs Shafton, "our names should then be quite / Raz'd from the bead-roll of gentility" (vii. 36-37). Thus, says Spacks, Sir Charles "considers it more honorable to deflower his

sister and kill himself than to deflower his virgin title." Furthermore, he is not deterred one whit in his plans when he learns that Susan prefers suicide to loss of virginity. Thus "the Mountfords propose, in short, to satisfy the debt owed by Sir Charles to Sir Francis by promising him the satisfaction of his lust, but giving him only a corpse."[37]

In discussing A Woman Killed, critics often contrast the chaste Susan Mountford with the unchaste Anne Frankford. Freda L. Townsend, for instance, maintains that "Anne's evil become[s] the blacker in contrast with Susan's good."[38] Susan may have been intended as a virtuous foil to the unchaste Anne, as Townsend proposes, but if so it is in the same sense that their two seducers Sir Francis and Wendoll are foils. None of these characters proves to be admirable or honorable, and this seems to suit the playwright's critical and moral purpose. In this case, Susan Mountford appears to be a paragon of chastity; but, like Richardson's Pamela and like Heywood's Luce in Wise Woman, her virtue is for "sale" or for barter in the marriage market.

The hypocritical Susan proclaims that "[her] honour never shall for gain be sold" (ix. 53), but in reality she

[37] T. S. Eliot, Essays on Elizabethan Drama (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956), p. 103; Van Fossen, p. lii; and Spacks, pp. 328-29.

[38] Freda L. Townsend, "The Artistry of Thomas Heywood's Double Plots," Philological Quarterly, 25 (1946), 102.

"sells" her honor for lawful "gain"--money and marital position--and to the man she despises most in the world. Ironically, "Acton! . . . that name [she is] born to curse" (ix. 51) will shortly become her own surname. Anne Frankford, in contrast, becomes unchaste in her fall from virtue, but ironically she is motivated to lose her chastity partly by an excess of generous feelings aroused in her by her seducer. As she tells Wendoll: "You move me, sir, to [com]passion and to pity" (vi. 140).[39] One of the greatest ironies in the play is that in reality it is the disinterested, unselfish virtues of the tender-hearted young wife which betray her[40] and assure her fall, while, in contrast, it is the appearance, not the reality, of a disinterested, unselfish virtue which assures Susan's rise in the world, and which commends her to Sir Francis and to most of Heywood's critics as well.[41] Susan's pretensions to honor, however, are specious: her honor consists in outward appearance. Unsurprisingly, this paragon of

[39] See C. F. Tucker Brooke and Nathaniel Burton Paradise, eds., _A Woman Killed with Kindness_, in _English Drama 1580-1642_ (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1933), 305. They gloss the word "passion" as "compassion."

[40] Cf. David Cook, "_A Woman Killed with Kindness_: An Unshakespearian Tragedy," _English Studies_, 45 (1964), 370.

[41] See Velte, p. 106; Boas, p. 44; Van Fossen, p. xli; Nichols, p. 294; Cromwell, pp. 97-98; and Herbert R. Coursen, Jr., "The Subplot of _A Woman Killed with Kindness_," _English Language Notes_, 2 (1965), 184.

virtue, after her marriage, has no Christian charity or pity for her dying sister-in-law. Her self-righteous attitude is obvious in her sententious remark to Jenkins, prior to seeing Anne on her deathbed: "Alas that she should bear so hard a fate; / Pity it is repentance comes too late" (xvii. 31-32). But in comparing the actions of the two women, Anne Frankford and Susan Mountford, we find that Anne dies by suicide, but the hypocritical Susan had actually resolved to commit the very same mortal sin (xiv. 84-85, 98-99). Anne lost her honor when she succumbed to the seductions of her husband's best friend, the impecunious Wendoll, but as Dolora Cunningham notes, Susan actually "places [her honor] on the market to redeem her brother's debts,"[42] and thereby wins a marriage proposal from the wealthy and influential Sir Francis. In taking a second look at the actions of the two women, we must conclude with Patricia Spacks that:

> Susan, who seems to provide a standard of virtue by which Mistress Frankford's lapses may be judged, appears far less honorable when examined closely. She is the pattern of goodness until her crisis comes--but so, for that matter, was Mistress Frankford. Asked to sacrifice her virtue for her brother, she reacts with a plan to cheat his creditor. The final outcome of her affairs reveals yet more clearly her fundamental lack of moral uprightness. . . . Sir Francis has been the major villain of the subplot, repeatedly working to harm the Mountfords. Yet Susan

[42] Dolora Gallagher Cunningham, "The Doctrine of Repentance as a Formal Principle in Some Elizabethan Plays," Diss. Stanford Univ. 1953, p. 98.

> will marry him without a qualm. An expedient resolution, this, a sentimental one--but hardly a resolution to leave us firmly convinced that Susan Mountford is the model of virtue and honor she has seemed to be.[43]

Similarly, Sir Francis Acton's pretensions to honor crumble completely under even a cursory investigation. He welches on a gambling debt after refusing to admit defeat at the hawking match. Next, "the envious Acton" (v. 43) and his friends earnestly labor to convict Sir Charles for the murder of Sir Francis' two men (v. 5); but although Sir Charles buys his freedom with his fortune and leaves prison almost a pauper, Sir Francis' rancor is still not appeased, nor his ire abated. Moreover, when Acton learns the news of his foe's second arrest, he "gloats like an Iago," says Ornstein, "over the sadistic satisfaction of hearing his enemy plead from a prison gate" (vii. 75-78).[44] In his monomanic desire to get even with Sir Charles, he is still not "Throughly reveng'd," however, and resolves to further shame the poor knight by seducing the sister Susan:

> *Sir Fra.* . . . No, no, *yet I am not*
> *Throughly reveng'd*. They say he hath a pretty wench
> Unto his sister; *shall I, in mercy sake*
> To him and to his kindred, *bribe the fool*
> *To shame herself by lewd, dishonest lust?*
> I'll proffer largely, but, the deed being done,
> I'll smile to see her base confusion.
> (vii. 78-84 [my italics])

[43] Spacks, p. 329.

[44] Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," p. 136.

And this, of course, is the very man whom the self-righteous Susan accepts so readily as a husband! This too is the thoroughgoing villain whom some critics have praised for his "kind" magnanimity to Charles and Susan. Peter Ure, for one, compares Acton's final "kindness" to Susan with Frankford's final "kindness" to Anne. This comparison is accurate but not in the sense that Ure proposes, as we shall see. "Acton's magnanimity to Susan," says Ure, "is balanced by Frankford's passionate compassion as his wife dies. Both men have been consistently kind and these final mercies are a consummation of their virtuous Magnificence."[45] Susan, like Anne, would seem to be doubly blessed in a "kind" (future) husband and a "kind" brother; for, like Sir Charles, Acton also proves to have no sympathy at all for his own sister Anne. Other critics see Acton in a more realistic light. Patricia Spacks, for example, is correct in saying that Sir Francis Acton "is clearly a figure parallel to Wendoll"; and in both cases, neither is ever punished in any way for his villainous actions. Sir Francis "causes his enemy misery; he wins as a bride the woman he desires," and "at the end of the play he even takes a high moral tone about Wendoll" (xvii. 12-14). "One would think," writes Spacks, that Sir Francis "never wanted to corrupt a woman himself." Moreover, as she

[45] Peter Ure, "Marriage and the Domestic Drama in Heywood and Ford," English Studies, 32 (1951), 204.

concludes: "He is wealthy, and he is of high social position; he is consequently accepted by all, moral laws do not affect him, he is in no way bound by honor."[46] Here the social critic is painting an unflattering portrait in which his audience can see a dishonorable, unchivalrous knight who nevertheless "is accepted by all" because of his wealth and high position.

In determining the purpose of the playwright, in this case, we should take our cue from the fact that Heywood changed the character of Sir Francis from the corresponding character Salimbene in his source, Painter's _Palace of Pleasure_. In fact, this is "The chief difference between the novella and the play," remarks Van Fossen, who goes on to say that

> . . . Sir Francis's evil designs on Susan are altered by love at first sight; Salimbene had earlier conceived an entirely honourable love for Angelica and has, in fact, had Charles released from prison because of it. Heywood's alteration in making Sir Francis a vindictive antagonist who plans Susan's seduction only as a final cruelty to Sir Charles has left him open to the charge . . . of creating an inconsistent and unbelievable character.[47]

Van Fossen is partly correct, for Sir Francis _is_

[46] Spacks, pp. 329-30.

[47] Van Fossen, pp. xix-xx. The subplot of _A Woman Killed_ is drawn from Painter's "The Thirtieth Nouell" of _The Palace of Pleasure_, Tome II, the story of "Salimbene and Angelica." The line of descent seems to be from Illicini to Bandello to Belleforest to Painter to Heywood. See Van Fossen, pp. xvii-xix.

unbelievable; he is a genuine melodramatic mustache-twirling villain. However, he is not inconsistent as a character; he is the same selfish, hypocritical, and self-serving person throughout. Even at the end, his "magnanimity" and "kindness" to Charles and Susan, when he accepts the latter as his wife, is not "a consummation" of his "virtuous Magnificence," as Ure proposes above, but rather a predictable culmination of his lustful desire for Susan coupled with his monomanic desire to get the better of her brother. His decision to make Susan his wife is certainly in his own interest. In the first place, he gains a beautiful and chaste bride, the woman he has lusted after and failed to attain by foul means. Admittedly, she is now poor, but more importantly, she is of noble birth and since Sir Francis has enough wealth for both the Mountfords and himself, money is no object or real hindrance. And in the second place, Sir Francis is not to be outdone in generosity by his hated foe, the man he has long sought to ruin. What better prize in a contest of honor than the opponent's own dear "highly-prized" sister? Sir Francis must at least give the outward appearance of being honorable and chivalrous (since inwardly he is neither) in this final "kindness" to the Mountfords.

Although David J. Cook is one of the many critics who think the Mountfords are honorable characters--"They are fully committed to life, honour, and each other"--he is,

nevertheless, most perceptive in his notation of "the sinister equivocation that the word ['kindness'] allows" in the play. As Cooke points out

> Sir Francis says he will tempt Susan's virtue with "kindness"; and when released from prison, not knowing the dubious means, Sir Charles asks who has done him this "kindness." This emphasises the sinister equivocation that the word allows. Frankford's "kindness" looks, on the surface, as generous as does that of Sir Francis in paying Sir Charles's debts.[48]

To enlarge upon Cooke's idea, an examination of the text will reveal that the word "kindness," as used in the play, consistently connotes "sinister equivocations" or irony. The word "kindness" is employed seven times and the word "unkindness" twice. Wendoll, referring to Frankford's "kindness" in maintaining him, tells Jenkins that: "This kindness grows of no alliance 'twixt us--" (vi. 33). On the surface Frankford's generosity to Wendoll seems a kindness, but like most of the other instances of kindness displayed in the play, it is ironically based upon a selfish or an ulterior motive, as in this case it is Frankford's desire for a male companion,[49] a desire which leads ultimately to his own marital tragedy, his wife's adultery. Similarly, in the subplot, Sir Francis Acton's ostensible kindness is

[48] Cook, p. 363.

[49] Brodwin notes that after "Assessing" Wendoll's "attributes," Frankford "decides to buy his companionship" (p. 104).

obviously based upon an even more sinister motive--his lustful desire to seduce Susan Mountford. The word is used four times in connection with this evil scheme. Acton tells Malby that ". . . [he] will fasten such a kindness on her / As shall o'ercome her hate and conquer it" (ix. 66-67). Charles asks Susan, "Which of all these [kinsmen and friends] did this high kindness do" (x.54)? When Charles learns the identity of his benefactor, Susan explains: "You wonder, I am sure, whence this strange kindness / Proceeds in Acton . . . "(x. 119-20). And when he discovers the true nature of his opponent's generosity, Sir Charles laments: "His kindness like a burden hath surcharged me, / And under his good deeds I stooping go" (xiv. 63-64). The other two applications of the word are a reiteration of the title: Frankford's sentence, "I'll . . . torment thy soul / And kill thee even with kindness" (xiii. 153-56), and Anne's epitaph: "'Here lies she whom her husband's kindness kill'd'" (xvii. 140). Anne's adultery is designated as an "unkindness." Frankford tells Cranwell that ". . . when I do but think of her unkindness, / My thoughts are all in Hell. . ." (xv. 5-6). This seeming understatement suggests what Cook calls "the sinister equivocation" of the word, only here the word is the antonym "unkindness." It is interesting to note that the first use of either word occurs in the first scene of the play when Frankford and Anne are withdrawing from

the company of their kinsmen and friends to join their other guests. Sir Francis remarks: "If you be miss'd, the guests will doubt their welcome, / And charge you with unkindness" (i. 76-77). No one would "charge" Frankford with unkindness at the time, but in retrospect, the line becomes charged with irony. Thus, the main plot of _A Woman Killed_ turns on Frankford's so-called "kindness," just as the subplot turns on Sir Francis' "strange kindness." The parallel theme of kindness in the subplot undercuts the notion of Frankford's kindness in the main plot.

Similarly, Sir Charles's solution to his moral problem undercuts Frankford's own solution. Here again the subplot serves to comment upon and interpret the main plot, or as Canuteson observes, "To assume that Frankford has acted either wisely or well, or even kindly, would be to misread the lesson of the subplot."[50] Canuteson notes that in placing the scene in which Sir Charles panders his sister to his enemy (xiv) immediately after the "judgment scene" in the main plot (xiii),

> Heywood forces us to consider the two solutions of moral dilemmas. In the first, Frankford, concerned with his honor, disregards simple forgiveness to comply with the demands of the time for punishment of unfaithful wives, while Mountford, to save his honor, does the ultra-honorable thing in offering his dear

[50] Canutson, p. 141.

> sister to (as he sees him) an honorable enemy to whom he is indebted. Both actions appear to be virtuous moves: Frankford's decision seems kind because it is not violent, Mountford's noble because it is daring. But in reality Mountford is dishonoring himself by maintaining an archaic code with such vigor, and Frankford is exposing himself as a refined revenger of his tainted honor while he protests to be acting out of kindness.[51]

As in Heywood's The Fair Maid, Part II, where Spencer's behavior extends the code of honor to absurd lengths, both Frankford and Sir Charles seem to be honorable men acting in accordance with a code of honor; but, in reality, their actions are not as honorable as they may appear to be on the surface. Sir Charles's actions are based on a monomanic obsession to clear himself of debt to his greatest enemy, while Frankford's are based on taking revenge on an erring wife who has betrayed him with his best friend.

At this point, we should consider the question of what Heywood, as a social critic, is revealing in his play and explore the following questions: (1) why the other characters, aristocrats, and men of stature in society, do not condemn Frankford for his "mild" but revengeful punishment of Anne; and (2) what is Heywood's own attitude towards Frankford's solution to his moral problem, his "kindness" to his erring wife? The answers to these questions are important, because in the context of the play, it is apparent that death, not banishment, is the expected

[51] Canuteson, pp. 138-39.

punishment for Anne's adultery; death is expected by Anne herself and by most of the others including her brother Sir Francis Acton. After some general background relevant to the subject, a more specific discussion addressing each question will follow.

In Heywood's time, the unwritten law justified a husband in wreaking revenge on his erring wife. "The idea that the husband's honor could be restored only by summary vengeance on his unfaithful wife was what we today call a cliché of the theatre," says Arthur Sherbo. "Actually, there was legal machinery for obtaining divorces in such cases, and husbands did not murder unfaithful wives with impunity--except on the stage."[52] As a rule, most of the adulteresses die violently on the stage, although many are involved in other crimes (such as murder) in addition to the sin of adultery. A few adulterous wives luckily escape the fate of the other fallen women: Aurelia, a repentant adulteress, is reunited with her husband Pietro Jacomo (Marston's _The Malcontent_); and Montsurry forgives Tamyra before he banishes her (Chapman's _Bussy D'Ambois_). Heywood combines all of these plot elements in _A Woman Killed_. In punishment for her adultery, the repentant Anne Frankford is banished (like Tamyra); then she is

[52] Arthur Sherbo, _English Sentimental Drama_ (East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1957), p. 49. See also Spacks, pp. 325-26; Van Fossen, p. xxxi; and Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," p. 131.

forgiven and reunited with her husband (like Aurelia); but only on her deathbed as she dies of expiatory suicide (as in the revenge tradition).[53]

Although Frankford refrains from taking a summary bloody revenge on his wife, he would have killed her lover Wendoll had he not been forcibly restrained from doing so. After Frankford's initial discovery of his wife's infidelity, he goes back into the polluted bedchamber a second time to wake the adulterous lovers. On this occasion, he asks that God give him patience (xiii. 64). When next we see him, an enraged Frankford, sword in hand, is chasing Wendoll--clad "*in a night gown*"--evidently, with every intention of killing him. At this point, the maid forcibly stops him by staying his hand and by physically holding him. Frankford then "*pauses awhile*" to collect his wonted composure and thanks the maid who ". . . like the angel's hand / Hast stay'd [him] from a bloody sacrifice" (xiii. 68-69). Much has been made of the fact that Frankford spares the lovers; he fails, in other words, to exact "a bloody revenge on the guilty pair" because of his Christian belief."[54] The point is, however, that Frankford *would have*

[53] For example, Alice Arden (*Arden of Feversham*), Evadne (Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy*); Isabella (Marston's *Insatiate Countess*); Bianca (Middleton's *Women Beware Women*); Beatrice Joanna (Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling*); and Vittoria Corombona (Webster's *The White Devil*) commit other crimes in addition to adultery, while Levidulcia (Tourneur's *The Atheist's Tragedy*) Evadne, and Bianca commit suicide.

[54] See, for instance, Van Fossen, p. xliv.

killed Wendoll had the maid not intervened, and although he does not murder his wife, he does punish her in revenge--ironically, he kills her with "kindness."

Yet outside of a few notable exceptions, Frankford has generally received generous treatment and praise from both the critics and from his peers in the play. Most critics see Frankford as an exemplar of the Christian gentleman. They feel that in the characterization of Master John Frankford, Heywood makes him "a representative of the Renaissance ideal of a 'Christian gentleman' . . ." (McNeir); shows "Frankford as man and as Christian" (Sturgess); and takes "great pains to stress the Christlike qualities of Frankford," for his ". . . Mercy toward his wife and the patience with which he has endured his wrongs are certainly an emulation of the highest Christian virtues" (Brodwin); Frankford is further extolled by critics as the embodiment of "the gentleman who never swerves from his Christian duty," a man who "acts the beau ideal of Christianity," and a man who "exemplifies the model conduct of a Christian in extreme circumstances" (Adams); a "patient and forgiving, a truly Christian character" (Velte); and " the noble compassionate Christian gentleman" (Van Fossen). Critics also commend Frankford for his Christian mercifulness (Adams), charitableness (Dolora Cunningham), magnanimity (Harrison), kindness (Ure, Brodwin, Johnson, and Adams), and forgiveness (Herndl , Boas, and

Johnson).[55] Frankford is also considered to be a pattern or model of an honorable gentleman--as "the perfect gentleman" (Tucker Brooke), as Heywood's "true gentleman" (Cromwell), a man with a "high standard of honor"; he is "in short, a paragon" (Spacks); a "truly noble" character (Velte); "the flower of his class, an admirable civilized type" (Moody E. Prior), and "l'idéal de Heywood, un type surhumain" (Yves Bescou).[56] But a few critics, as we shall see, take the more realistic view to be developed in the remainder of this study of A Woman Killed--the view that in reality Frankford is not a paragon or an exemplar, but rather a flawed and far from ideal character.

Of the few recent critics who have begun to question the traditional view of Frankford, even fewer have stopped to question the traditional views concerning Heywood himself

[55] Waldo F. McNeir, "Heywood's Sources for the Main Plot of A Woman Killed with Kindness," in Studies in the the English Renaissance Drama in Memory of Karl Julius Holzknecht, ed. Josephine W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1959), p. 211; Sturgess, p. 46; Brodwin, p. 114; Adams, English Domestic, pp. 154, 189, 151; Velte, p. 107; Van Fossen, p. xlv; Adams, p. 151; Cunningham, p. 101; G. B. Harrison, Elizabethan Plays and Players (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1961), p. 286; Ure, p. 204; Brodwin, p. 112; Johnson, p. 87; Adams, p. 151; George C. Herndl, The High Design (Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1970), p. 174; Boas, p. 39; and Johnson, pp. 85-86.

[56] Brooke, "Jacobean Drama," p. 547; Cromwell, p. 182; Spacks, pp. 326, 325; Velte, p. 107; Moody E. Prior, The Language of Tragedy (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947), p. 96; and Yves Bescou, "Thomas Heywood Et Le Problème De L'Adultère Dans Une Femme tuée par la Bonté," Revue Anglo-Américaine, 9 (1931), 131.

or have gone far enough to break away from the old assumptions about Heywood's attitude--the view he endorses in A Woman Killed. Ornstein, for instance, perceptively discerns some of the unflattering traits in Frankford's character, but he does not see that the view "shared by other characters" (Frankford's peers) is one thing while "the view" that the "play endorses" (Heywood's view) is something altogether different. Ornstein mistakenly believes they are one and the same, as he makes clear in his following comment:

> Heywood's most interesting plays, A Woman Killed with Kindness and The English Traveller, stand apart somewhat from the others because they are more sophisticated in conception than first appears, and because they approach the edge of subtle irony even as they profess a frank unambiguous moralism. Remembering only the sentimentality and earnestness of A Woman Killed with Kindness, I was surprised on rereading it to find it different and more disturbing than I had recalled. Unable to smile patronizingly at Frankford's noble posturings, I found him smug in his self-congratulations, devious in the ferreting out of his wife's adultery, sanctimonious in his condemnation of her, and perhaps a trifle sadistic in his "renunciation" of a conventional revenge. Equally bad, Frankford's demeaning assumptions about the way that wives should behave are clearly the view that the play endorses, for it is a view shared by other characters, who applaud the Christian forbearance with which he treats his guilty wife. Or, more accurately, everyone (including Anne, who calls her husband's treatment of her a "mild sentence") applauds Frankford except his good friend Cranwell, who tries to speak when Frankford passes sentence on Anne. We do not know, however, if Cranwell found Frankford's killing kindness dreadful, even a travesty of Christian mercy, because Frankford prevents him from expressing his objection.
>
> It would not be just, of course, to blame Heywood for expressing moral sentiments commonplace in his age. If there is an obtuseness in the judgment of Anne, it is an obtuseness inherent in the double

> standard of sexual morality, which has been so firmly entrenched in our mores and so long native to our thinking that it has not been seriously questioned until very recent times.[57]

Ornstein has been quoted at length because this passage obviously has a direct bearing on both of the questions raised above. We can applaud Ornstein's discerning judgment of Frankford, and we have to agree with his assessment of the view shared by Anne and the other characters except Cranwell--a view "endorsed" by the double standard--but we cannot accept his opinion that this is the view "the play endorses." As we shall see, it is not the view of Nicholas and the servants, and it is not the view "endorsed" by Heywood himself.

Like Anne herself and Frankford's peers, most critics applaud Frankford for his Christian forbearance; and, like Ornstein, they clearly believe this is "the view that the play endorses." Herndl, for example, feels that Heywood was "led . . . to violate the traditions of the revenge play by Frankford's Christian forgiveness of his wife"; Nichols believes that Heywood made Frankford "the first patient, forgiving, wronged man in a revenge play as well as an archetype of the domestic and sentimental hero"; while Velte contends that Frankford "is patient and forgiving," and concludes that "the figure of the forgiving avenger, Frankford, must have carried them off their feet

[57] Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," pp. 128-29.

with enthusiasm after a long line of the bloodthirsty Senecan avengers, to whom they had become accustomed"[58] in the drama and in the stories of revenge in the Italian *novelle*.

Heywood's primary sources for the main plot in *A Woman Killed* were very likely from Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure*.[59] Painter's stories, in turn, were based upon Italian *novelle*. And, as Fredson Bowers points out, revenge in the Italian *novelle* "was brutal beyond English experience, particularly in the terrible retaliation exacted for adultery and in the vendetta for murder. Expiatory suicide was also to be found in the *novelle*"; F. S. Boas reminds us, too, that on the Elizabethan stage,

> the "revenge" play had long been an established feature. Partly as a legacy of the Roman dramatist Seneca, a husband betrayed by his wife, a father whose son, or a son whose father had been murdered, has the duty of taking vengeance on the wrongdoer. In different ways Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, Chapman's *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, and *Hamlet* belong to this type

[58] Herndl, p. 174; Nichols, p. 313; and Velte, pp. 107-08.

[59] Painter's the forty-third and the fifty-eighth novels, *The Palace of Pleasure*. Cromwell notes that "Painter's fifty-eighth novel, a free translation of the thirty-sixth novel of the *Heptameron* of Queen Marguerite of Navarre, appears as novella thirty-five of Part I of Bandello's *Tragical Discourses*. The forty-third novel, which Painter has derived directly from Boaistuau, was originally told by Bandello, novella twelve of Part II; it likewise, as novel thirty-two forms a part of Queen Marguerite's collection of stories" (p. 52). See also Robert Grant Martin, "A New Source for *A Woman Killed with Kindness*," *Englische Studien*, 43 (1911), 229-33.

> though the avengers delay in carrying out their mission.[60]

In contrast, in Heywood's play, Frankford does not delay in "taking vengeance on the wrongdoer." In fact, his "kind" revenge is administered on the spot, so to speak, and only a short while after his discovery of the lovers in *flagrante delicto*. His wife then dies of "expiatory suicide" not long afterwards. Moreover, like Tourneur in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, for instance, Heywood strips his "revenge" plays (such as *A Woman Killed*) of the supernatural trappings employed by his Elizabethan predecessors; there are no ghosts, no madness, real or pretended. Heywood's revenge plays are, in fact, closer to the tradition of the Jacobeans, such as Tourneur, Webster, and Ford, than to the Elizabethans Kyd, Marlowe, or to Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

In comparing Heywood's play *A Woman Killed* with some more gruesome example of a husband's "kindness" and "Christian charity" to an adulterous wife in two of Heywood's probable sources from Painter, Frankford's sentence of banishment seems "mild" (xiii. 172) indeed, but then, of course, in this world there is little pity for anyone, much less for a fallen but penitent wife. Painter's

[60] Fredson Thayer Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1940), p. 266, and Boas, pp. 18-19.

stories also reflect a dark, gloomy world in which there is no kindness or Christian pity for a fallen woman--only cruel revengeful death. In the first story from Painter, the President of Grenoble poisons his erring wife with a salad gathered in his herb garden. "And by that meanes he was reuenged of his enemy and saued the honour of his house."[61] In the second story, a lady of Thurin and her female go-between are forced, by the lady's husband, to strangle the lover. Then the unfortunate lady is locked in the defiled bedchamber (which has been stripped of clothes and furniture) with the dead body of her paramour. "And when shee had continued a certaine space in that stinking Dongeon, without aire or comfort, ouercome with sorrow and extreme paine, she yelded her soule to God."[62]

It would seem then that a knowledge of both Heywood's sources based on Italian novelle and of the Elizabethan and Jacobean revenge plays is perhaps what has misled many critics who interpret Frankford's conduct as a pattern of Christian mercy and kindness. As we have seen, most critics make much of the fact that Frankford does not summarily kill his wife in the manner of his Italian counterparts, or in the manner of the protagonists in the tragedies of

[61] William Painter, "The Fifty-Eighth Nouell," The Palace of Pleasure, ed. Joseph Jacobs (New York: Dover Publications, 1966), II, 103.

[62] Painter, "The Forty-Third Nouell," The Palace of Pleasure, I, 248.

the period. Anne herself fully expects outright death or disfigurement (xiii. 92-100); "she anticipates the half-mad savagery of an Italianate revenger," says Ornstein who goes on to note that

> . . . Anne's expectation that her husband will carve her with his sword seems preposterous, but it serves to make Frankford's treatment of her *seem* like a noble forbearance, even though *Heywood leaves no doubt that Frankford's charity is in fact a calculated spiritual torment*--a kind of mortification by degrees. (my italics)[63]

First Frankford assures his erring wife that he will neither "martyr" her "Nor mark [her] for a strumpet . . ." Then he informs her of his real intentions--to "torment" her "soul"--to "kill" her "even with kindness" (xiii. 153-56).

Moreover, Sir Francis Acton, showing not the slightest trace of pity for his sister, avows that his brother-in-law was "too mild" in his "revenge of such a loathed crime."[64] Sir Francis then self-righteously declares that he would have chosen death had the "case" been his:

> My brother Frankford show'd too mild a spirit
> In the *revenge* of such a loathed crime;
> Less than he did, no man of spirit could do.
> I am so far from blaming his *revenge*
> That *I commend it*; had it been my case,
> Their souls at once had from their breasts been freed;
> *Death to such deeds of shame is the due meed.*
> (xvii. 16-22 [my italics])

[63] Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," pp. 137-38.

[64] Cf. Ornstein, p. 138.

A "kind," "merciful" sentiment from a brother! But then, brothers actually have little pity for sisters in <u>A Woman Killed</u>. Then too, as Canuteson observes, "Acton would be the last to charge Frankford with unusually harsh treatment." Ironically, Sir Francis Acton himself certainly did not show "too mild a spirit" in his "revenge" against Sir Charles Mountford, so that given his vindictive character, we are not at all surprised that he actually commends Frankford's "revenge" against his own sister Anne. "Acton actually praises Frankford's actions (ll. 19-20)," says Canuteson, "leaving us to consider any judgment praised by a man of this sort."[65] This, of course, is precisely the point and the answer to the first question under consideration above. Anne Frankford, conditioned by the mores and traditions of her time--by the double standard and the unwritten law of the revenge tradition--expects and feels that, in contrast, her punishment is "mild" indeed. The other characters, Sir Francis, Sir Charles, both aristocrats, and Susan, a chaste lady of noble birth, do not condemn Frankford for his "revenge" on his erring wife. Why then are we not to agree with them? The answer is to be found in our earlier discussion of these characters. We must see their approval of Frankford's conduct in the light of what Heywood has shown us of their own conduct. We have seen that they are revengeful and

[65] Canuteson, p. 139.

vindictive (Sir Francis), selfish and self-centered (Sir Charles), and hypocritical and self-righteous (Susan). The two men are out-and-out villains to boot. Given the character of these men, their approval counts for little indeed. Neither Sir Francis nor Sir Charles is in any position whatsoever to condemn Frankford. In fact, since he is commended by a vindictive foe (Sir Francis) and a murderer and a pander of his own sister (Sir Charles), this suggests that we are to take the opposite view to theirs. Furthermore, the chaste but somewhat sanctimonious and hypocritical Susan is not a blameless or flawless person herself, and the fact that she has no real pity for her dying sister-in-law (xvii. 31-32) indicates that we are not to accept her view. Indeed, given what Heywood has revealed of the nature of all the characters in the subplot, one cannot accept any view they "endorse."

This naturally raises the next question. If these characters do not speak for Heywood, who does; what is his view of Frankford's actions; and what view does he himself endorse? First, we must determine what can be inferred indirectly by considering such things as other possible literary sources not previously considered and the Renaissance psychology, or the theories of the period concerning the nature of women, which was previously discussed earlier in this chapter. Next we will analyze the more direct evidence which Heywood gives his audience/reader in the

play itself. The latter will answer the question of who speaks for Heywood in the play, and it will plainly reveal the view endorsed by the play and the playwright.

To begin with, McEvoy Patterson suggests another relevant source from Painter "Bernage's Story" (the fifty-seventh _novella_) to supplement the two previously mentioned Painter sources. In "Bernage's Story," the husband kills the wife's lover but spares his wife, thinking that death is too mild a punishment for her. Eventually, however, after she proves herself to be penitent and humble, he forgives her, restores her to her former position as his wife, and afterward they have many children.[66] W. F. McNeir also suggests two additional sources for _A Woman Killed_: Robert Greene's tale of an English courtesan, appearing in his _A Disputation betweene a Hee Conny-catcher, and a Shee Conny-catcher_ (1592) which is an adaptation of Gasgoigne's story (based "on an actual occurrence") "The Adventures of Master F. J.," which appeared in his _Hundredth Sundrie Flowres_ (1573).[67] In these stories of an erring wife, bosom friend, and injured husband triangle, the husband _is_ a true exemplar of Christian charity--a true Christian gentleman. His solution is to forgive and forget;

[66] McEvoy Patterson, "Origin of the Main Plot of _A Woman Killed with Kindness_," _Texas Univ. Studies in English_, 17 (1937), 78-82. Patterson notes that "Bernage's Story" is "a translation of the thirty-second tale of Margaret of Navarre's _Heptameron_" (p. 78).

[67] McNeir, pp. 194, 196-97.

this "wise gentleman reclaimed with silence a wanton wife, and retained an assured friend."[68] In marked contrast to these husbands, Frankford's own solution seems revengeful and not so "mild" after all. When compared to the Christian forbearance of these husbands, Frankford does not appear to be the shining exemplar of the forgiving Christian he is generally assumed to be. If Painter's "Bernage's Story," and the Gascoigne and Greene stories are sources, this fact would seem to indicate that since Heywood had the literary precedent of true Christian forbearance and forgiveness and did not follow it himself in portraying his own injured husband, he undoubtedly was not holding Frankford up as a model of Christian behavior, and he was not positing Frankford "as an example of how one must act if evil is to be thwarted," as Ribner proposes.[69] The truth of the matter is that Frankford judges, condemns, and punishes his wife. He does forgive her, which is to his credit, for a late forgiveness is better than none at all, but in this case he waits until she is only a heartbeat or two away from death. Of course, Frankford's eleventh-hour forgiveness seems so impressive that few critics have questioned it or suggested that it could have come earlier--that he

[68] Robert Greene, _A Disputation Betweene a Hee Conny-catcher and a Shee Conny-catcher_ 1952, Elizabethan and Jacobean Quarto Series, ed. G. B. Harrison (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966), p. 69.

[69] See Chapter I, p. 35 above.

could have given the poor weak, penitent wife a second chance as in the stories of Gascoigne, Greene, and Painter.

But then it would never occur to Frankford that, ironically, he has been both unkind and un-Christ-like in the manner of his revengeful punishment of Anne. By the same token it would never occur to Frankford that he himself is at fault. According to Renaissance psychology, Frankford is partly, if not largely, to blame for the domestic tragedy since he provided the occasion and ironically invited Wendoll "to be a present Frankford in his absence" (vi. 79). One recent critic, Margaret Bryan, even argues that one "aspect of Frankford's character [is] his pathological need to be cuckolded." She suggests that

> An examination of the structural and thematic functions of the food symbolism in _A Woman Killed with Kindness_ reveals that Heywood consistently uses eating to represent erotic love or lust, specifically that of Wendoll for Anne. Such a reading of the play provides a new view of Frankford as a neurotic husband who subconsciously invites his friend to cuckold him . . .[70]

She further points out that such a study also discloses another connection between the two plots of the play:

> the parallel actions of Frankford and Charles Mountford, the one unconscious, the other perfectly aware. As Charles openly offers to give Susan to Sir Francis,

[70] Margaret B. Bryan, "Food Symbolism in _A Woman Killed with Kindness_," _Renaissance Papers_ (1974), pp. 15, 9-10.

> Anne's brother, in payment of his debt, so Frankford unwittingly offers Anne to Wendoll.[71]

It seems very doubtful that this was Heywood's conscious purpose; it is implied perhaps but probably not intentional. However, the idea gives one pause to think. Frankford does so obviously provide an opportunity for his wife's fall that he seems to be asking to be cuckolded as Bryan proposes. This becomes even more evident in the light of Renaissance thought as related by such critics as Carrol Camden, Ruth Kelso, and Hardin Craig.[72] Camden quotes from Edmund Tilney writing on the subject of jealousy in _A brief and pleasant discourse of duties in Mariage, called the Flower of Friendshippe_ (1568):

> Naturally the husband must place no temptation before his wife by bringing male acquaintances into his house. While he may bring his best friends to the house, even here he should remember "that a man may shewe his wife, and his sworde to his friende, but not to farre to trust them. For if therby grow vnto him any infamie, let him not blame his wife, but his owne negligence."[73]

Heywood's audience would no doubt recognize the fault of the husband under the circumstances, and Heywood's critical or moral point would perhaps be more obvious to them than

[71] Bryan, p. 16.

[72] See pp. 60-61 above.

[73] Edmund Tilney as quoted in Camden's _The Elizabethan Woman_, p. 118.

to a modern audience. For one must remember that Anne's husband has provided her with more than ample occasion, since Wendoll is a permanent guest in the house. A. M. Clark reminds his reader that "Mrs. Frankford does not fall immediately after Wendoll's becoming an inmate of the house but after years in his company." Frankford, in fact, surprisingly invites Wendoll to live with them the day after the wedding. But Wendoll is "an inmate of the house" for several years at least before he seduces Anne. During this interval two children are born to the Frankfords.[74] Consequently, Frankford himself must bear some of the responsibility for his wife's loss of honor; he has "laid this cross" upon his own head, not God (xvii. 69). But instead of perceiving himself as he really is--hypocritical, unkind, and at fault too--he envisions himself as a betrayed "Christ-figure" with Wendoll as a Judas (viii. 102-03 and xiii. 75-77).[75] His wife, in contrast, sees him as a wrathful God-like figure. "Shall I entreat your pardon [she implores]? Pardon!O / I am as far from hoping such sweet grace / As Lucifer from Heaven . . ." (xiii. 79-81). Ironically, there is no hope of pardon

[74] Clark, _Heywood_, pp. 234-35. See also Mable Buland, _The Presentation of Time in Elizabethan Drama_ (New York: Henry Holt, 1912), p. 311.

[75] Cf. Cook, p. 361: "When he arraigns Wendoll, Frankford dramatizes his suffering; he sees himself as a Christ figure." See Canuteson, p. 133.

from the self-righteous Frankford until Anne has been punished for her sins. Like a wrathful god, he sentences his wife and registers his words in Heaven:

> My words are regis'red in Heaven already;
> With patience hear me: I'll not martyr thee
> Nor mark thee for a strumpet, but with usage
> Of more humility *torment thy soul*
> *And kill thee even with kindness.*
> (xiii. 152-56 [my italics])

At this point, Cranwell interrupts Frankford's pronouncement with the words "Master Frankford--" to which Frankford replies: "Good Master Cranwell--woman, hear thy judgement" (xiii. 156-58). "Frankford will not let him proceed," Van Fossen points out, "and we cannot tell what sort of reaction the brief phrase is meant to convey. We can see only that for some reason he wishes Frankford to reconsider his course of action."[76] Cranwell may well realize the true nature of Frankford's "kindness." He has already revealed his sympathetic nature in his concern for Sir Charles Mountford's punishment by Sir Francis Acton, when Cranwell admonishes his host Frankford for his lack of interest in the woeful plight of the incarcerated Sir Charles (xi. 23-27). It seems likely that Cranwell is on the brink of admonishing his pitiless host a second time when Frankford curtly and rudely cuts him off in order

[76] Van Fossen, p. liii. See also Ornstein's comment, pp. 108-09 above.

to continue pronouncing sentence on Anne. And as he concludes his sentence, his decree, Frankford assumes a God-like presumption:

> *But as thou hop'st for Heaven, as thou believ'st*
> *Thy name's recorded in the Book of Life,*
> *I charge thee never after this sad day*
> To see me, or to meet me, or to send
> By word, or writing, gift, or otherwise
> To move me, by thyself or by thy friends,
> Nor challenge any part in my two children.
> So farewell, Nan, for we will henceforth be
> As we had never seen, ne'er more shall see.
> (xiii. 172-80 [my italics])

Setting himself up as judge and jury, he sentences his wife to banishment, which is within his rights as an injured husband. He allows her to occupy one of his three or four manors (xvi. 8-9) and provides for her future maintenance which, under the circumstances, is beyond the call of duty. All of this is to his credit certainly; all of it makes him appear magnanimous and his sentence "mild." However, one must see it in relation to the actual sentence, to what the sentence means, and to the spirit in which it is pronounced. In the first place, he does not slay his wife in a rage. His wish to ". . . keep [his] white and virgin hand / From any violent outrage or red murder" (xiii. 31-32), and his fear of a similar divine judgment on himself (which activated his scruple against killing Anne and Wendoll in bed) no doubt deter Frankford from coldly murdering his wife. On the other hand, he is

not above wanting to "torment her soul" (or her spirit), to make her suffer over a prolonged period of time as Ornstein has noted above. Frankford "shows 'kindness,'" says Ernest Bernbaum, "in exiling her instead of slaying her, not because he sees anything to exonerate her conduct, but because the protracted bitterness of a lingering exile is a more fitting penalty for her crime than instant death."[77] Like the husband in "Bernage's Story," Frankford feels that death is too easy a punishment. In actuality, Frankford sentences his wife to what McNeir terms as "a living death in banishment."[78] He exiles her from home, family, friends, even her own two children. This "mild sentence" puts him somewhere between the Italianate avengers who murder unfaithful wives with impunity and the merciful and forgiving husbands who give their penitent wives a second chance.

In the second place, when Frankford pronounces sentence on his kneeling wife, he is not concerned with Anne's repentance or eternal salvation or even with her spiritual well-being, as suggested by some critics, either as he sentences her or after he banishes her from his sight.

[77] Ernest Bernbaum, The Drama of Sensibility (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), p. 36. See also Boas, pp. 42-43.

[78] McNeir, p. 202. He describes Anne's trip to the manor as "the symbolic funeral cortege of Mrs. Frankford escorting her to a living death in banishment.

Ribner, for one, maintains that Frankford as a gentleman

> thinks of his honour which must be protected, but his primary concern is for the salvation of his wife's soul. When he kills her with kindness, he is acting entirely out of love for her; in opposition to the code which demanded blood revenge, he asserts the contrary Christian doctrine of forgiveness and reconciliation. Frankford acts to bring his wife to a state of sincere repentance, and only upon her death bed, when he is assured of her soul's salvation, does he at last forgive her.[79]

Frankford does not exact "blood revenge," but the punishment he chooses is a form of revenge, nevertheless. If Frankford does assert the "Christian doctrine of forgiveness and reconciliation," it is only as a last minute grandstand gesture made in the presence of his peers. And one may wonder just how "Frankford acts to bring his wife to a state of sincere repentance," as Ribner suggests, since Anne is already sincerely repentant when Frankford judges her, and since he never considers repentance at all as he sentences her. In fact, a careful perusal of Frankford's confrontation with his fallen wife, his judgment and sentence of her (xiii) and of his later conversation with Cranwell after Anne's banishment (xv), the only two scenes in which he appears before the concluding deathbed scene, will reveal that Frankford does not once mention anything about repentance, penitance, Anne's soul, or her ultimate salvation.

[79] Ribner, _Jacobean Tragedy_, pp. 52-53.

It is further evident that he is not even concerned with her physical well-being either, since he makes no effort or attempt to dissuade Anne from her suicidal plan of starvation, and one may presume that he was informed of his wife's intention by his faithful servant. Anne plainly instructs Nicholas to tell his master that, like Frankford, her decree too is written in heaven:

> Anne. [to Nicholas.] If you return unto your master,
> say-- . . . That you have seen me weep, wish
> myself dead.
> Nay, you may say too-for my vow is pass'd--
> Last night you saw me eat and drink my last.
> This to your master you may say and swear,
> For it is writ in Heaven and decreed here.
> (xvi. 58-65)

Nicholas pities the poor penitent, but Frankford has no pity for her. In fact, since he makes no effort to stop Anne's suicidal plans, Frankford's sin is one of omission as well as of commission. But his unconcern with his wife is in keeping with his self-centered and self-righteous character.

And finally, when he at last deigns to visit his dying wife, his cold, unpitying attitude thaws only because Anne abases herself on her "heart's knees" (xvii. 90) and ironically grants him a God-like power of divine mercy. She implores his pardon "once more" and outlines a specious theological proposition to the effect that if he does not forgive her "heinous" fault in this world, "Heaven will not

clear it in the world to come" (xvii. 84-88). As Canuteson very perceptively points out:

> The curious thing is that Anne has added nothing--indeed she could not--to her former request for Frankford's forgiveness. She has repented to God, but this was not Frankford's aim in banishing her. The very fact that he forgives her now, following the same pleas that he heard before, shows conclusively the useless extremity of his revenge.[80]

Furthermore, it also shows conclusively the hypocritical nature of Frankford's original refusal to forgive Anne after her former request. Now, in the presence of his friends, he is willing to forgive; this belated forgiveness makes him appear kind and merciful.

As he stands at the bedside of his dying wife, Frankford's hypocrisy is patently clear when he tells Anne ". . . I will shed tears for thee, / Pray with thee, and in mere pity / Of thy weak state I'll wish to die with thee" (xvii. 95-97), while the others hypocritically chime in with "So do we all" (xvii. 98). The pitying servant Nicholas, on the other hand, declares in an aside: "So will not I; / I'll sigh and sob, but, by my faith, not die" (xvii. 99-100). Nicholas' unpretentious and straightforward honesty is like a breath of clean fresh air in the stuffy bedchamber of the dying woman, filled as it is with the stale hot air of insincere rhetoric and hypocritical grief of the other mourners, especially of the brother Sir

[80] Canuteson, p. 140

Francis and the husband Frankford.[81] And true to form Frankford never shows even the slightest particle of recognition that he himself bears some responsibility for his wife's fall, or of his own responsibility in her death--her expiatory suicide. As Canuteson observes:

> Sir Francis points out that a conventional treatment of Anne would not have effected "such true sorrow," and Frankford agrees: "I see it had not" [xvii. 135-36]. In other words, he thinks his method of dealing with Anne's sin was both carefully considered and successful. He carries out his plan to kill Anne with kindness right up to the last line of the play, when he composes her epitaph.[82]

And true to Frankford's desire to appear munificent, the epitaph will be engraved "In golden letters" on "her marble tomb" (xvii. 139, 138). The selfish husband has received no self-illumination; to the last, he does not discern that he has not been kind, charitable, or forgiving in his treatment of his erring wife. He has shown no pity for her and she has shown none for herself, as she commits suicide in an attempt to atone for her "heinous" sin or "fault" (xvii. 86). Only Nicholas and the servants and perhaps Cranwell reveal any genuine pity for the dying woman. And since these are the only good, decent, and

[81] Spacks observes that "No one else has any intention of dying, either, but Nick is alone in saying exactly what he means" (p. 332).

[82] Canuteson, p. 141.

honorable people in the play (except perhaps Malby who plays a role similar to Cranwell's with Frankford in chiding Acton for his revengeful treatment of Sir Charles), this is our cue to agree with them.

The real standard by which we may judge Frankford's actions--his "kindness" to his fallen but penitent wife--is Nicholas and the other servants. In this world of dishonorable people, Nicholas, Jenkins, Sisly, and Spiggot are honorable; in this world where things and people are not what they appear to be in outward show, Nicholas and his fellows can perceive the true situation. They provide a ray of light in an otherwise dark, gloomy portrait. As Patricia Spacks points out "the picture is not altogether black; there are, after all, in the play certain characters who behave honorably and see truly. They are the servants." Nicholas has no problem of perception and he "will not compromise with villainy when he perceives it, despite the fact that the rank of villain is far above his own," in the case of Wendoll. "Even the lesser servants give evidence of an uncompromising standard of honor and of an ability to perceive," and, furthermore, says Spacks, ". . . it is significantly a servingmaid who prevents Frankford from murdering Wendoll." As Spacks notes, Nicholas "is exactly what he appears to be: an honest servant." He can see not only the faults of others but also his own as well: Nick "is quarrelsome," but not

with women (viii. 37-38). "But he also has standards and adheres to them. He will have nothing to do with the most trifling hypocrisy" as in the deathbed scene when he "is alone in saying exactly what he means." In other words, as Spacks reveals,

> Nick is what he seems to be, he sees through what others seem to be, he is truly honorable--he is, in short, unique in the play. To be sure, he is faced with no such crises as perplex the more important figures of the drama. He is only a minor character, but it is a significant final irony that the standard of normalcy in the play should be supplied by such a figure. As men rise in the social scale, it would seem, their evil increases: the ultimate symbol of corruption is the court. We may suspect that Heywood would have been capable of writing proletarian drama.[83]

Patricia Spacks is concerned here only with A Woman Killed, but her discerning observation is significant for all of Heywood's dramatic works as well. We have noted in our discussion of Edward IV that "the ultimate symbol of corruption is the court." We have observed that "as men rise in the social scale . . . . their evil increases," as in the case of the archvillain Richard III. We will observe the truth of these statements in Chapter IV where Heywood again depicts the corruption of courts and courtiers in such plays as The Royall King, The Fair Maid, and A Mayden-Head Well Lost.

We will also remember Holaday's remarks that even in his last years Heywood was still the devoted royalist, on

[83] Spacks, pp. 330-32.

the one hand, and a "mildly democratic reformer criticizing the court and the government," on the other hand. Holaday also acknowledges that Heywood "sometimes expressed surprisingly democratic opinions on the worth and virtue of humble man."[84] Throughout this study, we will perceive that consistently in play after play, it is generally the lower classes--the poor, the common people, and the servants and clowns--who are the good, decent, honorable people and the ones who can most readily distinguish appearance from reality, not the bourgeoisie, the aristocrats, or the royalty. Furthermore, we shall also see in later discussions of other plays (as in our discussion of Hobs in Edward IV) that it is generally the servant and/or clown who is the spokesman for Heywood's social and moral criticism, and who also provides the comic relief or the realistic note of normalcy that keeps the plays from drifting into maudlin melodrama or into romantic excesses.

In A Woman Killed, the servants, especially Nicholas, clearly fulfill this function, and consequently Heywood no doubt intends that we agree with them, not the other characters. Canuteson, for instance, notes that Nicholas "saves the [judgment] scene from its grotesqueries by shushing everybody," when he says "'Sblood, what a caterwauling keep you here!" (xiii. 146); and Nichols, discussing Nick remarks that

[84] See pp. 10-11 above.

> More than any other character he is aware during the entire play of what is going on and of what the issues are; his comments resemble those of a chorus, and it is he who does more than any other figure to keep the play from degenerating into drivel.
>
> . . . The same quality of accepting things for what they are and of viewing things in true perspective appears in the other servants to a lesser degree.[85]

Otto Rauchbauer concludes that "the servants provide a standard of normality and security against which the audience may judge the main action of the play"; and Cook points out that "it is of vital importance that Nicholas . . . does not blame Anne." Nicholas "becomes the monitor of the tragedy," and ". . . he reinforces the sense that Anne is innocent, defenceless against passion."[86]

Anne is, after all, a weak woman and a sister of Eve. "Mistress Frankford's easy seduction," says W. E. Taylor, "only proves her sisterhood to Eve. Heywood can take for granted that his audience is familiar with the weak nature of woman and so will accept her 'O, Master Wendoll, O!' as the expression of her moral resistance."[87] Like

[85] Canuteson, p. 137, and Nichols, p. 331. See also Van Fossen, p. liv.

[86] Otto Rauchbauer, "Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in Th. Heywood's _A Woman Killed with Kindness_, _English Studies_, 57 (1976), 204; and Cook, p. 367. See also Arthur Brown, "Thomas Heywood's Dramatic Art," in _Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig_, ed. Richard Hosley (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1962), p. 336.

[87] William Edwards Taylor, "The Villainess in Elizabethan Drama," Diss. Vanderbilt Univ. 1957, p. 380. See also Ribner, _Jacobean Tragedy_, p. 57.

Jane Shore, who was helpless in countering the king's siege, Anne seems to be helpless against Wendoll's "frontal attack."[88] Indeed, a number of critics have noted Anne's apparent weakness or helplessness, her weak moral resistance in the face of Wendoll's importunity. Anne herself blames her fall on her lack of wit. As she complains to Wendoll: "That which for want of wit I granted erst / I now must yield through fear. . ." (xi. 112-13). Actually "the decision to sin is Wendoll's" says Canuteson, "and though we cannot excuse Anne, we can at least temper our attitude toward her guilt by blaming Wendoll as Nicholas does" when he muses "It is that Satan hath corrupted her, / For she was fair and chaste . . ." (vi. 179-80).[89]

Cook further shows that "the devotion" of Nicholas and his fellow servants "to Anne in her disgrace, in its simple truth of feeling, emphasizes Frankford's righteous harshness." Furthermore, the other servants "play the part of a very real, but movingly sorrowful chorus," says Cook; and, consequently, ". . . the pathos of Anne being cut off from the ordinary delightfulness of life by her actions is brought very close to us when the servants cry, in sorrow, not in reproach," just prior to Frankford's sentence: "O mistress, mistress, what have you done, mistress?"

[88] See Cook, pp. 357-58.

[89] Canuteson, p. 131.

(xiii. 145).[90] On the road in exile, Sisly attempts to cheer her mistress: "Good mistress, be of good cheer. Sorrow you see hurts you, but helps you not; we all mourn to see you so sad" (xvi. 11-12). When Anne instructs Nicholas to tell Frankford of her vow to starve herself, he replies: "I'll say you wept; I'll swear you made me sad. / Why how now, eyes? what now? what's here to do? / I am gone, or I shall straight turn baby too" (xvi. 66-68). And Nicholas, we will remember, is the only one at Anne's bedside who genuinely pities the dying woman.

If Nicholas and his fellow servants speak for the author, in this play, as indeed they seem to, then their view of the situation, and particularly of Frankford's actions, is the view endorsed by the play and the playwright. We are not to commend Frankford for his somewhat "mild" but revengeful punishment of his wife. We know from Heywood's comments in his Gunaikeion that he himself would not countenance a bloody revenge on an unfaithful wife. In his chapter "Of Adulteresses," he makes his point clear:

> But much is that inhumane rashnesse to bee auoided, by which men haue vndertooke to be their owne justicers, and haue mingled the pollution of their beds with the blood of the delinquents, Cato Censorius reckons such in the number of common executioners, and counts them little better than bloodie hangmen.[91]

[90] Cook, p. 368.

[91] Thomas Heywood, Gunaikeion (London: Adam Islip, 1624), p. 179.

Frankford's sentence of banishment is a lighter punishment and more to be desired than the deliberate cold-blooded murder of his Italianate counterparts who undertake "to be their own justicers." However, since the final outcome is the same in both cases--the erring wife dies--both solutions leave something to be desired. But given Frankford's flawed nature along with Heywood's pessimistic bent, we are not surprised that Frankford (or Shore for that matter) is unable to forgive and forget--to posit the solution of true Christ-like forgiveness and Christian forbearance in giving the unfaithful wife a second chance. If Heywood believed that a man like Frankford could behave like Christ, he would not have a dark, pessimistic world view but an optimistic one. Therefore, it follows that in the context of Heywood's dark vision of the nature of man and of evil, Frankford's decision was inevitable. In such a world a man _would_ punish his wife, not pity her. The critical point is that in such a world revenge is expected. "This is no world in which to pity men," as Uncle Mountford declares, and we have seen that it is obviously no world in which to pity a weak, fallen woman like Anne Frankford.

It should be clear by now that "The world of _A Woman Killed with Kindness_ is not a world of true and significant moral standards"; instead, as Spacks observes, "it is a world of appearances. The appearance of honor is accepted as a substitute for the real thing; the appearance of

prosperity makes men kinsmen"; and finally, "the appearance of virtue is enough to insure a happy ending."[92] There is no doubt that Heywood is intentionally using the theme of appearance and reality to reveal the way of the world in _A Woman Killed_. There is little in the world of his Yorkshire countryside which is what it seems to be in outward appearance. We have observed this time and again in the previous discussion of the characters and their actions. It is also too obvious to ignore in the ironic card game scene (viii) which appears to Anne and Wendoll as an ordinary evening of cards, but which in reality serves Frankford as a "mousetrap" (like Hamlet's) to reveal the true nature of affairs.[93] The theme is equally obvious in the later supper scene when Nicholas delivers Frankford's prearranged letter, and Frankford announces his feigned business in York. Anne, of course, does not know about the "trap" which Frankford has carefully prepared to catch her with Wendoll. She only knows that she has sinned and is fearful of the consequences. "O what a clog unto the soul is sin," she laments, "We pale offenders are still full of fear; / Every suspicious eye brings danger near" (xi. 103-05). Ironically "danger" is nearer than she realizes. Anne has just cause to be "full of fear"; in a few short

[92] Spacks, p. 330.

[93] Cf. Rauchbauer, p. 206.

hours Frankford will stealthily return home and surprise the lovers in bed (xiii. 43). And finally, it is evident that there is little honor between friends in this dark world, only the appearance of loyalty or of honor in friendship.

Wendoll will sacrifice his own honor and that of his friend and protector in order to satisfy his own lust. Yet until the discovery of the adultery, Wendoll appears to be a true friend and an honorable gentleman. But, as with Susan Mountford, it is a specious honor which consists only in outward appearance. L. B. Wright, discussing "the male-friendship cult" in Heywood's plays, finds Wendoll "is little perturbed over the essential immorality of his proposed seduction of Mistress Frankford, but in his first soliloquy he is distressed because he is proving 'a villain and a Traitor to his friend'" (vi. 25).[94] In his seduction of Anne Frankford, Wendoll is also concerned with honor, name, and family: "Or shall I purchase to my father's crest / The motto of a villain! . . ." he asks himself (vi. 95-96). But honor of friend and family does not outweigh his own base and dishonorable desires. Consequently, although he is "of a good house, he is not the honorable gentleman Frankford takes him to be. Nicholas,

[94] Wright, "Male-Friendship," p. 511. And too, as Wright says, when Wendoll does repent his villainy, it "is repentance for this treachery to a friend" (p. 512).

the Frankford servant, seems to be the only one who discerns Wendoll's real nature. Nicholas' instinctive distrust of Wendoll prepares us for Wendoll's future dishonorable villainy. "I do not like this fellow by no means," says Nicholas. ". . . Zounds! I could fight with him, yet know not why; / The Devil and he are all one in my eye" (iv. 85-88). L. B. Wright feels "it is significant that in Frankford's exclamation, on learning from Nick that his wife and Wendoll have played him false, the thought of his friend comes first" (viii. 60-63). Wendoll also later ". . . comes first to Frankford's mind when he exclaims that 'friends and bosom wiues proue so iniust'" (vii. 79). "And finally," says Wright, "Frankford reproaches Wendoll, not for seducing his wife, but for betraying his friendship" (xiii. 75-77).[95]

Frankford's wife Anne must play second fiddle, in other words, to his bosom friend. In reality, love for Anne seems to be the least consideration for Frankford. Before Anne's fall, Frankford gives of his material possessions--". . . every pleasure, fashion, and new toy--" (xiii.109)--not of himself; consequently, after her fall, love is the last thing Frankford thinks of; he is primarily concerned with reputation ("fear of shame"), honor ("regard of honour"), and name ("The blemish of my house" [xiii.117-20]), and even with the loss of his friend,

[95] Wright, p. 512.

Wendoll, not with the loss of his wife. It is interesting to note that his generosity to his wife, not love, is the first thing he mentions when he debates with Anne after the discovery of her infidelity. As Leonora Brodwin remarks, "His first thought is to the central pillar of his pride, his material generosity. When this is denied, he questions his masculinity. It is only last that he turns to love" (xiii. 107-14).[96] His turning to it last suggests that it has the least consequence in his mind.

As with Mistress Shore, Anne Frankford is a wholly sympathetic heroine. Like her earlier sister-in-sin, Heywood's second unfaithful wife is charitable and kind by nature. She reveals her kind nature in her concern for the plight of her brother's antagonist and victim, Sir Charles Mountford. As mentioned earlier, Cranwell, a guest and friend of the Frankfords, admonishes his host for being "remiss" in not attempting to persuade his brother-in-law Sir Francis to be more just and more lenient in his ". . . hard dealing against poor Sir Charles" (xi. 24-27). Frankford replies: "Did not more weighty business of my own / Hold me away, I would have labour'd peace / Betwixt them, with all care; indeed I would, sir" (xi. 28-30). As Canuteson points out, "This is nothing short of a selfish refusal to be a peacemaker: the contrast

[96] Brodwin, p. 111.

with Anne's behavior follows when Anne says that she will write to her brother, Acton, and is commended by Wendoll for her gesture": "A charitable deed," says Wendoll, "And will beget the good opinion / Of all your friends that love you . . ." (xi. 32-34).[97] Ironically, this kindness of Anne occurs at the moment when Frankford is in the process of setting the trap for her and Wendoll. Grivelet notes that "Ce trait de bonté . . . tend à la faire paraître plus comme une touchante victime que comme une criminelle endurcie."[98]

It is a magnificent irony, however, and one undoubtedly intended by Heywood, that it is Anne, the sinner, not Frankford, the so-called "Christian gentleman," who is actually characterized by Christian charity and especially pity, although her "pity" for Wendoll is not Christian but sinful. The one real instance of selfless pity and compassion in the play, outside of that displayed by the servants and maybe Cranwell, is ironically in Anne's surrender to Wendoll. As she confesses to her seducer "You move me, sir, to [com]passion and to pity" (vi. 140). Hardin Craig perceives that

> Wendoll's attack is one calculated to soften a soft nature . . .; he reveals his love, throws himself on Anne's mercy, appeals to her pity. She must choose

[97] Canuteson, p. 135.

[98] Grivelet, Heywood, p. 205.

> between duty, which means cruelty to a submissive and helpless suitor, and pity. She feels a responsibility for the condition her lover is in and for his danger. She is weak in judgement, strong in pity; she is a woman.[99]

"Anne is the type of the frail woman," writes Sturgess: she is "soft and impressionable, without the moral fibre to resist Wendoll's appeal to her mercy," for, of course, "Wendoll's attack [is] an attack based on the tactics of courtly love, desiring pity not reciprocation of passion."[100] Anne succumbs to the solicitations of Wendoll then out of a sense of pity not passion. Mistress Frankford pitied Wendoll; and, for her reward, she is punished without pity by her husband and by her own unpitying conscience. Unlike Sir Charles, Anne cannot forget her transgressions so easily.[101]

There is an ironic juxtaposition in the initial positions of Sir Charles Mountford and Anne Frankford, and an ironic contrast in their final situations. Both begin high on Fortune's Wheel. Sir Charles's "fall" prefigures Anne's fall from grace. Both lose their honor

[99] Craig, p. 132.

[100] Sturgess, p. 44. See also Grivelet, Heywood, pp. 214-15.

[101] Left alone on the field, Sir Charles laments his murder of two men, but his repentance is qualified by his sophistical self-justification (iii. 49-52) and by the fact that after this day, his remorse for his sin is never mentioned again. See Van Fossen, p. lii.

through a weakness in character. For his crime of murder, Sir Charles is sent away to prison, and for her crime of adultery, Anne, too, is sent away to live in exile at another Frankford "manor seven mile off" (xiii. 165). However, after a period of harsh usage and stringent privations, inflicted by others, Sir Charles begins his ascent on the Wheel of Fortune when he regains his "honor" and name of "gentleman" in an alliance with his former enemy. For as Sir Charles tells Susan: "All things on earth thus change, some up, some down" (vii. 7). In the dénouement of A Woman Killed, the Wheel starts up again for Charles as it continues to spin downward for Anne, After a period of stringent privations, self-inflicted in an attempt to regain her lost "honor" and name of "wife," Anne is flung from Fortune's Wheel in her suicidal death.

There is also an ironic contrast in the final position of Anne and her seducer Wendoll. This traitorous friend has offended but he is not punished. Wendoll repays his debt to Frankford by having an affair with his wife Anne; and in seducing the weak Mistress Frankford, Wendoll besmirches the name and honor of his best friend and benefactor. But ironically, although he has offended against the codes of both honor and friendship, he will still be able to regain his own lost honor and good name in his travels "In foreign countries and remoted climes, / Where the report of [his] ingratitude / Cannot be heard. I'll over,

first to France," he says,

> And so to Germany, and Italy,
> Where when I have recovered, and by travel
> Gotten those perfect tongues, and that these rumours
> May in their height abate, I will return;
> And I divine, however, now dejected,
> My worth and parts being by some great man prais'd,
> At my return I may in court be rais'd. (xvi. 127-36)

And while Wendoll can contemplate gaining honor and making a future good name for himself at court, Anne can "divine" only one answer to her dilemma--death. After she has yielded to Wendoll's blandishments, after she has been "wounded" in her "honour'd name" (xvii. 118), she heartily and sincerely repents; then she prepares to die.

In the dénouement of A Woman Killed "all things" in "this" world are "uneven" in terms of rewards for virtue and punishment for vice, as we have just seen in the case of Anne and Wendoll. There is no poetic justice in Heywood's dark vision where men reap the rewards of their villainy or of their lustful passion. In this world, Sir Charles Mountford has his debt of honor paid in full when his greatest enemy, Sir Francis Acton accepts the hand of Sir Charles's sister, the fair and chaste Susan; Wendoll, Frankford's best friend and the seducer of his wife, escapes all punishment as he leaves in pursuit of fame and fortune in foreign climes; and Frankford, the injured husband, who is at least partially responsible for the domestic tragedy, ironically laments that his "kindness"

has killed his unfaithful wife Anne when she sinks into a suicidal death from penitential fasting. Indeed, this is a world in which a virtuous, self-righteous sister of Pamela is rewarded with a wealthy and influential lord and master, while a compassionate but unchaste young wife must dance "The Shaking of the Sheets" or the dance of death in a solo performance.[102] Her husband Frankford (along with Wendoll) has led her in most of the dance steps, but, like Everyman, she must finish this dance alone. Ironically, her "nuptial bed" will be "a cold grave" (xvii. 124); her wedding-sheets will be her winding-sheets; and her "funeral epitaph" will be the ironic inscription: "*Here lies she whom her husband's kindness kill'd*" (xvii. 140 [my italics]). Frankford did not wish to martyr his wife, but, ironically, she is a martyr in the end although no one (except perhaps Nicholas or Cranwell) recognizes it, and least of all Frankford or Anne herself. She has been martyred by "honor" and "charity"--virtues which, in Heywood's world, are too often a matter of outward show only. As the curtain closes, Anne is not only a martyr,

[102] As a foreshadowing of the deathbed conclusion, the play begins with an ironic pun on wedding-sheets: winding-sheets in reference to a popular Elizabethan ballad "The Shaking of the Sheets" (i. 1-5). This balad would appear to be a wedding dance, but in reality, it is "The Doleful Dance and Song of Death." See *The Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. William M. Chappell (1875; rpt. New York: Ams Press, 1966), III, 183-86.

she is also a "scapegoat," for as Ornstein points out, there is an "emotional necessity for her death." This is apparent "If we think of Anne, for a moment, as a Desdemona who was actually false," says Ornstein,

> . . . For like Desdemona, Anne is apparently an ideal, a perfect wife: obedient, loving, gentle, and yielding to her husband. It is dreadful enough that such a woman should fall; it is unforgivable that when she falls, she shows no outward sign of her corruption. . . . If she were obviously degraded by adultery or showed a coarseness of spirit that had been masked by an appearance of modesty, she might be forgiven and redeemed, because her fall would confirm conventional notions of sexual vice. But Anne threatens moral assumptions because she is not hardened or made brazen and contemptible by her fall. She cannot be forgiven her sin because she seems as decent and as morally sensitive after her fall as she did before. . . . In her submissiveness, she is at once the perfectly obedient wife and the ideal victim of the aggressive masculine will, a woman trained to, and praised for, her yielding to a man. A pliant innocent and *a chaste-seeming strumpet*, she is a scapegoat figure who embodies what men desire and fear in women, and whose death is a fitting sacrifice at the altar of the double standard. (my italics)[103]

The English Traveller

Some twenty years later, Heywood created Mrs. Wincott, the "chaste-seeming strumpet" of *The English Traveller*, who, unlike Anne Frankford, has clearly been "degraded by adultery"; she reveals "a coarseness of spirit" in the end "that had been masked by an appearance of modesty" in the beginning. Like Jane Shore and Anne Frankford, she too must die, although she is neither forgiven nor redeemed. Mrs.

[103] Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," pp. 140-41.

Wincott becomes Heywood's third erring wife to become "a scapegoat figure," and another "sacrifice at the altar of the double standard." But here, in this last domestic tragedy, even the heroine is devoid of charity as well as chastity. Here the more cynical and disillusioned Heywood paints a final portrait of an unsympathetic unfaithful wife who is decidedly deceitful as well as dishonorable. In The English Traveller (1624-27; 1633),[104] Heywood expands the plot into a double triangle of one woman and three men, rather than a single triangle of erring wife, an ungrateful lover, and an injured husband employed in the earlier plays Edward IV and A Woman Killed. In his preface "To the Reader," Heywood labels The English Traveller a "Tragi-Comedy" (IV. 5).

The play consists of two plots, one a domestic tragedy of a young adulterous wife, an old impotent husband, a chaste young lover, and a villainous illicit lover; and the other a realistic-satiric Plautine comedy of a prodigal son, a wily servant, and an indulgent father.[105] In the

[104] The English Traveller was written sometime between 1621 and 1633, according to Harbage, but the date of composition is generally set at 1624-27. Entered on the Stationers' Register on July 15, 1633, it was first published in 1633. See Clark, Heywood, p. 119, and Harbage, Annals, pp. 120-21. All quotations from The English Traveller cited in the text are from the Pearson edition by volume and page number.

[105] The subplot is based on the Mostellaria of Plautus which also provided some of the framework for Jonson's The Alchemist. For two instructive source studies, see Hudson, pp. x-xxxiii; and Allan H. Gilbert, "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 12 (1913), 596-97, 600-02, 610.

main plot, Geraldine, a young English traveller, has returned home from abroad to discover that his childhood sweetheart has wed old Mr. Wincott in his absence. Nevertheless, Geraldine and his best friend Dalavill visit and are heartily welcomed at the Wincott household where Geraldine is treated as a surrogate son by the old husband, while Dalavill begins a feigned courtship of Prudentilla, a sister to the young wife. On one of his frequent visits to Mistress Wincott's bedchamber, Young Geraldine and the wife exchange vows to marry in the future after old Wincott's death. Until then, Geraldine pledges to continue living the chaste and circumspect life of a celibate. The relationship proves to be one-sided, however, because Mrs. Wincott is not content with the chaste lifestyle imposed on her through her marriage to an old impotent man and her chaste vow to Geraldine. Instead she pursues an adulterous intrigue with Dalavill under cover of his pretended pursuit of her sister. In the meantime, to remove the inhibiting presence of Geraldine in the Wincott house, the villainous Dalavill suggests to Old Geraldine that his son may be carrying on an illicit affair with his neighbor's young wife. Geraldine subsequently convinces his father of his innocence, but to scotch any further rumors he promises to forgo his visits to the Wincotts. Some time later on a market day, Besse, the chambermaid to Mrs. Wincott, informs Geraldine that her mistress is deceiving him as well as cuckolding

her old husband with Dalavill. Geraldine refuses to believe what he thinks is an obvious slander against his mistress and his bosom friend. On the same occasion, Geraldine meets the Wincott's servant, the clown, who brings word that his master craves his presence to account for his long unexplained absence. Young Geraldine then determines to break his vow to his father and arranges a secret meeting with Old Wincott at midnight on the following Monday. There, after Geraldine confesses to Old Wincott that he has been staying away to save everyone's name and reputation, the old man insists that his young friend spend the night and he retires to bed leaving Geraldine alone. Unable to sleep and propelled by his "fiery loue" (IV. 69), Geraldine decides to pay his mistress a surprise visit. Fortuitously, however, it is Geraldine himself who is surprised when pausing momentarily before the door of the bedchamber, he is arrested by the sound of Dalavill's voice within. The incensed young lover proposes to ". . . act a noble execution" on the villainous pair, but providentially he had left his sword behind in his own chamber (IV. 70). Instead, to himself, he angrily damns the adulterous pair to hell and leaves the house without revealing Mrs. Wincott's guilt. He further resolves, like Matthew Shore, to exile himself from England. Old Wincott prepares a farewell banquet and the materialistic Old Geraldine insists that his son attend lest Old Wincott write Geraldine out of his will in which

Wincott has given him "A faire and large estate . . ." (IV. 86). At the Wincotts' again, Geraldine privately confronts Mistress Wincott with her adultery. She attempts to outface him until he quotes verbatim from her midnight conversation with Dalavill, whereupon she crumbles under the weight of her guilt and dies shortly afterwards. Mrs. Wincott leaves a written confession addressed to her old husband who then chooses not to publish the dishonor. Instead, he feigns grief over his wife's sudden death and ironically makes her chaste lover Geraldine his sole heir. Dalavill, like Wendoll before him, makes a hasty exit after wisely perceiving that "The storme's coming. . . ." He hurriedly saddles a horse and gallops away to seek a safe, snug "harbour" elsewhere (IV. 93). Dalavill becomes an English traveller in the end while Geraldine, the former traveller, is persuaded to remain at home.

Only a bare summary of the subplot need be given here, since it will be reviewed again in part in a later discussion of the theme of appearance and reality. In this Plautine comedy, Lionell, the young profligate, is aided and abetted in his riotous debauchery by the clever fun-loving servant Reignald. After dissipating his father's wealth in his absence, Young Lionell borrows from a usurer to finance his prodigal expenses of entertaining the rioters, courtesans, bawds, and other low-life parasites who frequent the house. When Old Lionell returns unexpectedly from

abroad, he finds his house locked and Reignald at hand to warn him that the place is haunted by the ghost of a murdered guest of the former owner. Actually, Young Lionell along with his mistress Blanda, her bawd Scapha, and other rioters are even then hiding inside the house, trusting in the wily Reignald to deliver them from Old Lionell's wrath. Reignald almost succeeds in his clever manipulation of people and events until his subterfuges are uncovered. Both son and servant repent their folly and promise to mend their ways; both are then heartily forgiven by the indulgent father and master Old Lionell. Like Jonson and Middleton, Heywood exposes the follies and vices of man in the subplot of The English Traveller. In tone and temper this realistic-satiric comedy belongs to the Jacobean age, not the Elizabethan.

The subplot of The English Traveller is not as closely tied to the main plot as in the earlier A Woman Killed. Here in Heywood's last domestic tragedy, Old Lionell, an English merchant, is another English traveller who, like Geraldine, returns from an extended trip abroad only to discover that things have changed in his absence. Moreover, in the discovery scene of the subplot, Old Lionell learns that Young Lionell, his prodigal son, and Reignald, his clever servant, have played him false, just as in the preceding scene of the main plot, Young Geraldine discovers the perfidious falseness of his beloved mistress and his bosom

friend. Like Mistress Wincott, Reignald tries to outface his master in the end but to no avail. Outside of these parallels, the subplot is only loosely linked to the main plot through the humorous accounts related by the clown and Geraldine of the drunken revelry at the neighboring Lionell house prior to Old Lionell's return home, and further by the inclusion of the reunited Lionells, father and son, among the invited guests at Old Wincott's bon voyage feast for Young Geraldine in the _dénouement_.

In the realistic domestic tragedy of the main plot, Heywood is again dealing with the problem of the unfaithful wife. Here as in Heywood's earlier _Edward IV_ and _A Woman Killed_, the issue is also an adulterous love-relationship that destroys a marriage, but in this last domestic tragedy, the marriage is not perfect and ideal even in the beginning or even in appearance. As the clown tells Young Geraldine, who has recently returned from abroad:

> Small doings at home sir, in regard that the age of my Master corresponds not with the youth of my Mistris, and you know cold Ianuary and lusty May seldome meet in coniunction. (IV. 8)

This marriage of Old Wincott and his fair, young wife is antithetical to that of the Frankfords. On the one hand, the Frankfords are well-matched in background and in age for both are young; on the other hand, the Wincotts' January-May "coniunction" was neither wished for nor sought

by the wife, as she admits to Geraldine when they meet in her bedroom and exchange vows. And like Jane Shore before her (I. 24), Mrs. Wincott expresses her fidelity to her husband in this same conversation with Geraldine:

> Y. Ger. A villaine were hee, to deceiue such trust,
> Or (were there one) a much worse Carracter.
> Wife. And she no lesse, whom either Beauty, Youth
> Time, Place, or opportunity could tempt,
> To iniure such a Husband. (IV. 31)

This exchange between two chaste lovers is highly ironic, because even at the time, as they secretly vow to marry after Mr. Wincott's death, they are deceiving the old husband, who suspects nothing in their relationship. More ironic still is the fact that when Mrs. Wincott is tempted "to iniure such a Husband," she does so not with Geraldine, as one might expect at this point in the drama, but with Dalavill, Geraldine's best friend. In this play, as noted before, the triangle in Edward IV and A Woman Killed has been converted into a double triangle.

The emphasis is also different in Heywood's last domestic tragedy. In marked contrast to the sympathy aroused for the earlier heroines Jane Shore and Anne Frankford, there is little, if any, for Mrs. Wincott in this play. Heywood now portrays more corrupt characters, not only in the wife but also in the injured husband and the two lovers as well. Instead of repeating the same pattern of a basically good but unchaste heroine who falls through

weakness or pity, Heywood creates a much stronger character who proves to be an unyielding, immodest, immoral, dissembling, and disobedient woman. The disillusioned critic of society clearly shows that some middle-class wives are not admirable at all but sly and deceitful instead. In The English Traveller, Heywood is dealing with a January-May marriage, and consequently, the stage seems set for a comedy in which the young wife will cuckold her deserving old impotent husband. Here, however, the situation is complicated by two young lovers--one chaste and one unchaste--and by the fact that this is a domestic tragedy, not a comedy. In The English Traveller, Heywood also omits the seduction scene entirely and slurs over the tearful pathetic deathbed scene; the death of Mrs. Wincott occurs offstage and is only reported. In this drama "the wages of sin" is still death for the unfaithful wife, but the critical point is made with less finesse; hence, it is even more obvious. No one at all pities Mrs. Wincott, not even the servants. Unmistakably, "This is no world in which to pity" an unsympathetic erring wife. This becomes painfully obvious when we compare the fate of Mrs. Wincott to that of her two lovers, Dalavill and Geraldine. Again, for the third time, only the woman dies as the ritual scapegoat on "the altar of the double standard." Moreover, since the subplot depicts a riotous youth and a knavish servant who are forgiven their multiple transgressions, there is

once again no poetic justice in a somber world in which a scapegoat dies and a scapegrace thrives.

As in Heywood's other domestic tragedies, the subplot also carries most of the social satire and critical commentary. Here too, the servants become the principal mouthpieces for Heywood's criticism of youths who waste their father's hard-earned substance in debauchery. And as with Jane Shore and Anne Frankford, it is the sinner, Young Lionell himself, who expresses the moral, in this case the critical point that "In Youth there is a Fate, that swayes vs still, / To know what's Good, and yet pursue what's Ill" (IV. 23). This young scapegrace knows whereof he speaks, because he hotly pursues "what's Ill"--"Dice, Drinke, and Drab." As Robin, the country servant reveals to Old Lionell after he returns home and cannot find his son:

> Old Lio. Where's my sonne,
> That Reignald poasting for him with such speed,
> Brings him not fron the Countrey?
> Rob. Countrey Sir?
> 'Tis a thing they know not; Heere [city] they Feast,
> Dice, Drinke, and Drab; The company they keepe,
> Cheaters and Roaring-Ladds, and these attended
> By Bawdes and Queanes: Your sonne hath got a
> Strumpet,
> On whom he spends all that your sparing left,
> And heere they keepe court; To whose damn'd
> abuses,
> Reignald giues all encouragement. (IV. 76)

Thus the age-old antitheses of youth versus age, city versus country, faithful versus knavish servants are set up in this Plautine comedy.

Unlike his Biblical counterpart, this prodigal son remains at home. In this case, it is the father who journeys afar, while the son turns his home into "a common Stewes." The faithful servant Robin paints a vivid picture of the debauchery and riot of the prodigal son Young Lionell in Robin's dialogue with the wily servant Reignald--a conversation in which one can see the heavy hand of the social critic:

> Rob. Prancke it doe,
> Waste, Ryot, and Consume, Mispend your Howres
> In drunken Surfets, lose your dayes in sleepe,
> And burne the nights in Reuells, Drinke and Drab,
> Keepe Christmasse all yeere long, and blot leane
> Lent
> Out of the Calender; all that masse of wealth
> Got by my Masters sweat and thrifty care,
> Hauocke in prodigall vses; Make all flie,
> Powr't downe your oylie throats, or send it smoaking
> Out at the tops of chimnies: At his departure,
> Was it the old mans charge to haue his windowes
> Glister all night with Starres? his modest House
> Turn'd to a common Stewes? his Beds to pallats
> Of Lusts and Prostitutions? his Buttery hatch
> Now made more common than a Tauernes barre,
> His Stooles that welcom'd none but ciuill guests,
> Now onely free for Pandars, Whores and Bawdes,
> Strumpets, and such. (IV. 15-16)

Reignald deceives his old master by making things appear to be one thing when in reality they are quite different. Robin, who can see through Reignald, is more clear-sighted than his master Old Lionell. But then, he has observed the villainy of Reignald at first hand while his master was away.

Here again, as in Heywood's other plays, it is plainly the servant Robin who, like his country cousin Nicholas, is decent, honorable, and morally perceptive. Reignald is a servant too, but he does not act or think like the typical Heywood servant. Reignald does not serve; he rules. As he tells Robin, while their master is gone, he himself is "the mighty Lord and Seneshcall / Of this great house and castle . . ." (IV. 14). Reignald, of course, has been poured into the Plautine mold. He is closely based on his prototype Tranio in the _Mostellaria_ of Plautus and bears little resemblance to Heywood's usual servants, like Robin and Nicholas, who are cut from an English pattern.

As has been shown above, Nicholas, of _A Woman Killed_, is the one character in the play who can consistently distinguish between appearance and reality. Reignald can also distinguish between the two, but, as Norman Rabkin observes, he "makes his way by brilliant manipulation of the actual situations in which he is involved, and of their appearances," and "It is this faculty of being able--until old Lionell beats him at his own game--to see both the appearance and the reality at once, which gives Reignald his power over the other characters."[106] Reignald convinces his master Old Lionell, newly returned from sea, that his own house is haunted, that he now owns his neighbor

[106] Rabkin, Dramatic Deception," pp. 8-10.

Ricott's house, that his son, Young Lionell, is a prudent young man, and that Reignald himself is a faithful servant. While the debauched Young Lionell and his friends are hiding inside the house, Reignald convinces his master that the house is haunted--that it has "growne Prodigious, / Fatall, Disasterous vnto" the Lionells (IV. 39). Next, when the usurer demands payment for the money Young Lionell had borrowed to supply the "prodigall expences" (IV. 49) of son and servant, in Old Lionell's absence,[107] Reignald convinces his master that the money was used by his prudent son to purchase the Ricott house (IV. 52). The prudent son, however, is actually "the Prince of Prodigallity" (IV. 26), a spendthrift and a rioter, while Reignald is a dissembling, deceitful rogue, not the "kinde seruant" his master ironically calls him (IV. 87) after Reignald's deceptions are exposed.

That there is not a wily deceptive servant in either _Edward IV_ or _A Woman Killed_ is a measure of the increasing pessimism and cynicism of the playwright. We still find the good servant (Robin) in _The English Traveller_, but he is no longer the featured servant. In this late play, it is the knavish Reignald who takes the spotlight away from not only Robin but also the hero Young Lionell as well. In

[107] As in _A Woman Killed_, Heywood lodges a protest against the practices of usurers when Reignald says: "Pox a this vse, that hath vndone so many; / And now will confound mee" (IV. 51).

the period between his first and last domestic tragedies, Heywood's vision has darkened considerably, and he has revealed an even closer affinity with his fellow Jacobean playwrights. As a matter of fact, Reignald will undoubtedly remind one of Jonson's Face, as Rabkin notes, in "conducting the revels in the absence of the master of the house . . ." and in some of his ingenious machinations as he attempts to outface his master when he returns unexpectedly. Rabkin discerns that both plots in _The English Traveller_ "involve the unmasking of a dissembler," and he concludes that "If the theme [of appearance and reality] develops in the main plot chiefly through the role played by Mistress Wincott, it does so in the subplot through the actions of Reignald." In the main plot, the _dénouement_ involves the unmasking of Mrs. Wincott, for "the good appearance she has so firmly established in the eyes of young Geraldine and the audience must be destroyed," says Rabkin. Prior to this, there had only been Bess's hint that her mistress "has been dishonest."[108]

Thus it is primarily through Heywood's favorite theme of appearance versus reality that his dark vision of man and of evil is projected to his audience/reader. "Heywood's play," says Rabkin, "reflects the theme of life as a mystery,

[108] Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception," pp. 9-10, 8, 6.

the solution to which lies hidden behind any one of a number of appearances." Rabkin also notes that in The English Traveller,

> Old Lionel has weathered the storms of the world's seas only to return to seas far more evil. Heywood seems to be presenting the world as a sea in which what appears to be a safe harbor may not necessarily be so--again appearance and reality. . .[109]

In the characterization of Mrs. Wincott Heywood proves once again that he is keenly aware of the evils, ambiguities, and complexities in the human condition. Here the grey areas darken as the technique of the foil is completely inverted and literally stood on its end. In this play, the chaste maiden Prudentilla is a much more admirable character than her sister, the adulterous wife, Mrs. Wincott, and more honorable than her counterpart Susan in A Woman Killed, but then Prudentilla plays a very minor role. We see much less of her than of Susan in the earlier play; and, furthermore, her virtue is never put to the test as is Susan's. Prudentilla's raison d'être is primarily to serve as a virtuous foil for her unvirtuous sister, and to provide a shield for Mrs. Wincott's adultery with Dalavill, Prudentilla's ostensible suitor. The contrast between Mrs. Wincott's evil and her sister's virtue is both intentional and ironic, for while Mrs. Wincott rebukes her sister for

[109] Rabkin, pp. 14-15.

her flirtatious behavior, her own adultery is in ironic contrast to Prudentilla's more innocent playfulness. Prudentilla is "An incurable flirt," as Nichols points out, and "she exercises her talents freely, . . . but she is virtuous."[110] Mrs. Wincott is not virtuous and she does not even fare very well in comparison with the whore Blanda, the "heroine" of the subplot in The English Traveller, who has set her affections on one man, Young Lionell, against the advice of her friend, the bawd Scapha:

> Sca. Ile tell thee Daughter; In that thou knowest thy selfe to bee beloued of so many, and setlest thy affection, only vpon one; Doth the Mill grinde onely, when the Wind sits in one corner? . . . Or he a Skilfull Musician, that plaies but on one String? Is there but one way to the Wood? And but one Bucket that belongs to the Well? To affect one, and despise all other, becomes the precise Matron, not the Prostitute; the loyall Wife, not the loose Wanton:
> (IV. 20)

Undoubtedly, the irony is intentional on Heywood's part, in that it is Mrs. Wincott, the ostensibly "precise Matron" and "loyall Wife" who actually follows Scapha's advice in keeping three men on the string (Mr. Wincott, Geraldine, and Dalavill), where the "Prostitute," the "loose Wanton" Blanda gives complete fidelity to only one (Lionell).

In contrast to Heywood's earlier domestic tragedies, Heywood devotes no time at all to the seduction of Mrs. Wincott. The first hint that she is not a paragon of virtue

[110] Nichols, p. 187.

and propriety occurs late in the play (Act III) when the maid Bess reveals to Geraldine that her mistress has been carrying on an affair with his best friend, Dalavill, for an undetermined period of time. But since Geraldine refuses to believe Bess, it is even later (Act IV) when Mrs. Wincott is definitely revealed for what she really is: a sly, deceitful adulteress. The absence of a seduction scene is seen by Frederick Boas as the biggest flaw in Heywood's dramatic technique in The English Traveller, for "Mistress Wincott falls from virtue even without the short struggle of Nan Frankford and though she is doubly pledged to her husband and Geraldine."[111] No doubt a woman who is already "doubly pledged" could just as easily become triply pledged. Mrs. Wincott has already gone behind her husband's back in giving her secret pledge to Geraldine, so why not deceive her old, impotent husband, Mr. Wincott, and her young, chaste lover, Geraldine, by taking a young, real lover, Dalavill? For as Taylor points out, Mrs. Wincott "is more than just weak. Once involved in sin, she is a sly sinner"; and Herndl sums up the situation by proposing that "there is no motive for Mistress Wincott's treachery, only the motiveless malignity of 'the flesh' and the irresistibility of concupiscence." Herndl adds, however, that by the end of the play, Mrs. Wincott "is made wholly sympathetic and is

[111] Boas, p. 46.

felt to be a victim of evil."[112] It is questionable, however, that Mrs. Wincott ever becomes "wholly sympathetic" even in her eleventh-hour repentance and subsequent death. Furthermore, if she is "a victim of evil," much of the evil is of her own making. Heywood's failure to motivate Mrs. Wincott's fall is not a flaw in Heywood's technique as Boas suggests above; instead, it is another indication of Heywood's increasing pessimism. For in Mrs. Wincott we see the culmination of the progressive deterioration in the character of the fallen woman; with this "sly sinner," we have come a long way from the sympathetic helplessness of a Jane Shore or the innate weakness of an Anne Frankford. Heywood's first fallen wife Jane Shore is repentant even before she sins; Anne Frankford is already repentant before the discovery of her adultery (xi. 103-08, 110-14); but the last adulteress Mrs. Wincott is repentant only after she can no longer conceal her infidelity.

As with the heroines, there has also been a progressive disintegration in the character of the heroes, Shore, Frankford, and both Old Wincott and Geraldine, as well as in the villains Edward IV, Wendoll, and Dalavill. In The English Traveller, Dalavill (like Wendoll) ". . . first appeares, a Gentleman, / And well conditioned" (IV. 24), but in reality, he is a dissembling villain. Old

[112] Taylor, p. 70, and Herndl, p. 177.

Wincott appears to have some reservations about Dalavill (perhaps an intuitive response like Nicholas' to Wendoll) until he is reminded by his wife that Dalavill is Geraldine's bosom friend (IV. 23-24) and this instantly dissipates any mistrust on the part of the old husband. Like Frankford (and most of Heywood's characters) Old Wincott is blind to the true nature of others; he is blind to the true nature of his wife, of his friend and soon to be wife's "secret" lover (Geraldine), and of this friend's friend and soon to be wife's real lover (Dalavill). But as Old Geraldine later ironically remarks: "How men are borne, / To woe their owne disasters?" (IV. 45).

Old Geraldine is himself deceived by his son's "Noble Friend" Dalavill (IV. 44). This deceitful villain plays a part similar to that of Shakespeare's Iago, only in this case his false insinuations are for his friend's father rather than for the lady's husband. When Dalavill suggests to Old Geraldine that his son Geraldine is having an illicit affair with Mrs. Wincott, he ironically claims that he is motivated only by his regard for the reputation of his friend Young Geraldine and for the "Honour" of Mrs. Wincott, "As one," he says, "to whom I hope to be allyed, / By Marriage with her Sister" Prudentilla (IV. 44). Dalavill then repeats the spurious rumours and concludes each lie with the Iago-like refrain "I thinke they both are honest"

(IV. 43-44).[113] Old Geraldine, completely taken in by his treachery, ironically comments that Dalavill has done "The office of a Noble Gentleman" (IV. 44). We later learn the true purpose of Dalavill's dissembling--to keep Geraldine away from the Wincott house so as to give himself a clear field with the young wife. To further his plan, Dalavill also dissembles an interest in Prudentilla. He appears to court her while, in reality, he is pursuing an affair with her sister. And Mrs. Wincott, caring nothing for her sister's feelings, will also use Prudentilla as a screen for her affair with Dalavill.

In comparing the villains Wendoll and Dalavill, Robert Hudson reminds us that Wendoll does at least struggle with his conscience before he proceeds to seduce his friend's wife. Dalavill, on the other hand, is "conscienceless."[114] This "same" Dalavill, the ". . . false periur'd traitor . . . / To friend and goodnesse . . ." this "Serpent" and "Synon," as the undeceived Geraldine later calls him (IV. 70), breaks the code of both honor and friendship with impunity. He even boasts of his betrayal of friendship when he assures his mistress, Mrs. Wincott, that his friend Geraldine is ". . . a Cox-combe, fit to be so fool'd" (IV. 90). But, in contrast, Wendoll, villain though he is,

[113] Cf. Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception," p. 5. Othello (1604) was written and first performed around a quarter of a century before The English Traveller.

[114] Hudson, p. lxiv. See also Johnson, pp. 95-96.

is not so base as to brag about his betrayal of friendship. As we have seen, Wendoll is primarily remorseful precisely because he betrayed his erstwhile friend Frankford when he seduced his wife.

The English Traveller opens, ironically, with the words "Oh friend" (IV. 7). The words are addressed to Geraldine by his "choice friend" Dalavill (IV. 56). In this play, as in A Woman Killed, the appearance of friendship disguises the reality that Dalavill, like Wendoll, is a false traitorous friend, not a "choice" true one. As with Frankford and Mr. Wincott, there is great irony in Geraldine's self-deception, in his failure to perceive the true nature of his relationship with his false lover, Mrs. Wincott, and with his false friend, Dalavill. There is even greater irony in the fact that Geraldine cannot perceive his own true nature. This young man is even more selfish and smugly self-righteous than Frankford and, ironically, with even less cause, seeing that his relationship is a "secret loue" (IV. 56) with his old friend's young wife, not a relationship with his own wife, as in Frankford's case.

It appears to be an intentional irony on Heywood's part, as well as a strong indication of greater cynicism, that while Frankford invites the villain Wendoll into his own home, Geraldine introduces the villain Dalavill into the home of his friend and future benefactor (IV. 13). It is ironic that Geraldine, like Frankford, is partially

to blame for both the fall and the death of the woman he claims to have loved. His introduction of Dalavill into the Wincott's house and his later absence from their house, because of Dalavill's machinations and Geraldine's vow to his father, ironically pave the way for the adulterous liaison between his mistress and his bosom friend. Geraldine is further responsible to some degree for Mrs. Wincott's death. Frankford ironically kills his wife with "kindness"; Geraldine ironically kills his mistress with unkindness, for he utters, as Grivelet notes, "the cruel words which will kill the false beloved."[115] Like Master Frankford too, Young Geraldine is not really concerned with his lady's salvation or spiritual well-being. Conversely, he actually damns her soul and Dalavill's to hell: "Damne on, reuenge too great; And to suppresse / Your soules yet lower, without hope to rise," he rants, "Heape Ossa vpon Pelion . . ." (IV. 70).

It is surprising, therefore, that Geraldine (like Frankford) has been extolled as an honorable Christian gentleman by so many critics. Hudson feels that Geraldine is one of Heywood's "typical heroes whose virtue and honor are beyond reproach"; Ward distinguishes Geraldine as "assuredly one of the truest gentlemen of Elisabethan comedy"; Velte sees him as "a cultured gentleman and

115 Grivelet, "Simplicity," p. 59.

traveler . . . the young man, who is portrayed as the soul of honour . . ."; Herrick likewise calls him "the soul of honor," while Otelia Cromwell speaks of him as "the wife's knightly admirer," as one of Heywood's "pattern gentlemen," along with Frankford, and as one of his "exemplary people," for, according to Cromwell, Matthew Shore, Frankford, and Young Geraldine are "the long-suffering heroes who bend to the lash of fate"; Swinburne also feels that Geraldine is "worthy to stand beside [Frankford] as a typical sample of English manhood at its noblest and gentlest . . ."; and Hudson agrees that Frankford and Geraldine "are the gentlemen heroes, . . . Honorable, loyal, and unselfish, both rise above their personal injury to exemplify the spirit of forgiveness"; Aronstein thinks that Frankford, Geraldine, and Old Wincott are all "christian gentlemen"; Cromwell believes that "As dramatic figures, Master Frankford and Young Geraldine are admirable foils to the inconstant wives; but, absolutely flawless, they are superhuman," as well as "patterns of righteousness"; Velte extolls Geraldine as "a good son and a noble Christian character. . . . He is the young citizen as he should be."[116] On the other hand, Marilyn

[116] Hudson, p. lxxii; Ward, History, p. 565; Velte, p. 109; Herrick, p. 285; Cromwell, pp. 75, 80, 175; Swinburne, p. 240; Hudson, p. lviii; Aronstein, p. 241; Cromwell, pp. 78, 127; and Velte, p. 111.

Johnson and Hudson feel that Geraldine is not the model Christian gentleman that Master Frankford is, while Clark argues that "This rigidly moral and virtuous young man, who in his relations skates on the thinnest of ice, is much less sympathetic than Frankford because he has been sophisticated according to fashion"; and Ornstein suggests that "Like Philaster and Amintor, he has the contradictory doubleness of Fletcherian characterization: he is both heroic and inept, sublime and ridiculous."[117]

On the question of Geraldine's chaste relationship with Mrs. Wincott, the critics are also divided: On the one hand, Norman Rabkin maintains that both Geraldine and Mrs. Wincott "show an impressive self-restraint and concern for honor as they pledge never to deceive Wincott; their vow . . . is thoroughly virtuous"; and J. A. Symonds proposes that Fletcher himself could not have rendered the espousal scene "with greater ease and delicacy." In this scene, ". . . The calm strength and honourable feeling displayed by this Paola and his Francesca in their perilous interview are the result of unsuspecting innocence and sweetness" says Symonds, and "If the situation is almost unnatural and disagreeable, the poet has contrived to invest it with the air of purity, reality, sincerity, and

[117] Johnson, p. 95; Hudson, pp. lxvi-lxvii; Clark, Heywood, p. 239; and Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," p. 136.

health."[118] On the other hand, in opposition to Symonds, A. M. Clark feels that

> Young Geraldine is the Fletcherian prig, sickled [sic] o'er with the unhealthy complexion of the age of decadence. . . . It is the core of the play that is rotten; it is not the husband of the woman who is wronged, not even the lover of a widow, but the lover of another's wife; and this hero has exchanged with the woman oaths of constancy to be effective after her aged husband's death . . . Perhaps Fletcher himself could not have realized "a difficult scene with greater ease and delicacy than are displayed in the interview between young Geraldine and Wincot's wife" [see Symonds above]. But why must this Paola and his Francesca choose the bedroom of the woman to exchange their vows? . . . This is not merely unpleasant, it is absurd.[119]

Clark is quite right, for this chaste, exemplary lover seems to spend more time in Mistress Wincott's bedchamber than anywhere else. As he confesses to the servant Besse: ". . . I haue beene with her at all houres, / Both late and early; In her bed-chamber" (IV. 57).

Ironically, on the night Geraldine discovers the adultery of his mistress and friend, he is slipping around behind Old Wincott's back in visiting his wife in her bedchamber. Furthermore, in the earlier "priuate meeting" with his friend Wincott, at the latter's house, Geraldine is breaking his oath to his own father in going behind his

[118] Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception," p. 5, and Symonds, "Heywood," p. xiv.

[119] Clark, Heywood, pp. 238-39. Cf. Brodwin, p. 119.

back to visit their neighbor Wincott: "Though neere so strict hath bin my fathers charge," he says, "A little I'le dispense with't . . ." (IV. 59). It is doubly ironic that while Geraldine is deceiving his father and his old friend Mr. Wincott, he is being deceived by his own best friend Dalavill. Actually, once Old Wincott has retired for the night, Geraldine longs for the company of his mistress and decides to pay a secret visit to her in her bedchamber. As he muses:

> The house is knowne to me, the staires and roomes;
> The way vnto her chamber frequently
> Trodden by me at mid-night, and all houres:
> How ioyful to her would a meeting be,
> So strange and vnexpected; Shadowed too
> Beneath the vaile of night; I am resolu'd
> To giue her visitation, in that place
> Where we haue past deepe vowes, her bed-cham-
> ber:
> *My fiery loue* this darkenesse makes seeme bright,
> *And this the* path that leades to my delight.
> . . . And this the gate vntoo't . . .
> (IV. 69 [my italics])

These are scarcely the words and actions of a model of honor and propriety; rather they are the words and actions of a hypocritical young man. As Robert Hudson points out, "There is a strong suggestion of sensual passion" in this passage. Furthermore, "one cannot help wondering," says Hudson, "what the deportment of the noble hero would have been had he found his lady alone."[120] The point is

[120] Hudson, pp. lxx, lxxii.

well-taken. This clandestine "arrangement" with Mrs. Wincott also "instances the hypocritical character of Heywood's ethical world." For as Herndl says: "The way to her bedchamber . . . is a path that he has 'frequently trodden . . . at midnight, and all hours'--in perfect innocence, although he is filled with 'fiery loue.'"[121] A good point too but more importantly, the "arrangement . . . instances" Heywood's pessimism and cynicism at this time. This could not have been written by a genial, optimistic spokesman for bourgeois morality. As a critic of that same society, however, Heywood is revealing once again the deceitful way of the world. This is particularly apparent in the scene where Geraldine discovers the adultery and in the later concluding scene where he denounces his former lady (IV. 88-91). The shallowness of the code of honor to which he thinks himself committed is clearly revealed in these two key scenes.

In the former case, as he stands outside of Mrs. Wincott's bedchamber, eavesdropping on the adulterous lovers, the furious Geraldine exclaims:

> . . . Tis the same false periur'd traitor, Dalauill,
> To friend and goodnesse: Vnchaste impious woman,
> False to all faith, and true coniugall loue;
> . . . . But my Sword,
> I'le act a noble execution,
> On two vnmatcht for sordid villanie:--
> I left it in my Chamber, And thankes Heauen

[121] Herndl, pp. 175-76.

> That I did so; It hath preuented me
> From playing a base Hang-man; . . .
> . . . . Although I pardon,
> Heauen will find time to punish, I'le not stretch
> *My just reuenge* so farre, as once by blabbing,
> To make your brazen Impudence to blush;
> *Damne on, reuenge too great*; And to suppresse
> Your Soules yet lower, without hope to rise,
> Heape Ossa vpon Pelion; . . . (IV. 70 [my italics])

Ironically the revengeful Geraldine blames Mrs. Wincott for being "False to all faith, and true coniugall loue." It never occurs to the hypocritical, self-centered young man that in Mrs. Wincott's relationship with him as well as in her relationship with Dalavill, she is "False" in that she is married to Old Wincott not to Geraldine. Moreover, Geraldine himself is false to the faith placed in him by her husband and by his own father. He self-righteously speaks of "My just reuenge," not Wincott's. He is not concerned about his old friend, the husband, at all. Like the typical middle-class hero of Heywood, he thinks only of himself. Geraldine, like Frankford, would have played "a base Hang-man" and killed Mrs. Wincott and Dalavill had he not left his sword in his chamber. In this situation, however, it is ironically the lover, not the husband, who would have acted "a noble execution" on the wife and her other lover. Hypocritically he says: "I pardon" but then ironically undercuts any notion of a pardon by his subsequent vindictive statements and by his own revengeful action and statements in his later confrontation with

Mrs. Wincott--a confrontation which ironically kills her.

Mrs. Wincott, like Anne Frankford, dies in expiation of her "heinous" sins, but in The English Traveller there is not even a Nicholas to pity her. Of course, she is much less worthy of pity than Anne Frankford, but her erstwhile lover Geraldine flatly refuses even to forgive her, penitent though she is at last. Geraldine's own vanity has been hurt, and the bitter young man will not forgive the lady. Geraldine is even more revengeful when he confronts Mrs. Wincott with her guilt at the end of the play than in the earlier scene when he discovers her illicit liaison with Dalavill. On the occasion of his last confrontation with Mrs. Wincott, she asks him who gave him "this intelligence," and he answers:

> Onely hee,
> That pittying such an Innocencie as mine
> Should by two such delinquents bee betray'd,
> Hee brought me to that place by mirracle;
> And made me an eare witnesse of all this.
> (IV. 91)

Forgetting "the 'fiery loue' that prompted him to her bedchamber," says Ornstein, Young Geraldine "declares that God led him to the place 'by miracle.'" Ornstein further points out that Geraldine's "indignation has an ironic aspect . . . for he discovers the Wife's lust only because

he attempts to visit her bedchamber late at night."[122] One should notice too he insists that his "innocencie," not the husband's has been betrayed. He is correct of course; the cunning adulteress Mrs. Wincott has actually betrayed both men. It is quite understandable that Geraldine should feel a deep sense of betrayal and loss at this point, but it is also characteristic of this young man that he always thinks of himself first. Here, he does not even consider the old husband, his friend and generous benefactor; he is too caught up in his own anger and resentment. This becomes more apparent when Mrs. Wincott falls upon her knees to begin her repentance and Geraldine continues his self-righteous tirade:

> Tush, bow to Heauen,
> Which thou hast most offended; I alas,
> Saue in such (Scarce vnheard of) Treacherie,
> Most sinfull like thy selfe; Wherein, Oh wherein,
> Hast my vnspotted and vnbounded Loue
> Deseru'd the least of these? Sworne to be made a
> stale
> For terme of life; And all this *for my goodnesse*;
> *Die, and die soone*, acquit me of my Oath,
> But prethee die repentant . . . (IV. 91 [my italics])

But since Geraldine has damned Mrs. Wincott earlier (IV. 70) and selfishly desires her death now, one finds it difficult to believe he is really interested in her repentance, really interested in anything except his "owne wrongs."

[122] Ornstein, "Bourgeois Morality," pp. 134-35.

He only wishes for her to "die and die soone" so he will be free of his oath. Early in the drama, in the first scene of the play, Heywood hints that this egocentric young hero will prove to be a different man from what he appears to be. As Geraldine tells Prudentilla: "I should be loath / Professe in *outward shew* to be one Man. / And prooue my selfe another" (IV. 12 [my italics]).

The husband, old Mr. Wincott, proves to be only slightly more kind and charitable than Geraldine. Wincott does pardon his wife when he learns of her infidelity directly after her death; but his pardon costs him nothing, especially since no one else need ever know that a "crime" has been committed. It is not surprising then that he will mourn Mrs. Wincott's untimely death only for the sake of appearance. But along with Geraldine, he must share some of the responsibility for his young wife's undoing. "The old man," as Grivelet notes, "obviously has a large share of responsibility in the drama, for the dangerous situation from which so much unhappiness will result for everyone is largely due to his own possessiveness."[123] Ironically, Old Wincott's "possessiveness" is not related to his wife at all but to Young Geraldine, whom he is continually trying to woo away from his own father Old Geraldine. As Young Geraldine confesses to Dalavill: "Hee studies to

[123] Grivelet, "Simplicity," p. 62.

engrosse mee to himselfe, / And is so wedded to my company, / Hee makes mee stranger to my Fathers house" (IV. 9). Old Wincott actually reveals no love whatsoever for his beautiful young wife, only a possessive, doting "loue," (IV. 13) if one can call such selfish emotion love at all, for Geraldine who represents to him the heir _he_ should have had rather than Old Geraldine, his neighbor (IV. 10). Moreover, Old Wincott accepts Dalavill into his home, even accepts him (against his own intuitive distrust of Dalavill) as a man whose "Worth" is "vnquestioned," strictly because he is Geraldine's companion and friend (IV. 24). But finally, and most ironic of all, after the sudden death of Mrs. Wincott, the old husband is free to "remarry," this time closer to his heart's desire--Young Geraldine! In the ironic dialogue which concludes this highly ironic scene--the last speech in the play--Old Wincott outlines a "till death do us part" mating between himself and his surrogate son and now sole legal heir Geraldine: ". . . This meeting that was made / Onely to take of you a parting leaue," says Old Wincott, "Shall now be made a Marriage of our Loue, / Which none saue onely Death shall separate," an alliance which will begin with the "marriage" feast and end with a hypocritical period of mourning for the dead wife:

> First feast, and after Mourne; Wee'le like some Gallants
> That Bury thrifty Fathers, think't no sinne,
> To weare Blacks without, but other Thoughts within.
> (IV. 94-95)

In the conclusions to both A Woman Killed and The English Traveller, the hypocrisy of Heywood's heroes is so pervasive it is surprising that so many seem to have missed it, or if they have observed the hypocrisy (one can hardly miss it entirely), they have not stopped to consider what this means--what Heywood is actually emphasizing about his "exemplary" gentlemen. Of the three husbands, Matthew Shore, ironically, will die with his wife, although he is not willing to live with her again after her fall; Frankford, on the other hand, will neither live with his wife nor die with her, although he hypocritically says he wishes to (xvii. 95-97). And Old Wincott, shaken very little by his wife's death is even more of a hypocrite about his intentions to conceal his shame by wearing black in token of mourning the untimely but convenient death of the fallen woman. Yet all of these husbands are generally lauded by the critics as model Christian gentlemen and exemplary husbands.

Moreover, some of the women in these plays are scarcely "exemplars" themselves. Actually, in these domestic tragedies, kinship like friendship means little or nothing to the selfish, self-centered, and hypocritical characters, like Mrs. Wincott, who populate his world. We will remember that in Edward IV, the queen loves Jane as a sister, although she is, of course, no kin; in fact the queen has every reason to hate Jane, her husband's

"bedfellow" (I. 126). This is significant in light of the fact that a sister-in-law and a real sister have neither love nor pity for a sister-in-law and a sister respectively; and, moreover, in contrast to the queen, each has no reason whatsoever to hate her relative. But, as we have seen, neither Susan Mountford nor Mrs. Wincott has any love or pity for Anne or Prudentilla. Susan's conceited, self-righteous hypocrisy towards her dying sister-in-law, Anne Frankford, is evident in her sententious, unfeeling summation of Anne's plight (xvii. 31-32). More ignoble, and more heartless still, is the wilful and deceitful Mrs. Wincott who will use her trusting young sister as a screen to conceal her illicit affair with Dalavill. Between Heywood's portrayal of a sister-in-spirit (the queen) to a sister-in-law (Susan) to a sister-in-blood (Mrs. Wincott), there has been a profound change in this allegedly genial, kindly, and lovable playwright, a progressive darkening of his spirit over the twenty-five year period. Heywood reveals his own kinship with his fellow Jacobean playwrights in all of his domestic tragedies but never more clearly than in the final play _The English Traveller_. The progress of Heywood's cynicism is graphically underlined by his ending of his last domestic tragedy with a "marriage" of an old husband with the culpable young lover of the dead wife, rather than with another repetition of the ironic but

much less cynical marriage-in-death of injured husband and guilty wife in his first two domestic tragedies.

Characteristically, in the concluding scene of the final play featuring an erring wife, Heywood is not indulging in poetic justice by rewarding virtue and punishing vice and evil, as one might expect from an optimistic spokesman for middle-class morality and ideals. In the _dénouement_ of _The English Traveller_, the selfish, hypocritical lover Geraldine earnestly desires the death of Mrs. Wincott so that he will be free from his secret vow to marry her, the wife of his own friend and neighbor, upon the husband's death. When Mrs. Wincott accommodates him by succumbing almost immediately, Geraldine conveniently becomes the sole heir of her husband, Old Wincott. The old dissembling husband will first feast and celebrate a new alliance with Geraldine and afterwards hypocritically mourn the old alliance with the dead spouse; and again the seducer, this time Geraldine's best friend Dalavill, escapes unscathed. In Heywood's dark vision, this is without doubt no world in which to forgive or even to pardon an erring wife, except as a deathbed gesture, if at all. Thus in _A Woman Killed_ and _The English Traveller_, only the adulterous wives must bear the brunt of the punishment for the illicit affairs, only the guilty wives are punished with the loss of fortune, position, and even of life itself, while their guilty lovers escape and are

free to pursue their pleasures and their fortunes elsewhere. In the latter play, in addition, a second young lover (culpable though chaste) is further rewarded, in the dead wife's stead, with her old husband's entire estate. Thus, if order and "harmony" on earth have been restored in Heywood's domestic tragedies, as Irving Ribner maintains, it is only in the sense that in each case, the adulterous wife is dead.

In these plays, it seems clear that the social critic-playwright is portraying, among other social evils, the problem of the fallen woman or the erring wife, who according to Powell, generally "got but scant sympathy in either the drama or the life of the time." However, because "all . . . of these plays are resolved by the very convenient death of the wife," says Powell, "it is evident that Heywood found no real solution of the domestic problem he attacked."[124] In the following chapter, we shall see that in his comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life and manners, Heywood is again acting as a social critic, where along with other follies, vices, and evils in man and in society, he is also dealing with the problem of the innocent long-suffering, abused wife in

[124] Powell, p. 204. Powell feels, however, that in Heywood's "treatment of both husband and wife, he shows himself far ahead of his time and comes near to the modern attitude of malice towards none but charity for all."

How a Man May Chuse and *The Wise Woman*, and the problem of the abused husband whose erring wife is a witch in *Lancashire Witches*.

CHAPTER III

REALISTIC-SATIRIC COMEDIES AND TRAGICOMEDIES OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH LIFE AND MANNERS

For I . . . never coo'd conceive a thought
Of this my woman worthy of a rebuke,
(As one that in her youth bore her so fairely
That she was taken for a seeming Saint)
(*Lancashire Witches* IV. 222)

Heywood's predilection for dramatizing domestic problems is evident not only in his domestic tragedies but also in his realistic-satiric comedies of the philandering husband and abused wife, *How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad* (1601-02) and *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (1604), as well as in his realistic-satiric tragicomedy of an erring wife and abused husband, *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634).

In the case of the erring male, the prodigal sons Arthur of *How a Man May Chuse* and Chartley of *The Wise Woman,* we find the antithetical situation to that of the erring female. After an eleventh-hour repentance, these heroes are rewarded with the forgiveness and the unmerited love of their patient spouses, along with "a happy reacceptance by society in general."[1] All this is despite the

[1] See Mary Crapo Hyde, *Playwriting for Elizabethans 1600-1605* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1949), p. 41. In the case of a husband's fall, says Hyde, "a slight

fact that Young Chartley is a "shittle-wit[ted]" (V. 313-14), insensitive philanderer, trifling with the affection of three women--his wife, his supposed wife, and his would-be wife. He is the male equivalent of Mrs. Wincott in The English Traveller. And Young Arthur is "a diuel" who is "yoakt" to a "Pore Saint" (l. 290); he is a despicable villain who not only beats his wife with his fist, slanders her, and forces her to receive his mistress, the courtesan Mary, at a dinner in their home, but he also "poisons" Mrs. Arthur (in actuality and unbeknown to Arthur, he gives her a sleeping potion like that taken by Shakespeare's Juliet). He then proceeds to marry the courtesan once he has disposed of his wife. Yet, "This absolute villainy," says Leggatt, "is met with an equally absolute loyalty. Mistress Arthur, though tempted, steadfastly refuses to commit adultery,"[2] although she condones her husband's infidelity. In the conventions of the time, Mrs. Arthur represents the ideal, a patient wife who accepts her villainous prodigal husband back with open arms; she will forgive and forget. But in the Lancashire Witches, in contrast, we have no such patient wife in Mrs. Generous or prodigal son in her husband Mr.

---

apology is sufficient provocation for his wife's forgiveness and a happy reacceptance by society in general."

[2] Alexander Leggatt, Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973), p. 36.

Generous. In this case, it is the husband who is the abused party although he is not so long-suffering. Here, of course, the problem is somewhat different; the erring wife is a witch, not an adulteress.

Of these three plays How a Man May Chuse and The Wise Woman are related to the prodigal son-patient wife reconciliation dramas, while The Wise Woman and Lancashire Witches employ the motif of witchcraft, white and black. Furthermore, How a Man May Chuse and Lancashire Witches provide a basis of contrast in the characterization of wives as saint or devil (witch), and of the abused wife versus the abused husband. These dramas are further related by the theme of appearance and reality and by the fact that in all three, Heywood, as a social critic, is dealing with both domestic and social problems as in his domestic tragedies. Moreover, as a realist, he is portraying the follies, vices, and evils of man and society in the early seventeenth century. This was an era of conny-catching and cozening, of fraud and quackery, a time when alchemy and astronomy flourished alongside of palmistry and witchcraft. Like Jonson and Middleton, Heywood concentrates upon this side of life in his comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life, and especially in The Wise Woman. As a keen observer of life and a social critic Heywood focuses sometimes satirically but more often realistically on his own society and times--

life in Jacobean England--and especially the varied life of London with its lively array of quacks and charlatans, rioters and rogues, rakes and gallants, bawds and courtesans, swindlers and dupes, along with swaggering young gentlemen and modest young ladies, humorous old fathers and prodigal sons, black and white witches, good and bad wives. Although Heywood also depicts other lands, people, and times, especially in his plays based on classical history or myth and in some of his romances of adventure and intrigue, his primary interest lies in portraying the domestic and social life and manners of his fellow man in his own country and time in a realistic manner. Indeed, at times his scenes almost achieve a photographic quality as he shifts his focus from the Royal Exchange which young Arthur often visits in _How a Man May Chuse_ to "the "Tavernes, Ordinaryes, _Bowle-Allyes_, _Teniscourts_, _Gaming-houses_" (V. 340) in the town frequented by his young rioters Chartley, Boyster, Sencer, and Harringfield in _The Wise Woman_ to the country weddings, dances and feasts and the hunting fields in the English countryside with the young gallants of Lancashire in _Lancashire Witches_. What one remembers most in Heywood's drama is the keen verisimilitude of his portrayal of Jacobean England. Indeed, so much of what Heywood touched he turned into realism as he sought to give dramatic form and expression to his world. With Heywood we watch Young Chartley and his riotous companions

gambling at dice in the opening scene of The Wise Woman; we go hunting for hares with Arthur, Shakestone, and Bantam and go hunting for witches with the intrepid Doughty in Lancashire Witches; and, as Thorp notes, we are taken "inside a middle-class home" to eavesdrop "on a genuine domestic squabble of the year 1600" in How a Man May Chuse.[3]

How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad

The early play How a Man May Chuse (generally attributed to Heywood) is an adaptation of the old prodigal son-patient wife motifs.[4] In this case, the two motifs are combined in that the prodigal son-husband is the riotous rake who abuses his wife, a patient Griselda whose fidelity never falters and whose chastity remains inviolate. The patient wife, Mrs. Arthur, is embroiled in a double triangle involving her prodigal husband's pursuit of and marriage to the courtesan Mary and of her own persecution by her would-be seducer Anselme. Like her patient sisters in such plays as The London Prodigal and Miseries of Enforced Marriage, Mistress Arthur's subsequent career ". . . amounts merely to watchful waiting for her husband to return to her arms after going

[3] Thorp notes that in the preliminary scenes of the play Heywood has "taken us inside a middle-class home and shown us a genuine domestic squabble of the year 1600" (p. 90).

[4] For a discussion of the sources of the prodigal son-patient wife motifs, see Leonard, pp. 62-72.

to the devil in his own way. It seems clear," says Powell, that

> in these three plays, as well as in a few others on the same motive . . . the dramatist was actually attacking the problem of the abused wife; but except in the case of Grissel, whose abuse was more apparent than real, he reached no conclusion.[5]

It will be remembered, too, that Heywood also reached no conclusion in attacking the problem of the erring wife in his domestic tragedies. However, that he even attempted to deal with such marital problems attests to the fact that Heywood was not a flattering spokesman for middle-class morality and ideals, but was rather a critic of contemporary life and manners in dramatizing the domestic problems of the erring wife and the abused wife. Furthermore, the critic's desire to instruct his audience is clearly evident in his title *How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad*. This title, according to Powell, "tells of attempts at instruction on the subject of matrimony," although the play

> . . . does not get beyond the picturing of a patient wife--patient *ad infinitum* and *ad nauseam*--and of a villainous whore, her husband's mistress. Except in presenting models of a good wife and a bad woman, the secret of how the inexperienced are to tell the one from the other is not revealed. This play too, then, is a worthy effort but hardly an achievement of its apparent purpose.[6]

[5] Powell, p. 198.

[6] Powell, p. 200.

As we shall see in the following discussion, however, Heywood is more successful than Powell will allow. We will remember that Heywood's "purpose" in presenting his plays (as outlined in An Apology for Actors) is to provide illustrative examples of such people as "a good wife and a bad woman," so that his audience might learn to recognize some of the distinguishing characteristics of each. In this play, the virtues of the good wife and the vices of a bad one are neatly summed up by Young Arthur in his final speech as he stands between his good and bad wives and addresses the audience: ". . . he that will chuse / A good wife from a bad," he says, "come learne of me / That haue tried both, in wealth and miserie" (ll. 2720-22). He then concludes by reciting a list of qualities of both kinds of wives for the edification of "the inexperienced."

Written probably between 1601 and 1602,[7] this didactic tragicomedy of contemporary English life was published anonymously in 1602. How a Man May Chuse[8] must have

[7] By general consent, the date is set at 1601-02. See A. E. H. Swaen, Introd., How A Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad, by Thomas Heywood (1912; rpt. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1963), p. xlii; Harbage, Annals, p. 82; Clark, Heywood, p. 22; E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), IV, 19-20; and Frederick Gard Fleay, A Bibliographical Chronicle of the English Drama: 1559-1642 (1891; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1962), I, 276, 289-90.

[8] How a Man May Chuse was once ascribed to Joshua Cooke because of an "untrustworthy" notation in ink by

appealed to its seventeenth-century audience and readers, since, like a modern best seller, it went through seven printings between 1602 and 1634.[9] The popularity of the play may perhaps be explained by the fact that it is similar in subject matter and in appeal to a modern "soap opera." It traces the turbulent middle-class marriage of

---

an unknown person on the title page of the 1602 edition in the British Museum. See Joseph Quincy Adams, Jr., "How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad, edited by A. E. H. Swaen," Modern Language Notes, 28 (1913), p. 110. Most critics now believe, however, that the play is entirely Heywood's. A few are not entirely convinced. Velte, for instance, is not sure the play is entirely Heywood's (p. 125), and Cromwell thinks "that additional external evidence is needed to make this a clear case of Heywood's authorship" (p. 200). On the other hand, most critics accept the play as Heywood's. See, for instance, Swaen, p. xiii; Adams, "How a Man," pp. 109-10, and his "Thomas Heywood and How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad," Englische Studien, 45 (1912), 43; Fleay, pp. 289-90; Swinburne, pp. 246-47; Crofts, pp. 239-40; and Thomas Mabry Cranfill, ed., Rich's Farewell to Military Profession 1581 by Barnabe Rich (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1959), p.xxxix. The play is also included in Heywood's canon without question in The New CBEL published in 1974 (I. 1882). And as Marilyn Johnson, Heywood's latest major critic, points out "in the definitive biography of Heywood, A. M. Clark accepts the play into Heywood's canon without even presenting the argument for it" (p. 106). See Clark, Heywood, p. 22. There seems to be little if any real question that the play is one of the 220 in which Heywood had "either an entire hand, or at least a maine finger" (Pearson, IV. 5). The source for this play is drawn from Cinthio's Hecatommithi, III, 5. Heywood probably used a translation of this work, the sixth novel of Riche's Farewell to Military Profession (1581). For a discussion of the source, see Swaen, pp. xiii-xvi. All line references from this play in the text are from How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad, ed. A. E. H. Swaen (1912; rpt. Vaduz: Fraus Reprint, 1963).

[9] Seven editions, all quartos, of How a Man May Chuse were published in 1602, 1605, 1608, 1614, 1621, 1630, and 1634 (Clark, p. 22).

the Arthurs through such sensational incidents as domestic squabbles, discussions of wife-beating and other abuses; the husband's adulterous affair; the supposed murder of the wife by "poisoning"; her rescue from the family tomb by an ardent admirer and would-be seducer, Anselme; the husband's bigamous remarriage to a whore named Mary; his confession to Mary, to prove his love, that he had disposed of the first wife to marry her; the "bad" wife's betrayal of him for his money; his flight and subsequent arrest, trial, and rescue by the timely arrival of the patient, long-suffering "good" wife, all further dressed up with some edifying scenes touching on penitence, regeneration, and reconciliation, and concluding with a recital by the reformed prodigal husband on how to know a good wife from a bad one.

Even from this bare outline of the plot structure, one can easily imagine the "box office" appeal it must have had for its early middle-class audience. Stories of battered and abused wives, adulterous husbands, scheming, avaricious rivals and home-wreckers, sensational poisonings and murder trials with eleventh-hour reprieves are perennially popular and afford playwrights and social critics an opportunity to expose or attack these domestic abuses and social evils on the stage or in print. As with The Wise Woman and Lancashire Witches, this play is satirical as well as realistic. Sylvia D. Feldman is correct in

saying that "The setting and the social position of the characters in How a Man May Chuse are in the satirical-realistic tradition. And, as in satirical comedy, there is some ridicule of the vices of the time."[10] And Otelia Cromwell, in discussing the question of authorship of the play, points out that

> The main thread of action and the episodes introducing the minor characters are developed in a setting, sympathetic in its realism to a slight degree, satiric for the greater part . . . but satire untinged with mockery or bitterness. Though the spirit is pure fun, delightful raillery, the poet holds up for sport the shallow pedantry of Aminadab's school-room, the sophistication of the law courts in Justice Reason's verbiage, the inconstancy of women and the hypocrisy of Puritanism in Fuller's recitals of his amours. The characterization of Mrs. Arthur is the only important element of the play capturing the sympathies of the poet.[11]

Cromwell believes that Heywood is almost entirely free from satire[12] and this is perhaps one of her main reasons for questioning Heywood's authorship of the play without further external evidence.[13] But it would be more accurate to say that his use of satire in this play lends further support to the almost unanimous opinion that Heywood is the author of How a Man May Chuse. It should be clear from our discussion in Chapter I that Heywood is not

[10] Sylvia D. Feldman, The Morality-Patterned Comedy of the Renaissance (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), p. 38.

[11] Cromwell, pp. 194-95.

[12] Cromwell, p. 109.

[13] Cromwell, p. 200.

deficient in the satiric spirit. Nevertheless, so as not to lose sight of the main point here, it should be noted that Cromwell has perceptively identified most of the important examples of social satire in the play. Heywood satirically pokes fun at pedantry, the law courts, the inconstancy of women, and the hypocrisy of Puritanism, while on a more serious note, he also points out both the folly and evil of suicide; and he exposes the avaricious, self-seeking, and sometimes deceptive nature of bawds, prostitutes, and pimps.

Heywood humorously exposes the ignorance and immorality of the schoolmaster-pedant in both _How a Man May Chuse_ (Sir Aminadab) and _The Wise Woman_ (Sir Boniface). J. Q. Adams, Jr. points out quite convincingly the similarity in the characterization of these two "ludicrous pedagogues." He contends that they differ only in their names; otherwise, "they are allied in spirit," and prove to be similar in both language and conduct.[14] Swaen, the editor of _How a Man May Chuse_, further notes

> that in both plays a schoolmaster is introduced who is fond of using Latin, whose Latin is shaky, and who morally is not what we should expect of a man of his standing. Sir Boniface assists a bawd [the Wise

[14] Adams, "Heywood and _How_," pp. 32-33. See also pp. 33-35 for a listing of the similarities between the two pedants. For an informative discussion of the pedant in the drama of the period and of Heywood's two pedants, see Hyde, pp. 72 ff.

> Woman], Sir Aminadab visits one [Mistress Splay] and is in love with a woman living in her house [Mary].[15]

It is Sir Aminadab, in fact, who vies with Young Arthur for the love of the courtesan Mary, and when the pedant loses out, he resolves to take the "rat poison" (sleeping potion) given him by Fuller "in sport" (l. 1289)--the "poison" which is subsequently appropriated by Young Arthur who threatens to shame Sir Aminadab with his friends for destroying himself over "A paltry wench" (ll. 1369-72). Here Heywood seems to be dealing with the problem of suicide in a satirical manner to reinforce his earlier treatment of it in a more serious tone when the distraught Mistress Arthur contemplates ending her life but rejects it out of hand on religious grounds. Before leaving for the Exchange or one of his other haunts, Young Arthur ironically tells his wife how she can win his heart:

> _Yon._ _Ar._ . . . . I will tell thee
> How thou shalt winne my hart, die sodainly,
> And Ile become a lustie widower:
> The longer thy life lasts the more my hate,
> And loathing still increaseth towards thee.
> When I come home & finde thee cold as earth,
> Thē wil I loue thee: thus thou knowst my mind.
> (ll. 281-87)

When Arthur and his friend Young Lusam leave, Mistress

[15] Swaen, p. viii. Swaen notes that "In both plays some one distorts Latin and gives absurd translations of Latin phrases to ridicule the pedant."

Arthur soliloquizes:

> If thou wilt win my heart, die suddenly,
> But that my soule was bought at such a rate,
> At such a high price as my Sauiours bloud,
> I would not sticke to loose it with a stab.
> But vertue banish all such fantasies. (ll. 291-95)

Heywood seems to be emphasizing the fact that suicide is not the proper solution for either unrequited love or for ending an unhappy marriage. He makes the point about hastening death, or suicide, more explicit in _Gunaikeion_ where he writes:

> These considerations of humane frailetie (as that there is but one Life, but many wayes to destroy it; but one Death, yet a thousand meanes to hasten it) _mooues me to persuade all_, as well men as women, young as old, noble as base, of both Sexes, and of what calling or condition soeuer, to doubly arme themselues with constancie to abide it, and courage to entertaine it: . . . As it is ill to wish death, so it is worse to feare it: besides, as it is base Cowardise dishonourably to shun it, so it is meere Pusillanimitie despairingly to hasten it. (my italics)[16]

In this serious, almost tragic, treatment of domestic and social problems in _How a Man May Chuse_, the Latin logic-chopping of the pedant Sir Aminadab and his prize pupil, the witty clown-page Pipkin; the inanity of Justice Reason's locutions; the comic agreements and disagreements of the two humorous old fathers, Old Lusam and Old Arthur;

[16] Heywood, _Gunaikeion_, p. 420. This quote could well serve as a gloss on the suicide of Anne Frankford in _A Woman Killed_.

and the bawdy stories of Fuller, the chauvinistic tutor of Anselme, furnish most of the comic relief as well as the satire on the life and manners of the time.

Through the speeches of Justice Reason Heywood effectively satirizes the law courts of his day. For instance, one can almost hear the guffaws of the groundlings in response to the "reasonable" counsel the Justice gives Mistress Arthur when her father Old Lusam and father-in-law Old Arthur consult him as a marriage counselor:

> Iust. Good woman, or good wife, or Mistresse, if you haue done amisse, it should seeme you haue done a fault; and making a fault, theres no questiō but you haue done amisse: but if you walke vprightly, and neither lead to the right hand nor the left, no question but you haue neither led to the right hand nor the left, but as a man should say, walked vprightly: but it should appeare by these plaintisses, that you haue had some wrong, If you loue your spouse intierly, it should seeme you affect him feruently; and if he hate you monstrously, it should seeme he loathes you most exceedingly: and theres the point, at which I will leaue, for the time passes away: therefore to conclude, this is my best counsell, looke that thy husband so fall in, that hereafter you neuer fall out.
> Old Lu. Good counsell, passing good instruction,
> Follow it daughter. Now I promise you,
> I haue not heard such an Oration
> This many a day: what remaines to doo? (ll. 852-69)

Old Arthur, the overbearing father of Young Master Arthur, and Old Lusam, the tractable father of Mistress Arthur, attempt to resolve the differences between their children, but all of their counsel and chiding is to no avail. Their dialogue however, does much to enliven the gloom in this generally dark picture of marital discord.

In characterization, these two old men are Jonsonian "'humor' characters whose eccentricity," as Arthur Sherbo explains,

> is a comical indecision that constantly forces them to agree or disagree with whatever is said to them, although they are ready to contradict their immediately preceding statement if there is any opposition to it--or agreement with it.

But then, as Sherbo points out, "Quotation is better than explanation here"[17] as in the case of Justice Reason's circumlocutions noted above:

> *Old Ar*. Tis told me M. *Lusam*, that my sonne
> And your chast daugthter whom we matcht together,
> Wrangle and fall at oddes, and brawle, and chide.
> *Old Lu*. Nay I thinke so, I neuer lookt for better:
> This tis to marry children when they are yong,
> I said as much at first, that such yong brats
> Would gree together, euen like dogs and cats.
> *Old Ar*. Nay pray you M. *Lusam* say not so,
> There was great hope, though they were matcht but yong
> Their vertues would haue made them simpathise,
> And liue together like two quiet Saints.
> *Old Lu*. You say true, there was great hope indeed
> They would haue liu'd like Saints, but wheres the fault?
> *Old Ar*. If fame be true, the most fault's in my sonne.
> *Old Lu*. You say true M. *Arthur*, tis so indeed.
> *Old Ar*. Nay sir, I do not altogether excuse
> Your daughter, many lay the blame on her.
> *Old Lu*. Ha say you so, bithmasse tis like enough.
> For from her childhood she hath bene a shrowe.
> *Old Ar*. A shrow, you wrong her, all the towne admires
> For mildnesse, chastnesse, and humilitie. (her,
> *Old Lu*. Fore God you say well, she is so indeed:
> The Citie doth admire her for these vertues.
> *Old Ar*. O sir, you praise your child too palpably,
> Shee's mild and chast, but not admir'd so much.

[17] Sherbo, p. 77. See also Cromwell, p. 194.

> _Old_ _Lu_. I so I say, I did not meane admir'd.
> _Old_ _Ar_. Yes if a man do well consider her
> Your daughter is the wonder of her sexe. (ll. 71-98)

Here, in this comical analysis of an otherwise serious situation, Heywood is revealing his kinship with his fellow Jacobeans, especially with Jonson. Arthur Browne acknowledges this relationship when he notes, in his discussion of Heywood's "drama of common life," that

> there is his ability to poke fun at things which elsewhere he will take seriously, a facet of his character which seems to have something in common with Jonson's anti-romanticism. This is often done by the introduction into a serious scene of one of Heywood's typical clowns, with his earthy realism, shrewd comment on the action, bawdy jests and word-play.[18]

An excellent example of this typical Heywoodian technique is Fuller's bawdy recital of his amorous wooing of a hypocritical Puritan told at the Arthurs' dinner party shortly before the poisoning scene. On this occasion the obtuse Old Lusam and Old Arthur fail to recognize the "Ieast" or point--the exceedingly explicit and vulgar punch line--of this dirty story, much to the evident disgust of Fuller who concludes that "To talke of wit to these, is as a man / Should cast out Iewels to a heard of swine" (ll. 1721-22). Fuller, who tutors Anselme in "Loues schoole" (l. 570), furnishes much of the bawdy and vulgar

[18] Arthur Brown, "Citizen Comedy and Domestic Drama," in _Jacobean Theatre_, ed. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris (New York: Capricorn, 1967), pp. 81-82.

humor in the play partly at the expense of women in general, and of hypocritical Puritan women in particular. A Jacobean anti-feminist and reformed "wencher," Fuller rails on the inconstancy of women, as for example when he advises Anselme on the proper way to court Mistress Arthur:

> Ful. . . . But list to me, Ile turne thy hart from
> And make thee loath all of the feminine sexe. (loue,
> They that haue knowne me, knew me once of name
> To be a perfect wencher: I haue tried
> All sorts, all sects, all states, and finde them still
> Inconstant, fickle, alwaies variable.
> Attend me man, I will prescribe a methode
> How thou shalt win hir without al peraduēture.
> (ll. 352-59)

Of all the "sects," however, he seems to have found the Puritan women the most accommodating, as is evident in the earlier mentioned bawdy story of successfully seducing a hypocritical Puritan girl (ll. 1671-1716). As a prelude to another story concerning a fickle mistress (ll. 1132-64), Fuller further advises Anselme to "loue none at all, they will forsweare themselues" (l. 1127).

Fuller's tutelage of Anselme, the would-be lover of Mistress Arthur, is a comic parallel to the serious tone of Mistress Splay's tutelage of Mary just prior to her becoming the real lover of Master Arthur:

> Splay. Daughter attend, for I will tell thee now
> What in my yong daies I my selfe haue tried:
> Be rul'd by me and I will make thee rich.
> . . . When any sutor comes to aske thy loue,
> Looke not into his words, but into his sleeue,
> If thou canst learne what language his purse speakes,
> Be rul'd by that, thats golden eloquence.

> Money can make a slauering tongue speake plaine:
> If he that loues thee be deform'd and rich,
> Accept his loue, gold hides deformitie.
> Gold can make limping Vulcan walke vpright,
> Make squint eyes looke strait, a crabd face locke smooth,
> Guilds Copernoses, makes them looke like gold:
> Fils ages wrinkles vp, and makes a face
> As old as Nestors, looke as yong as Cupids,
> If thou wilt arme thy selfe against all shifts,
> Regard all men according to their gifts.
> (ll. 953-76)

This, of course, recalls the bawd Scapha's advice to the whore Blanda in English Traveller, discussed in the last chapter, and it is a pale sketch of the much stronger and more explicit critical castigation of the rapacious greed, depravity, and dissembling nature of bawds, pimps, and courtesans in the subplot of Royal King and Loyal Subject, written at about the same time (1600-03), a scene which will be discussed in the following chapter. Such passages should convince the reader that Heywood was not a playwright with a staunch faith in human nature. As we see over and over again in his plays, Heywood, like his fellow Jacobean playwrights, was realistically aware of the greedy, avaricious, and sometimes evil nature of man; and, like the medieval social critics several centuries before him, he was painfully aware of the frailty of man in succumbing to the lures of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

As a matter of fact, the morally weak Young Arthur enters right on cue, only minutes after Mistress Splay's speech noted above, and as Mary asks: "Soft who comes here?

begone good Mistris _Splay_, / Of thy rules practise this is my first day" (ll. 980-81). An apt pupil, Mary proceeds to ". . . set [her] lime-twigs for" Arthur. She soon entangles him (ll. 2016-17), too, because Young Arthur falls with even less resistance than Mistress Anne Frankford in _A Woman Killed_. From the first Master Arthur is unable to distinguish appearance from reality--unable to recognize the evil reality underneath the appearance of good. Pipkin later tries to warn his young master that his "gentlewoman" Mary is actually a whore:

> _Pip_. The gentlewoman of the old house, that is as wel knowne by the colour shee laies of her chees, as an Alehouse by the painting is laid of his Lettice: she that is like _Homo_, Common to all men: she that is beholding to no Trade, but liues of her selfe. (ll. 1446-50)

But Arthur turns a deaf ear to such talk. When it comes to realizing the true nature of his fair mistress, he is both deaf and blind until it proves to be too late. Ironically, all the while Arthur thinks he is deceiving others in his pursuit of and marriage to Mary, it is actually Arthur himself who is deceived, as Fuller clearly points out to Anselme:

> I knew the wench that is become his Bride,
> And smil'd to thinke how deepely he had lide,
> For first he swore he did not court a maide,
> A wife he could not. she was else-where tied,
> And as for such as widowes were, he said,
> And deeply swore, none such shuld be his bride.
> Widow, nor wife, nor maide, I askt no more,
> Knowing he was betroth'd vnto a whore.
> (ll. 2104-11)

The cynical Fuller, who along with Pipkin, often serves as the vehicle for Heywood's social criticism in this play, can readily distinguish appearance from reality. More than anyone else in How a Man May Chuse, he realizes that "All things are full of ambiguitie" (l. 2077). In Heywood's world, as he makes clear here in Fuller's observations, everything is "full of ambiguity," for it is difficult to sort out fact from fiction where one is easily and understandably mistaken for the other. In this tragicomedy of contemporary English life and manners, it is also clear that the playwright is consciously playing upon this theme of appearance and reality. It is patently evident that in this world, people and things are often not what they seem to be on the surface. In the world of the Arthurs and Lusams, as we have seen, Mary appears to be a gentlewoman, but Arthur discovers too late she is really a shrewish, independent prostitute. The "draught" Arthur tenders his wife, as a "pledge" of reconciliation, appears to be a cup of wine to both Mistress Arthur and the assembled guests while Arthur himself thinks it is poison; in actuality, however, it is a sleeping potion, a "compound powder" made of "Poppie" and "Mandrakes" (l. 2694). Shortly afterwards, Mrs. Arthur appears to be dead and is buried in the Lusam's family tomb, but, in point of fact, she is only in a deep sleep like Juliet. The husband Arthur assumes he is a widower and proceeds to marry Mary,

while in reality, he is a bigamist; his first wife is alive all the while and living at the home of Anselme's mother where she was taken after the mourning Anselme discovered her alive at the tomb. Indeed, everyone supposes Mistress Arthur is dead and buried until she arrives posthaste at Arthur's trial to save him from being executed for a crime he seems to have committed, although in reality, of course, he is not really guilty. As his good wife informs Justice Reason: "Murther there cannot be where none is kild" (l. 2661). Now in the denouement, all is made perfectly clear and everyone including presumably even the vacuous Justice can distinguish between these false appearances and the true realities. The reformed prodigal can also now see and hear clearly, and he can instruct others in how a man may choose a good wife from a bad. We are not instructed, however, as to how Young Arthur is to solve the dilemma of having two wives, good or bad, since the play ends before the problem of the bigamous second marriage is resolved.[19]

In this critical picture of the middle-class marriage triangle of the Arthurs and the courtesan Mary, Heywood paints his three main subjects in bold strokes of black and white. The prodigal husband, Master Arthur, is as

[19] As we shall see in Chapter IV, there is a similar problem in A Mayden-Head, a problem which is also not resolved.

black-hearted a villain as one could imagine; the patient wife, Mistress Arthur, is as fair and chaste a heroine as one could wish; and the scheming other woman, Mistress Mary, is as greedy and immoral a villainess as one could envision. Under the circumstances, even the most obtuse members of the audience--even an Old Arthur or an Old Lusam--could scarcely have failed to recognize the underlying social message of the play.

Until his eleventh-hour reformation, Young Arthur is "that scum of manhood" and a "vile husband" (l. 2130) to that "Wonder of women" (l. 268), a "kinde patient wife" (l. 2576), "a true obedient Wife" (l. 1572). Arthur's prodigality and adultery clearly serve as a foil to Mistress Arthur's patience and chastity. As Anselme laments: ". . . ō neuer had chaste wife, / A husband of so leaud and vnchast life" (ll. 1998-99). And Mary, the "strumpet" (l. 2414) is just as clearly a foil to Mistress Arthur, the "saint." As Young Arthur at last confesses:

> But in exchanging her, I did preferre
> A diuell before a Saint, night before day,
> Hell before heauen, and drosse before tried gold.
> (ll. 2559-61)

Prior to his rude awakening to the realities of life, Arthur himself had been a very "diuell" in his treatment of this paragon of virtue, the exemplary Mistress Arthur.

Fuller reminds the patient wife of her husband's villainy. Arthur had not only committed adultery, but he had also abused her with mental cruelty:

> <u>Ful</u>. He left your chaste bed, to defile the bed
> Of sacred marriage with a Curtezan.
> . . . And not content with this,
> Abus'd your honest name with staundrous words,
> And fild your husht house with vnquietnesse.
> (ll. 2133-37)

He had physically abused and battered his fair wife:

> <u>Ful.</u> Nay did he not with his rude fingers dash you on the face,
> And double dye your Corrall lips with bloud?
> Hath he not torne those Gold wyers from your head,
> . . . Hath he not beate you, and with his rude fists,
> Vpō that Crimzon temperature of your cheeks,
> Laid a lead colour with his boystrous blowes.
> (ll. 2140-43, 2146-48)

Arthur not only wanted to kill his wife, but he also wanted to spite her before she died by bringing his courtesan home to dinner and seating her at the wife's place at the table. Furthermore he had plotted every detail of the death to which he had "doom'd" his wife (l. 1015); then he had dissembled a desire for a reconciliation when he gave her the "poisoned" cup.

> <u>Ful</u>. Then did he not
> Eyther by poison, or some other plot,
> Send you to death, where by his Prouidence,
> God hath preseru'd you by wondrous myracle?
> (ll. 2150-53)

And finally, he had hypocritically mourned her death and then within nine days (l. 2057), he had married the courtesan:

> Ful. . . . Nay after death hath he not scandaliz'd
> Your place, with an immodest Curtizan? (ll. 2154-55)

When Young Arthur recants his villainy in the denouement, it gives one pause to wonder if such an "execrable wretch" (as Swinburne calls him)[20] could reform so completely. His last minute reformation can be understood in reference to the convention of the prodigal son, and to the fact that he has learned from personal experience; Arthur himself has been abused by his second wife Mary.

By the same token, one can scarcely credit the actions of Mistress Arthur who remains loyal to her husband through all of his cruelty and abuse and who displays a patience that passeth all understanding, except, of course, in reference to the convention of the patient wife. As Fuller asks Anselme: "Art sure she is a woman? if she be, / She is create of Natures puritie" (ll. 2170-71). Even though she is ". . . so rudely beate and buffeted" (l. 590), she bears all her husband's ". . . checks and crosses patiently" (l. 473). When father, father-in-law, friend, or foe speaks against her wayward husband, she hastens to

[20] Swinburne, p. 246.

speak in his defense. When she is importuned by Anselme, she does not fall like Jane Shore, Anne Frankford, and Mrs. Wincott. She remains "most chast & true" (l. 2717), as she perceptively orders Anselme to:

> Tempt no more diuel, thy deformitie
> Hath chaung'd it selfe into an angels shape,
> But yet _I know thee_ by thy course of speech:
> Thou gets an apple to betray poore _Eue_,
> _Whose outside beares a show of pleasant fruite_,
> But the vilde branch on which this apple grew,
> Was that which drew poore Eue from Paradice.
> ([my italics] ll. 1221-27)

Unlike her husband, she can discern the ugly reality beneath the fair exterior. And finally, she is a good wife, obedient and subservient.[21] She is Arthur's "hand-maid" (l. 471) and his "true obedient Wife" (l. 1572). She would gladly "drudge and toyle," become Arthur's "maide," "slaue," or "seruant" if he would "smile" upon her "now and then" (ll. 254, 257-58, 260). Mistress Arthur's complete submissiveness is in fact in direct contrast to Mistress Mary's complete wilfullness.

Mary, the "leaud lasciuious Curtezan" (l. 1985) is the antithesis of Arthur's first wife, for Mary ". . . was euer borne to haue her will" (l. 2201). Mary, who "liues by lying" (l. 933), dissembles love for Arthur until after

[21] For a discussion of Mrs. Arthur as a good wife, see Johnson, pp. 111-19. Kelso discusses the importance of obedience as a wifely virtue in the Renaissance in her instructive study (pp. 96-97).

their marriage; then she shows her true colors. She is a willful, independent, termagant who will give her husband no peace or "quietnesse" (l. 2244). She is "crosse, spightfull and madding" as well as a gadabout (ll. 2729-30); moreover, she is disobedient, impatient, and immoral. She hates her husband Arthur as he had hated his first wife, and she wishes him dead as he had wished Mistress Arthur dead. The tables have turned and Arthur, who had treated his first wife like a slave, has now become a slave himself:[22]

> Yong Ar. . . . What am I from a maister made a slaue?
> Ma. A slaue? nay worse . . .
> . . . I am thy wife, I will not be drest so
> While thy Gold lasts, but then most willingly
> I will bequeath thee to flat beggerie.
> I do alreadie hate thee . . .
> . . . Now Arthur, if I knew
> What in this world would most torment thy soule,
> That I would doo: would all my euill vsage
> Could make thee straight dispaire, and hang thy selfe.
> (ll. 2207-24 [my italics])[23]

And ironically, Arthur, the foolish prodigal, furnishes her the very "rope" with which to hang him when in a desperate attempt to gain her love, he confesses the

[22] It should be apparent by now that Heywood has built his play around the structural technique of parallels and contrasts. In this case, Mary's treatment of Arthur parallels Arthur's treatment of his first wife to a large degree. Arthur himself draws attention to the similarities (ll. 2243, 2575-77).

[23] Mary wishes to "torment" Arthur's soul. We will remember that in A Woman Killed, Frankford also wishes to torment Anne's soul (xiii. 153-56).

"murder" of his first wife: "Thou knewest full well how sodainly she died," he says, "To enioy thy loue euen then I poysoned her" (ll. 2305-06). As one might expect, Mary loses no time in sending for the "warrants" to have him arrested. As she instructs her pimp Brabo: "Goe and fetch warrants from the Iustices / To attach the murderer, he once hangd and dead, / His wealth is mine: pursue the slaue thats dead" (ll. 2319-21). Now Young Arthur, fleeing for his life, will soon learn the cruel reality--that "This is no world in which to pity men," for like Sir Francis Acton who labors to take Sir Charles Mountford's life until Susan Mountford appears on the scene in _A Woman Killed_, Mistress Mary labors for Arthur's death until Mistress Arthur arrives to save him: "What do I see, liues _Arthurs_ wife againe? / Nay then I labour for his death in vaine" (ll. 2674-75). The bad wife Mistress Mary labors to destroy Young Arthur; the good wife Mistress Arthur works to save him.

Like Sir Charles Mountford in _A Woman Killed_, Young Arthur quickly discovers that in this world, ". . . miserie . . . neuer foundst a friend":

> _Enter young Arthur poorely_.
> _Yong Ar_. O whither shall I flie to saue my life,
> When murther and dispaire dogs at my heeles?
> O miserie, thou neuer foundst a friend,
> All friends forsake men in aduersitie:
> My brother hath denied to succour me,
> Vpbraiding me with name of murderer.
> My vncles double barre their doores against me;

> My father hath denied to shelter me,
> And curst me worse then Adam did vile Eue.
> Ithat within these two daies had more friends
> Then I could number with Arithmatike,
> Haue now no more then one poore Cipher is,
> And that poore Cipher I supply my selfe.
> All that I durst commit my fortunes too,
> I haue tried, & finde none to relieue my wants,
> My sudden flight, and feare of future shame,
> Left me vnfurnisht of all necessaries,
> And these three daies I haue not tasted foode.
> (ll. 2341-54)[24]

Ironically, the only charity this recreant receives is from his much abused wife, from the very person he is supposed to have killed. Mistress Arthur gives him food to "ease [his] hunger" (l. 2385) and some coin "to spend" (l. 2442). His abuse at the hands of his second wife, followed by his fear and hunger and the unexpected charity of this woman who "much resembles" his former wife (l. 2376) humbles Young Arthur and brings him to see clearly the error of his former degenerate and dissolute ways.

Despite all his former villainy, his profligacy and cruelty, Young Arthur is rewarded, like his Biblical counterpart the prodigal son, beyond his deserts with total forgiveness and reconciliation. In *How a Man May Chuse*, the prodigal son-husband after his eleventh-hour reformation is reconciled with his patient, obedient, chaste, and good wife Mistress Arthur, and he is further reaccepted back into the society of friends and into the bosom of his

[24] Cf. *A Woman Killed* iii. 98-101 and x. 5-10.

family. And once again, as is generally the case in Heywood's plays, there is no poetic justice. The debased and villainous trio of bawd, prostitute, and pimp escape all punishment despite the fact that they themselves had each striven to insure Arthur's punishment and death for their own profit. The selfish, vindictive, and evil nature of Mistress Mary's cohorts is underscored in both speech and actions when Young Arthur is apprehended and later at his trial. When Young Arthur is arrested, Brabo gloats to Mistress Splay that "This fellowes death will make our mistris rich" and the bawd replies: "I say I care not whose dead or aliue, / So by their liues or deaths, we two may thriue" (ll. 2479-81). Later testifying at Arthur's murder trial, Brabo declares: "I will not part hence till I see him swing" (l. 2566). Like Mistress Splay, he has no regard for the sanctity of human life. He will even aid the officers in apprehending Sir Aminadab when it is learned that Arthur secured the "poison" from him. Brabo reveals his perverse and evil nature when he says: "Ile aide him [the officer] too, the schoolemaister I see / Perhaps may hang with him [Arthur] for companie" (ll. 2587-88).

Clearly in this tragicomedy of contemporary life, Heywood is revealing the nature of evil in man and in his world--a world where good may temporarily triumph over evil but where evil continues to flourish unchecked and

unpunished. Sylvia Feldman also recognizes this when she notes that *How a Man May Chuse*

> is set in middle-class, Elizabethan London, where good and evil co-exist. Mary and Mistress Arthur, for example, are neighbors. A foolish judge hears the complaints against Arthur for his ill treatment of his wife, while Young Lusam comments wisely upon the judge's stupidity. Although good (represented by Arthur's regeneration and his reconciliation with his wife) triumphs over evil, evil continues to exist. Mary does not succeed in bringing about Arthur's physical and spiritual death, but neither does she repent her wickedness nor is she punished for her crimes. She remains free to live as she has been living and to threaten the well-being of others. Young Arthur, then, lives in a world where both good and evil are realities, but where man must choose which he will pursue.[25]

At the conclusion to *How a Man May Chuse*, Mistress Mary and her depraved confederates are free to ensnare other morally weak victims just as at the end of *The Wise Woman*, the white witch of Hogsdon is free to victimize other credulous and superstitious citizens. In this later play, Young Chartley, like Young Arthur his counterpart in the earlier drama, must learn to choose which course he will pursue, good or evil; he too must learn to distinguish the deceptive surface appearance from the underlying true reality in his world.

[25] Feldman, p. 26.

The Wise Woman of Hogsdon

Although the two domestic dramas of contemporary life and manners How a Man May Chuse and The Wise Woman are similar in many respects, especially in characterization, the tone is entirely different. The former is generally sober and serious while the latter is skeptical and cynical. In this respect, The Wise Woman differs from the other adaptations of the popular themes of profligacy and patience, such as How a Man May Chuse. As Leonard notes, "although The Wise Woman shares elements of theme, structure, and language" with the other prodigal son-patient wife plays, it is like none of them in tone. Unlike the earlier How a Man May Chuse and others, this play ". . . never threatens to become tragicomedy." In fact, says Leonard: "It is the only one of the series in which the comic spirit is not joined to a more serious, potentially disastrous element," such as suicide or murder,[26] either in appearance or in reality. Consequently, if the tragicomedy How a Man May Chuse resembles a modern "soap opera," such as the popular daytime serial The Young and the Restless, which deals with serious current domestic and social problems, then the comedy The Wise Woman corresponds to a modern situation comedy, especially one with a satirical or critical social message, such as All in the Family or Maud.

[26] Leonard, p. 69.

Furthermore, in its frank hilarity, its bawdy puns, and its vulgarity in matters of sex, The Wise Woman also resembles a take-off or spoof on the soap operas like the recent satirical comedy Soap.

In any case, however, the realistic-satiric comedy The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (1604)[27] reveals Heywood at his "best and brightest."[28] This well-constructed, well-executed play was probably written a year after A Woman Killed with Kindness (1603), and at approximately the same time as I Fair Maid of the West (probably 1603-04 or possibly 1609-10), another of Heywood's best efforts. Hence, if these dates are correct as most critics believe, Heywood's dramatic ability reached its height in the period 1603-04 with the composition of his best domestic tragedy (A Woman Killed), his best realistic-satiric comedy of contemporary English life and manners (The Wise Woman), and probably his best romantic tragicomedy of adventure and intrigue (I Fair Maid). It is surprising then that outside of two unpublished

[27] The Wise Woman, published in 1638, was probably written in 1604, the date first assigned by Fleay and usually agreed upon by the critics; it was entered in the Stationers' Register on March 12, 1638. There is no known source for the play. See Fleay, I, 291-92; Chambers, III, 342; Harbage, Annals, pp. 88-89; Clark, Heywood, p. 243; and Leonard, pp. 21-34. All references from this play cited in the text by volume and page number are from the Pearson edition.

[28] Swinburne, p. 245.

critical editions of The Wise Woman,[29] there has been no modern edition published of this delightful comedy as in the case of these other two plays. The Wise Woman obviously deserves more attention than it has received. There has been, in fact, very little critical interpretation or general discussion of the play outside of the introductions to the unpublished editions; the usual plot summaries in most of the general discussions of Heywood's work; an occasional examination of the play as one in the prodigal son-patient wife tradition; citations of some of the dramatic conventions of the play by Duane Nichols; a short discussion of the chaste maidens of the play by Marilyn Johnson; and the notations of satire and the similarities in mode and manner to the work of Jonson and Middleton. In this comedy, as in the tragicomedies of contemporary English life under discussion in this chapter, the playwright clearly appears to be consciously and earnestly exposing some of the domestic and social follies and evils of his time, as well as consciously and purposely employing the theme of appearance and reality to point up his social message.

In The Wise Woman, Heywood reveals an intimate acquaintance with the more seamy side of contemporary English life.

[29] Leonard's unpublished doctoral dissertation (Univ. of Southern Calif. 1967), and Allyne Wilder Landis' master's thesis (Duke Univ. 1939).

Parrott and Ball point out that "The action is laid in the underworld of contemporary London"; Otelia Cromwell observes that in this play, the Wise Woman serves as "the potent magnet of attraction for certain types of people," and "as such she illustrates a rather sordid element of London life"; and also discussing the title character, Velte notes that

> Though ignorant, she is possessed of low cunning, and in her own way is wise, wise enough to lose no opportunity of turning a dishonest penny. The picture partakes of the nature of social satire. The Wise Woman is by no means an admirable character and her vices have not been glossed over. . . . In its revelation of contemporary conditions the play served a moral purpose. Like Reade or Dickens, Heywood is here attacking a current abuse, an abuse too of which the middle-classes far more than the aristocracy were conscious.[30]

This "social satire"--Heywood's criticism of "a current abuse"--in itself should make the play valuable to any student of seventeenth-century English life and literature. But in addition to its relevance as a social document, an exposé of fraud and quackery in the period, the play is also good theatre. From the realistic opening scene of gambling at dice to the closing Sheridan-like screen scene exposing the prodigal's philandering and the unmasking of his real wife, the play should prove to be both enlightening and entertaining to a modern audience. A summary of

[30] Parrott and Ball, p. 123; Cromwell, p. 88; and Velte, pp. 119-20.

the intricate, well-developed plot should suggest some of the dramatic or theatrical possibilities for the staging of this high-spirited situational comedy.

In The Wise Woman, Young Chartley is betrothed to a young country gentlewoman named Luce (the second Luce), but on the eve of their wedding he takes horse and posts up to London deserting his bride-to-be. The second Luce, disguised as a page, follows her errant lover to London where she arrives in time to overhear him planning a secret marriage to another Luce, a goldsmith's daughter, to be consummated the following day at the house of the Wise Woman of Hogsdon. The second Luce, under the name of Jack, takes service with the Wise Woman who belies her name in not realizing that Luce is a girl. Chartley arrives on the scene drunk and disorderly and promptly insults the Wise Woman whereupon the second Luce encourages her employer to revenge herself on the young gallant by preventing his forthcoming marriage to the City Luce. In the meantime, Boyster, who also loves the City Luce, arrives and gives the Wise Woman money to make Luce his wife. The next day the prospective brides and grooms arrive in masks, as instructed, and are paired off by the Wise Woman who then explains to each couple that they are masked for the convenience of the other couple, a young heir and a Lord's daughter he has stolen from the court. In the double wedding ceremony which follows, performed by the pedant

Sir Boniface, Boyster marries the City Luce while Chartley marries the Wise Woman's boy Jack (the Country Luce), doubly disguised as a girl. At the end of the ceremony, the Wise Woman disturbs the newlyweds with an outcry. The men leave frightened going separate ways, and the white witch instructs the two Luces to change clothes. Boyster meeting the second Luce clad in his wife's dress believes he has been duped by the Wise Woman into marrying a boy; however, he swears to keep quiet out of fear of scandal and ridicule. Meanwhile, Chartley and the City Luce believe they are man and wife, but before they can consummate the nuptials, the fickle Chartley sees Gratiana, the daughter of the knight Sir Harry, and becomes enamored of her. He then gulls his supposed wife Luce out of the money and jewels he had given her and proceeds to use them to court the wealthy Gratiana, who is a more suitable match for a young gentleman like himself. When the City Luce learns of her "husband's" new marriage plans, she repairs to the Wise Woman for help, knowing that she herself can do little to stop Chartley since their marriage was a secret arrangement which she cannot prove. Sencer, an ardent admirer of Gratiana, also applies to the white witch for counsel, followed by Boyster who rails against the old trot for her supposed betrayal of him. The second Luce further laments to herself that she seems doomed to remain both "A maid and a wife" (V. 332). The Wise Woman, promising

to set all things straight, devises a plot to bring the young Lothario to heel. Thus the disguised Sencer delivers a letter to Chartley from his "wife," the City Luce, inviting him to spend that night with her. And again on the eve of another wedding, Young Chartley rides away; this time he momentarily leaves his would-be wife Gratiana for a rendezvous with his supposed wife Luce at the Wise Woman's by feigning a trip into the country to see his dying father. While Chartley pursues a circuitous course to the house in Hogsdon, all the interested parties (including Old Chartley who has arrived from the country in search of his knavish son) are assembled at the Wise Woman's. Before Chartley's arrival, the white witch closets each of her guests in adjoining rooms where they can overhear the subsequent conversation between the prodigal and the City Luce. All is soon revealed and Chartley is forced to face each person he has wronged in turn until finally unable to outface them all, he bows to the inevitable and reforms in short order. Now the disguised page "skatters her hayre," and Chartley discovers that he has not married a boy bride as the Wise Woman herself had supposed, but his own "First loue, and best beloved," the second Luce (V. 352). The play ends with the proper pairing off of the young couples: Chartley with second Luce, Boyster with City Luce, and Sencer with Gratiana.

As compared with Young Arthur in How a Man May Chuse, the prodigality of the witty young scapegrace Chartley is treated in the more cynical manner of Middleton while the well-executed plot construction of The Wise Woman reminds one of Jonson. Clark, for instance, observes that "the very style is Middletonian, pungent and fluid, racy and coarse " The "wonder" of this Middletonian comedy, he says, is "that with little or no previous experience [Heywood] should have rivalled Middleton, the admitted master of the *genre*. The farce is quite as masculine as any of the latter's irresponsible early works." Clark then goes on to say that "the picture of a way of life, which for all its improbable conditions is made thoroughly convincing, is as consistent and amusing" as any of Middleton's early comedies.[31] Parrott and Ball also observe that the play is "in the realistic manner of Middleton," while T. S. Eliot sees the play as reminiscent of Jonson; and he notes that, in it, Heywood "succeeds with something not too far below Jonson to be comparable to that master's work; the wise woman herself, and her scenes with her clientele, are capitally done." The Wise Woman earns "for Heywood the title of 'realist' if any part of his work can."[32] Here, in this satiric-realistic comedy, Heywood is

[31] Clark, p. 244

[32] Parrott and Ball, p. 123, and Eliot, p. 104.

closer to the mode and manner of his fellow Jacobeans Jonson and especially, as we shall see, Middleton than in any other play with the possible exception of the subplot of English Traveller, which is also Jonsonian and Middletonian in spirit.

Like his fellow Jacobeans, Heywood also satirizes and ridicules some of the vices and social evils of the time. He pokes fun at the pedantry of Sir Boniface's latinate speech, but he also ridicules the ignorance of the knight Sir Harry;[33] he touches lightly upon the problem of marriages arranged for convenience or at the whim of the parent [illegible] in the case of Gratiana, along with the subject of marrying above one's station, as in the case of the City Luce, although neither marital problem is played up to any great extent; while,on the other hand, Heywood is more serious in his criticism of the corrupt law courts and the unequal system of justice. However, the main target of his critical barbs is the Wise Woman, the spurious white witch herself. And in her characterization, as Clark observes, Heywood

> . . . admirably hit off the whole class of fortune-tellers, baby farmers, bawds, and imposters of all kinds. . . . It was not, as has been supposed, that he was any less credulous of witches and magic than he was in later life. But here with a blunt common sense like Jonson's in The Alchemist he lays bare the

[33] Cf. Velte, p. 134.

> tricks of all manner of pretenders to wisdom above the reach of their fellows.[34]

Heywood's ridicule of pedantry and ignorance is developed around Young Sencer, the ardent admirer of Gratiana. Like Lucentio in Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew, Young Sencer gains admittance to the house of the girl he loves by posing as a tutor. Prior to this, Sencer's suit for Gratiana's hand had been rejected by Sir Harry on the grounds of the young man's unsavory reputation. Before leaving, however, Sencer had secured Sir Harry's pledge that he could wed his daughter if and when Sencer were ever received gladly into the knight's house and hired to stay with father and daughter. Shortly afterwards, Sir Boniface and Sir Timothy (the disguised Sencer) both apply for the post of tutor to Gratiana and her brother. What follows is a hilarious contest between the two aspirants in which both Sir Boniface's pedantry and Sir Harry's ignorance are exposed. Sir Timothy, for example, makes the schoolmaster Sir Boniface confess himself an ass in English (V. 322). Sencer also manipulates Sir Boniface into speaking bawdy words and talking idly, as, for example, when it appears that the pedant has said "His Nose was Husband to a Queen" in answer to Sencer's questions about the Queen of Crete and her husband Minos:

[34] Clark, Heywood, p. 246.

Sencer. Who was Pasiphas husband Queene of Creete.
Sir Boniface. Who knowes not that, why Minos was her Husband.
Sencer. That his nose was; did I not tell you so.
Sir Boniface. I say that Minos was:
Sencer. That his Nose was ha ha.
Sir Harry. Ile not beleeue it.
Sir Boniface, there are a brace of Angels.
You are not for my turne, sir Timothy
You are the man shall reade vnto my daughter
The Latin tongue, in which I am ignorant:
(V. 324)

But Sir Harry promptly reneges on his earlier promise to the rejected suitor when Sir Timothy, the newly hired tutor, reveals his true identity as Sencer. Ironically, at this point, Gratiana's father will not bestow his daughter on an unsuitable suitor, although in the end he readily enough accepts Sencer as a son-in-law to spite Young Chartley.

But then Sir Harry had just as readily accepted Chartley's suit for Gratiana's hand when the young gallant arrived with a forged letter from his father supposedly offering the knight's daughter a jointure of three hundred pounds a year. After reading the letter, Sir Harry expresses his pleasure at the prospect and tells Gratiana that she is no child of his unless she bids Young Chartley welcome. Then when the acceptable well-heeled suitor Young Chartley says: "In earnest of further acquaintance, receiue this Chayne, / These Iewels, hand and heart," Sir Harry orders his daughter to

Refuse no Chaine nor Iewels, heart nor hand,

> But in exchange of these bestowe thy selfe
> Thine owne deere selfe vpon him.

The pliant, obedient Gratiana accepts Chartley immediately, although she had never seen him before:

> My selfe on him, whom I tell now neere
> saw?
> Well since I must, your will's to mee a law.
> (V. 325-26)

After contracting his daughter first to Chartley in front of Sencer, Sir Harry later gives her to Sencer out of spite to Chartley, when he says: "Ey and the more the inconstant youth to spight. / Sencer, I giue her thee in Chartlyes sight" (V. 350). Although Gratiana is not forced to marry either Chartley or Sencer, she is actually given no choice in either case by her rapacious and capricious father who bestows her on one suitor for financial reasons and on another for spite. In a discussion of Heywood's Curtaine Lecture (published 1638), Marilyn Johnson points out that

> Heywood is against forced contracts, especially those that are made for financial reasons. His opposition to forced marriages made for gain places him at variance with a custom which had been in existence for some time and which would continue.[35]

In view of Heywood's unorthodox views and his unflattering portrait of Sir Harry, one may suspect that he is lodging

[35] Johnson, p. 43.

a mild complaint against such greedy and revengeful parental behavior in contracting young daughters.

In the case of Luce, the goldsmith's daughter, the father is pleased that his daughter will be raised by her marriage to Young Chartley, a gentleman. As he says to the young suitor:

> I entertaine the motion with all love,
> And I rejoyce my Daughter is preferr'd,
> And rais'd to such a match; I heard the contract,
> And will confirme it gladly: but pray Sir,
> When shall the merry day be? (V. 289)

Much is made of the fact that Luce is poor and as such is not a suitable match for Chartley.[36] Chartley, for instance, is pleased that he has won his money back in the dice game. "Nay," he muses, "and shee may be glad of it too: for the Girle is / but poore . . ." (V. 284). He confesses to Luce's father that the wedding must be kept secret for awhile since it could mean the loss of ten thousand pounds if news of the marriage should reach his father before Chartley comes of age. But Chartley makes his own feelings patently clear in his soliloquy, following his first sight of Gratiana:

[36] As we shall see in the following chapter, a similar problem exists in the disparate social positions of Bess Bridges and Spencer in The Fair Maid, and between Lauretta and the Prince of Florence in A Mayden-Head. In the former, Bess proves herself worthy of Spencer before their much delayed marriage, whereas in the latter, the situation is reversed. Lauretta proves herself completely unworthy of the prince.

> Chart. Gratiana! oft have I heard of her, but saw her not till now: 'tis a prettie wench, a very prettie wench, nay, a very, very, very prettie wench. But what a Rogue am I, of a married man? nay, that have not beene married this six houres, and to have my shittle-wits runne a Wooll-gathering already? What would poore Luce say if shee should heare of this? I may very well call her poore Luce, for I cannot presume of five pounds to her portion: what a Coxcombe was I, being a Gentleman, and well deriv'd, to match into so beggarly a kindred? What needed I to have grafted in the stocke of such a Choake Peare, and such a goodly Popering as this to escape me? Escape Mee (said I?) if shee doe, shee shall doe it narrowly; but I am married already, and therefore it is not possible, unlesse I should make away my wife, to compasse her. Married! why who knowes it? Ile out-face the Priest, and then there is none but shee and her Father, and their evidence is not good in Law: and if they put mee in suite, the best is, they are poore, and cannot follow it. I marry Sir, a man may have some credit by such a Wife as this. I could like this marriage well, if a man might change away his Wife, still as hee is a weary of her, and cope her away like a bad commoditie: if every new Moone a man might have a new Wife, that's every yeare a dozen. But this, Till Death us do part, is tedious . . .

It is open to question whether Heywood is criticizing marriages across class lines in this play. Although this seems to be the case, it is dangerous to push the issue too far. There is little question, however, that he is criticizing the law courts and the judicial system as it relates to the poor of his day. As Chartley points out above, Luce and her father lack the wherewithal to pursue their case against him in the courts. Luce herself is only too well aware of this when she tells her father: "To Law with him hee hath a greater purse, / And nobler friends, how then to make it knowne?" (V. 331). Like Young

Forest, in Fortune by Land and Sea, for instance, Luce is powerless and poor; consequently she cannot hope for justice when opposed by influence and wealth.

The major problem portrayed in The Wise Woman, however, is without doubt, the social evil represented by the nefarious white witch, the title character, the Wise Woman of Hogsdon. And here The Wise Woman is "a departure from the usual treatment of witchcraft as it was presented in the early seventeenth century." As Leonard says: "In its jovial high jinks the play resembles the early witch dramas. Yet it has also that tincture of satire and realism which is found more often in the seventeenth century." Furthermore, of the witch dramas of the period, it "is the only one to deal fully and satirically with the witch as a fraud and charlatan," Leonard writes, "and to suggest so directly that the practice of the false witch was common, although Heywood was clearly a believer of witchcraft."[37] There is

[37] Leonard, p. 76. Earlier Elizabethan plays which tend to treat the theme in a lighthearted manner include Lyly's Endymion (1588) and Mother Bombie (1587-90); Shakespeare's use of the weird sisters, the witches, in Macbeth (1606), however, sets "an appropriate tone of impending evil and disaster"; Jacobean witch plays tend to employ the theme in a more realistic and satirical manner, perhaps partly because of the influence of James I whose interest in witchcraft is documented in his Demonologie (1597). The seventeenth century witch plays include Middleton's The Witch (c. 1609-16), Marston's The Wonder of Women, or Sophonsiba (1605-06), and two plays concerning contemporary witches, Dekker, Ford, and Rowley's The Witch of Edmonton (1621), and Heywood and Brome's

little doubt that, like the majority of his contemporaries, Heywood did believe in the efficacy of witchcraft. In fact, he explicitly professes his belief in two of his didactic works Gunaikeion (published 1624) and The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels (published 1635).[38] Under the circumstances, Heywood's satiric picture of the white witch of Hogsdon (Hoxton) in The Wise Woman "is not intended as a ridicule of witches in general," for, as Robert R. Reed, Jr. puts it:

> in an age of witchcraft, she is a charlatan. The distinction between genuine witches and charlatans who posed as occultists in the hope of monetary profit was commonplace during the reign of King James I. Indeed, the king himself, although a believer in the occult, exposed at least three fraudulent practitioners of the art. Like the king, Heywood was fully aware of the advantages to be gained by a pretender to occult knowledge, whether acting as a wise woman or a Jesuit exorcist; but this does not mean that he entertained a serious doubt as to the reality of witchcraft. Witches existed, as he informs us in the Gunaikeion; on the other hand, knowledge of the occult was so profitable that women and even men, pretended to it in order to obtain some fraudulent advantage.[39]

Lancashire Witches (1634). In these plays," says Leonard, "witchcraft is treated as a subject of the most serious consequences." In marked contrast, "Johnson's The Mask of Queens (1604) and The Devil Is an Ass (1616) deal satirically with witchcraft" (Leonard, pp. 73-75).

[38] For a further discussion of Heywood's belief in witchcraft, see K. M. Briggs, Pale Hecate's Team (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 106-07; Frederick S. Boas, An Introduction to Stuart Drama (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946), p. 189; and Elmer Edgar Stoll, Shakespeare Studies (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960), p. 237.

[39] Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr., The Occult on the Tudor and Stuart Stage (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1965), p. 155.

Heywood's Wise Woman of Hogsdon is a bogus white witch, a charlatan, who victimizes her credulous customers with a pretended knowledge in such occult arts as fortune telling, palmistry, and astrology. This fraudulent Jill of all trades further claims some knowledge of physicke, professing to cure people. Her simulated practice of the white arts of witchcraft further serves as a front for other lucrative employments. In fact, as Reed points out,

> Heywood's ridicule, focusing upon these pretensions, is an informative sketch of charlantry. The Wise-woman's reputed practice of the occult is merely a facade behind which she practices her true profession--that of a bawd who keeps a house of prostitution; in addition, she employs two midwives who deliver the illegitimate children of "Chamber-maids and sometimes good mens Daughters . . . for a matter of money" [Pearson V. 306]."[40]

A social evil of this stripe would almost certainly appeal to any critic of society as a prime target for satire and ridicule; consequently, the opportunity to expose these fraudulent practices upon the center stage or under the rush-lights, so to speak, must have been well-nigh irresistible to a playwright-social critic like Heywood.

The second Luce, who serves as Heywood's mouthpiece in this matter, clearly underlines the critical point Heywood is making in this play in the following observations on her covetous and cunning employer:

[40] Reed.

> 2. Luce. Most strange, that womans brain should apprehend
> Such lawlesse, indirect, and horrid meanes
> For covetous gaine! How many unknowne Trades
> Women and men are free of, which they never
> Had Charter for? but Mistris, are you so
> Cunning as you make your selfe; you can
> Neither write nor reade, what doe you with those
> Bookes you so often turne over?
> Wisew. Why tell the leaves; for to be ignorant, and seeme ignorant, what greater folly?
> 2. Luce. Beleeve me, this is a cunning Woman; neither hath shee her name for nothing, who out of her ignorance, can foole so many that thinke themselves wise. . . . (V. 306-07)

and

> 2. Luce. 'Tis strange the Ignorant should be thus fool'd.
> What can this Witch, this Wizard, or old Trot,
> Doe by Inchantment, or by Magicke spell?
> Such as posesse that Art should be deepe Schollers.
> What reading can this simple Woman have?
> 'Tis palpable grosse foolery. (V. 293)

The Country Luce, says Reed, "expresses the typical insight of those who were observant enough to distinguish between charlatans and so-called genuine practicioners of white magic." The Wise Woman, although a fraud herself, enumerates the names of nine white witches "who were held to be authentic Elizabethan practitioners even by men of Heywood's inquiring temperament":[41]

> Wisewo. Ey, I warrant you, I thinke I can see as farre into a Mill-stone as another: you have heard of Mother Nottingham, who for her time was prettily well

[41] Reed, p. 156.

> skill'd in casting of Waters: and after her, Mother Bombye; and then there is one Hatfield in Pepper-Alley, hee doth prettie well for a thing that's lost. There's another in Coleharbour, that's skill'd in the Planets. Mother Sturton in Goulden-lane is for Fore-speaking: Mother Phillips of the Banke-side, for the weaknesse of the backe: and then there's a very reverent Matron on Clarkenwell-Green, good at many things: Mistris Mary on the Banke-side, is for recting a Figure: and one (what doe you call her) in Westminster, that practiseth the Booke and the Key, and the Sive and the Sheares: and all doe well, according to their talent. For my selfe, let the world speake . . . (V. 292-93)

"Like the majority of his contemporaries," says Reed, Heywood "did not deny the art of white magic"; he actually "regarded it with a respect not accorded to the commonplace practice of black witches."[42]

The Wise Woman is not only a fraud, but she is also ignorant herself, although she is "wise" enough to ". . . foole so many that thinke them- / selves wise . . ." as the second Luce observes above. In fact, as Katherine Briggs points out, The Wise Woman

> is a satire on the perennial willingness of human beings to help in cheating themselves in supernatural matters. Anyone who has ever played at fortune-telling can vouch for the accuracy of this part of Heywood's representation. If he is to be equally depended upon in his account of the Wise Woman's elaborate arrangements for forwarding illicit love affairs and disposing of unwanted babies, it is plain that there was some reason for the severity of the witch persecutions.[43]

[42] Reed, p. 157. Reed goes on to say that "in [Heywood's] opinion, which was representative, it was a science pursued by 'Schollers' and not a product of illiterate imagination."

[43] Briggs, p. 141.

It should be evident from our previous discussions that Heywood can be "depended upon" to present what appears to be an accurate exposé of many of the social vices and evils of the age in his plays of contemporary English life and manners, as well as in his other dramas. In The Wise Woman, Heywood actually exposes the secrets and some of the tricks used by charlatans like the Wise Woman for the enlightenment of his audience and readers. Under the circumstances, this important passage deserves to be quoted at length, for it clearly reveals the heavy hand of the social critic at work:

> Wisewo. Jack, thou art my Boy.
> 2. Luce. Mistris!
> Wisewo. Ile be a Mother to thee, no Mistris: come Lad, I must have thee sworne to the orders of my house, and the secrets thereof.
> 2. Luce. As I am an honest Lad, I am yours to command. But Mistris, what meane all these womens pictures, hang'd here in your withdrawing roome?
> Wisewo. Ile tell thee, Boy; marry thou must be secret. When any Citizens, or yong Gentlemen come hither, under a colour to know their Fortunes, they looke upon these pictures, and which of them they best like, she is ready with a wet finger: here they have all the furniture belonging to a privat-chamber, bedde, bed-fellow and all; but mum, thou knowest my meaning Jacke.
> 2. Luce. But I see comming and going, Maids, or such a goe for Maids, some of them, as if they were ready to lie downe, sometimes two or three delivered in one night; then suddenly leave their Brats behind them, and conveigh themselves into the Citie againe: what becomes of their Children?
> Wisewo. Those be Kitchin-maids, and Chamber-maids, and sometimes good mens Daughters: who having catch a clap, and growing neare their time, get leave to see their friends in the Countrey, for a weeke or so: then hither they come, and for a matter

> of money, here they are delivered. I have a Midwife or two belonging to the house, and one Sir Boniface a Deacon, that makes a shift to christen the Infants: we have poore, honest, and secret Neighbours that stand for common Gossips. But dost not thou know this?
>
> 2. Luce. Yes, now I doe: but what after becomes of the poore Infants?
>
> Wisewo. Why, in the night we send them abroad, and lay one at this mans doore, and another at that, such as are able to keepe them; and what after becomes of them, we inquire not. And this is another string to my Bowe.
>
> 2. Luce. Most strange, that womans brain should apprehend
> Such lawlesse, indirect, and horrid meanes
> For covetous gaine! . . . .
> . . . But wherefore have you built this little Closet close to the doore, where sitting, you may heare every word spoken, by all such as aske for you.
>
> Wisewo. True, and therefore I built it: if any knock, you must to the doore and question them, to find what they come about, if to this purpose, or to that. Now they ignorantly telling thee their errand, which I sitting in my Closet, overheare, presently come forth, and tell them the cause of their comming, with every word that hath past betwixt you in private: which they admiring, and thinking it to be miraculous, by their report I become thus famous. (V. 305-07)

In such a frank and revealing dialogue, the auditor or reader can also easily discern the cunning, deceptive reality that actually underlies the apparently "miraculous" clairvoyance of a charlatan like the Wise Woman.

The plot of The Wise Woman actually turns on a subtle distinction between the false appearance and true reality in the nature of people, things, and events in the play. In this world there is little in the end which turns out to be what it had seemed to be in the beginning. One has only to glance through the plot summary given above to

see how skilfully and pervasively Heywood has employed the theme of appearance and reality in this realistic and satiric comedy. Only a sampling of examples need be mentioned here while the discussion of characterization to follow may suggest others. In this play, for instance, the Wise Woman appears to be a legitimate white witch while she is actually a charlatan; the second Luce appears to be her boy Jack, but she is really a young gentlewoman from the country who is only disguised as a boy; and who, in turn, is again disguised (or "retro-disguised")[44] as a girl in order to be passed off as the other Luce to wed Young Chartley in a marriage arranged by the Wise Woman. In the ceremony which follows appearance and reality become so confused that only the second Luce herself knows the true state of affairs, for even the Wise Woman is duped into thinking she has married Chartley to a boy bride; consequently, Young Chartley is really married to his first betrothed, the second Luce, but he thinks he is married to Luce, the goldsmith's daughter, when he then sees Gratiana, the knight's daughter, and subsequently becomes betrothed to her; in reality, therefore, this philandering rake actually has a real wife, a supposed wife, and a would-be

[44] The term "retro-disguise" was coined by Victor Oscar Freeburg, Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965), pp. 79, 82. For an informative discussion of disguise and deception in the play, see also Leonard, pp. 51-56.

wife. Boyster also does not know that he is really married to the City Luce, thinking instead that he has been gulled into marrying the Wise Woman's boy Jack. When Chartley comes to court Gratiana, he brings a forged letter purportedly from his father; consequently, it appears to Sir Harry that "this forward match" between Chartley and Gratiana "Tooke its first birth from [Old Chartley]," as he later tells the astonished old man who, of course, knows nothing of what has transpired between his son and Sir Harry's daughter (V. 342). Gratiana's other suitor Sencer at one point appears to be the tutor of Sir Timothy and at another time a servingman who delivers Chartley a letter inviting him to what is supposed to be an assignation with his "wife," but which turns out to be something entirely different from what Chartley had anticipated and from what it actually appears to be on the surface; for in this meeting between an ostensible husband and wife, Chartley thinks he is addressing only Luce, when, in reality, he is exposing his villainy and hypocrisy before an assembled audience of interested parties. When these plot elements are taken into consideration, there can be little doubt that Heywood was consciously working with the theme of appearance and reality in this play, as indeed he was in so much of his work.

In The Wise Woman, Heywood is also treating the themes of prodigality and patience as in How a Man May Chuse,

only in this case, says Bradbrook, "Heywood gave unusually gay and farcical treatment to the Prodigal. Not only is there a patient wife, but two other would-be wives."[45] In this case, it takes a Wise Woman, a white witch, to extricate the philandering prodigal husband from the complications of trigamy. As we have seen, one of the "would-be wives" is a poor daughter of "a plaine Citizen" (V. 289), while the other is a rich daughter of a knight. Both maidens, however, are in the market for husbands and both are chaste.

In the first case, Leonard points out that "Heywood makes clear the discomfiture of Luce the goldsmith's daughter as she sits in her father's shop, a bait for gallant's eyes."[46] And in discussing "citizen comedy," Alexander Leggatt reports that "Very often . . . the setting is a shop, with the woman behind the counter, and the dialogue plays with the ideas of buying and selling"; and, "since the seducer is often of a higher rank than the shopgirl, the setting makes the scene a compliment to the chastity of middle-class women." Leggatt further concludes that "There is always something a little mechanical about such scenes, with the chaste maid and the seducer going

[45] M. S. Bradbrook, The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1956), p. 135.

[46] Leonard, p. 79.

through set motions, like wind-up toys."[47] As we have seen in Chapter II, Jane Shore is also a "woman behind the counter" in her husband's goldsmith shop and the king himself is the seducer. In their case, however, Edward IV and Jane Shore are not "wind-up toys"; historically, they are real flesh and blood people, and the successful seduction of Jane by the king is certainly not "a compliment to the chastity of middle-class women," as it presumably is in the case of Luce, who, like Susan Mountford, displays a Pamela-like morality in her dealings with suitors. As Luce says, no one will "possesse" her except "in a Nuptiall tye" (V. 286). She first spurns Boyster who comes to the shop to "buy" (V. 285). She next spurns Chartley who enters the shop minutes after Boyster's departure until he resolves to marry her:

> Chart. . . . I told you,
> the second word would be Marriage. It makes a man forfeit his Freedome, and makes him walke ever after with a Chaine at his heeles, or a Jack-an-Apes hanging at his elbow: Marriage is like Daedalus his labyrinth, and being once in, there's no finding the way out. Well, I love this little property most intolerably, and I must set her on the Last, though it cost me all the shooes in my shop. Well Luce, thou seest my stomacke is come downe; thou hast my heart already, there's my hand. (V. 288)

Young Chartley's proposal, however, does not cost him any of the "shooes" in his shop, since he promptly disavows his

[47] Leggatt, p. 101.

secret "marriage" to Luce when he sees Gratiana. In reality, the shittle-witted Chartley changes mistresses with as little concern as he would change his "shooes."

Chartley's other would-be wife, the patient Gratiana is also on the marriage block with her father supervising the buying and selling, as we have previously seen. Ironically, like Luce who cannot "fancie" Boyster (V. 286), Gratiana does not fancy Sencer when he comes to court. As she declares: ". . . Ruffians I detest: / A smooth and square behaviour likes mee mest" (V. 300-01). In discussing these two suitors, Leonard suggests that

> If Boyster is plain-spoken, Sencer is characterized as almost a young ruffian, a progenitor of the Mohocks of later years. Sencer, of course, is not a hoodlum, merely a wild young gallant and a rather clever one at that, as his word-combat with Sir Boniface reveals. He is entirely capable of wooing Gratiana with eloquence and in a courtly manner, yet he is rejected by her and her father, Sir Harry, because of his "hot" . . . ways.[48]

In the end, nevertheless, both of these patient "wives," Luce and Gratiana, accept "new husbands," these hitherto unacceptable suitors, Boyster and Sencer respectively, without the slightest demur or qualm.

In contrast to these two "would-be wives," Young Chartley's real wife, the patient second Luce is given no choice in suitors. She fancies only Chartley and remains

[48] Leonard, p. 92.

unwavering in her affections for this fickle "wild-headed Gentleman" (V. 277) from first to last. In her persistent fidelity, she is reminiscent of the patient, long-suffering Mistress Arthur, her counterpart in How a Man May Chuse; and like her sister-in-suffering the second Luce's patience can be explained only in terms of the patient wife convention. Otherwise, a girl of her obvious good sense, intelligence, and resourcefulness could scarcely abide such a rake and unprincipled scoundrel as Young Chartley. Leonard comes to the same conclusion when he points out that

> From the beginning she knows that Chartley is a ne'er-do-well, yet she continues to pursue him, contrives the secret ceremony to marry him, and accepts him gladly after Gratiana and Luce have rejected him. . . . Such utter faithfulness, like Chartley's repentance, was thus a widespread convention, powerful enough for Heywood to rely upon without presenting any other reasons for Second Luce's attachment.[49]

Although the second Luce resembles Mistress Arthur in her constancy, she is a much stronger character. Possessing wit, intelligence, and initiative, she actively pursues Chartley until he unwittingly "catches" her as his bride in the marriage arranged by the Wise Woman. Like Helena in All's Well, the second Luce is not content to wait patiently and uncomplainly by the hearth after her desertion. She

[49] Leonard, p. 92.

follows her wandering Lothario to London where she eventually reclaims him.[50] In marked contrast, Mistress Arthur does not actively pursue Young Arthur; she just sits like a doormat and welcomes her errant husband whenever he deigns to come home or decides to return to her waiting arms. In this, she is more like John Phillips' Grissill, a heroine who, according to Thorp, "is withal so very patient that one doubts whether she has wit enough to be otherwise."[51]

No one who has read The Wise Woman can doubt, however, that Young Chartley has wit, although he just as obviously does not have integrity or honesty. In this, he is like two of Heywood's other young scapegraces and prodigals, Young Lionell in the subplot of The English Traveller and especially Jack Gresham in Part II of If You Know Not Me. "Heywood has created his scapegraces" like these three, "under the influence of Plautus," says Otelia Cromwell who further remarks that Chartley and Gresham particularly are "Individualized by quickness of wit and dexterity in turning every impending disaster to their own advantage."[52] In

[50] But as Hapgood points out and Turner concedes, the second Luce is not as active in bringing her roving husband to his senses as is Helena. This feat is engineered by the Wise Woman. See Robert Hapgood and Robert Y. Turner, "Dramatic Conventions in All's Well That Ends Well," PMLA, 79 (1964), 179, 181.

[51] Thorp, p. 881.

[52] Cromwell, pp. 83, 85. See also pp. 84, 86-87. In the case of Young Lionell, it is "the quick-witted Reignald who thinks and acts for Lionel" (p. 85).

this, Chartley also resembles the Wise Woman herself, for she too is a master at turning everything to her own advantage, which in her case is generally in the nature of coin of the realm. Moreover, both are notably lacking in moral and ethical principles. As Leonard observes, Chartley not only "holds his trothplight lightly and considers nothing but the material advantages of love," but in pursuing Luce and Gratiana, he also

> . . . knowingly outwits his friends Boyster and Sencer, who are themselves worthy suitors, not dupes or affected fops to be gulled because they deserve no better. Chartley thus subverts the notions of unselfish love and faithful masculine comradeship that are often part of romantic comedy.[53]

Nichols also quite rightly points out that "in the course of the action Chartley offends or gulls both Luces, Sencer, Boyster, the Wise Woman, Luce's father, Gratiana's father, and his own,"[54] to which one should also add Gratiana. Like the villainous Dalavill in English Traveller, Young Chartley offends, dupes, and gulls everyone. But Chartley is duped himself by both the Wise Woman and the second Luce, as well as by Sencer who delivers the pre-arranged letter and the City Luce when she plays her part in exposing him before the others in the screen scene.

[53] Leonard, pp. 91-92.

[54] Nichols, p. 51.

Like Dalavill, too, Young Chartley has little pity or charity for his victims, although at one point he almost seems ashamed of his perfidy when he muses:

> Chart. What a Pagan am I, to practise such villany against this honest Christian [Luce]! If Gratiana did come into my thoughts, I should fall into a vaine to pittie her . . .

But he does not fall into such a "vaine," because he immediately begins to think of Gratiana and decides to use the money and jewels he has just retrieved from Luce to court Gratiana:

> but now that I talk of her [Gratiana], I have a tongue to wooe her, Tokens to win her; and that done if I doe not find a tricke, both to weare her, and wearie her, it may prove a piece of a Wonder . . . (V. 317-18)

Chartley's rapaciousness, his total lack of honor and of pity becomes even more apparent when he contemplates marrying Gratiana for her dowry and then poisoning her. As he confesses to Luce:

> . . . it is but
> giuing her a dram, or a pill to purge melancholy to make her turne vp her heeles, and then with all that wealth, come I to liue with thee my sweete raskall. (V. 347)

Young Arthur in How a Man May Chuse "poisons" his first wife so that he can marry the second, the whore Mary; but Young Chartley would contract a bigamous marriage with a second wife, poison her, and then after inheriting "all that wealth"

return to the first "wife." As if this were not enough, like the heroes of the coterie playwrights such as Middleton, Young Chartley would rejoice at the news of his father's death.[55] When the disguised Sencer brings Chartley the letter from Luce, Young Chartley exclaims:

> Good newes, as I liue, there's for thy paines my good sir Pandarus: Hadst thou brought mee word my father had turnd vp his heeles, thou couldst scarcely haue pleased mee better . . .

And when Chartley decides to accept Luce's invitation, Sencer advises him to persuade Gratiana and Sir Harry he has ". . . receiu'd a letter that / [his] Father lyes a dying." To which Chartley replies: "You rogue, I would hee did but the / name of that newes is cal'd, too good to be true" (V. 337).

In The Wise Woman, and especially in the characterization of the knavish rogue Young Chartley and the cunning charlatan, the white witch, Heywood reveals a streak of cynicism and skepticism not clearly discernable in the

[55] Alfred Harbage points out that "Day after day at Blackfriars, Paul's, and Whitefriars, the audience contemplated the erosion of the closest bonds known to man--in the lusts of the flesh in tragedy, and the love of money in comedy. 'Are your fathers dead, gentlemen, you're so merry?' asks Fitzgrave in Middleton's Your Five Gallants. . . . Some of the characters who speak in this fashion are recognized as contemptible, but others are not so conceived. The line of satire grows blurred, jest becomes earnest, and the ugly mask leaves its imprint on the living face" (Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions [New York: Macmillan, 1952], pp. 257-58). Young Lionell also wishes his father were dead and buried at sea (The English Traveller IV. 21, 35).

earlier reconciliation drama _How a Man May Chuse_. Here in The Wise Woman, Heywood is closer to Middleton particularly than in any other play, for these two villains would fit right into Middleton's world. Instead of the moral earnestness we find in _How a Man May Chuse_ or in his domestic tragedies studied in the last chapter, we find Heywood in _The Wise Woman_ portraying his rioters, gallants, sharpers, and fools with no sense of moral outrage as in Jonson but rather dispassionately as in Middleton; as Leonard observes: "in presenting this society Heywood shows neither contempt nor outrage. Instead, his revelations are made with rather little passion, as though he is showing his society as we all know it to be."[56] We will remember that Heywood's villains also bear a resemblance to some of Jonson's _dramatis personae_ and in its superbly constructed plot, _The Wise Woman_ also resembles Jonson's well-executed dramatic productions, such as _The Alchemist_ and _Epicoene, or The Silent Woman_. The characterization of the Wise Woman resembles that of Subtle and Face in _The Alchemist_, while the unmasking of a bride at the conclusion to Heywood's play may also recall the unmasking of the bride Mistress Epicoene in Jonson's _Epicoene_. The denouement of the two plays are reversed, however, for in Jonson's _Epicoene_, the silent bride of Morose turns

[56] Leonard, p. 79.

out to be a boy in reality, whereas the supposed wife of Young Chartley, the Wise Woman's boy Jack, actually turns out to be a girl, the second Luce.

In the denouement of _The Wise Woman_, Young Chartley, like Dalavill and Young Arthur is not punished for his perfidy. Like Dalavill, he gets off scot-free, outside of a little momentary embarrassment; and like Young Arthur, he is rewarded with a fair, chaste, patient, and loving wife he definitely does not deserve. There is even less poetic justice at the end of _The Wise Woman_ than at the conclusion to the earlier _How a Man May Chuse_. Good does not overcome evil at all at the end of _The Wise Woman_, for Young Chartley's regeneration is a matter of expediency, not of moral principle. Indeed, Young Chartley does not really repent at all in the sense that Young Arthur does. He is simply nonplussed and unable to outface everyone. As he declares: "What shall I say, or thinke, or doe, I am / at a Nonplus" (V. 348). Moreover, since he has condemned himself out of his own mouth for the illumination of everyone concerned, he cannot then disavow his villainy. Instead, being the bright and witty young man that he is, Young Chartley accepts his discomfiture with equanimity and bows to the inevitable with good grace, as he hastens to assure his father Old Chartley:

> Then see sir, when to all your judgements
> I see me past grace, doe I lay hold of _Grace_, and heere

> begin to retyre my selfe, this woman [Wise Woman] hath lent mee
> a glasse, in which I see all my imperfections, at which my conscience doth more blush inwardly, then my face outwardly, and now I dare confidently vndertake for my selfe I am honest. (V. 352)

This expedient last minute conversion can be explained, of course, in reference to the conventions of the prodigal son and of instant character reversal and Heywood's audience no doubt accepted it as such. In this play, the playwright-social critic has also "lent" his audience a "glasse" in which to see its own "imperfections," as well as its own credulity and superstitious ignorance in the event that any had been or would be gulled or victimized by the tricks of a charlatan and fraud like the Wise Woman of Hogsdon.

This particular white witch is also not punished in any way for her own villainy, as Swinburne observes:

> Poetical justice may cry out against the dramatic lenity which would tolerate or prescribe for the sake of a comfortable close to this comedy the triumphant escape of a villanous old imposter and baby-farmer from the condign punishment due to her misdeeds; but the severest of criminal judges if not of professional witch-finders might be satisfied with the justice or injustice done upon "the late Lancashire Witches" in the bright and vigorous tragicomedy which, as we learn from Mr. Fleay, so unwarrantably and uncharitably (dispite a disclaimer in the epilogue) anticipated the verdict of their judges against the defenceless victims of terrified prepossession and murderous perjury.[57]

Like Young Chartley, and so many of Heywood's other villains,

[57] Swinburne, p. 249.

the Wise Woman, the phony white witch, escapes free and clear whereas at the conclusion of The Late Lancashire Witches, the black witches are bound over to the law to be tried and punished for their misdeeds. The heroine of this play, Mrs. Generous, loses her hand and will presumably soon lose her life, while the Wise Woman only loses her boy Jack when he is revealed as the second Luce. In neither play dealing with the motif of witchcraft does Heywood indulge in poetic justice as such; he rather portrays things as they actually happened in the real life of his times. In The Wise Woman, Heywood satirically exposes the cunning and covetousness connected with the pretended learning of a charlatan in his Horatian treatment of the bogus white witch. In this earlier play, he is closer to the tone and temper of Jonson's satirical exposé of the fraud and avarice connected with the practice of alchemy in The Alchemist. In Lancashire Witches, on the other hand, Heywood deals with the more evil practices of the devotees of the black arts in his Juvenalian treatment of the Pendle Forest witches. In this later play, he is closer in tone and temper to Jonson's more serious exposé of the vices and evils of man and society in Volpone.

The Late Lancashire Witches

In Heywood's repertory, the play which most closely parallels real events or rather supposed real events in

seventeenth century England is the topical The Late Lancashire Witches (1634) written in collaboration with Richard Brome.[58] In terms of modern drama, this play would correspond to the current mania or fad for stories and dramas of the occult and the supernatural. Or if one wished to pursue the "soap opera" analogy as with the previous two plays of Heywood discussed in this chapter, Lancashire Witches would correspond to a former daytime drama of the supernatural Dark Shadows in its appeal, or insofar as some of the witches' pranks are comical, especially in the humorous scenes of the subplot centering upon the Seeleys and their servants, the play might be compared to Bewitched or to Tabitha.

In the subplot, generally attributed to Brome, the bewitched Seeley household is turned topsy-turvy when the parents are dominated by the children, who are, in turn, under the thumb of the servants Lawrence and Parnell. The witches wreak havoc at the wedding of these servants when they bewitch the musicians and transform the wedding feast into "Snakes, Batts, Frogs, / Beetles, Hornets, and

[58] The Late Lancashire Witches by Heywood and Richard Brome was written and published in 1634; and as Velte notes: "There is no question as to the date of the play or the circumstances in which it arose" (p. 120). See also Clark, Heywood, pp. 120-21, and Robert Grant Martin, "Is The Late Lancashire Witches a Revision?" Modern Philology, 13 (1915-16), 253-89. All references from the play in the text are from the Pearson edition by volume and page numbers.

Humble-bees . . ." (IV. 207). They further transform the wedding night into a time of frustration and fury when the bridegroom is rendered impotent through a charmed "Codpeece-point" (IV. 253), a wedding gift from Lawrence's former mistress, Mal Spencer. This lovely milkmaid is in reality a witch who can make her milk pail glide along through the air at her beck and call. She is also the choice friend of Mrs. Generous, the heroine of the main plot. When Mal, Mrs. Generous, and the other Lancashire witches are turned over to the authorities, in the end, the Seeley household returns to normal once again.

In the main plot, a domestic drama of Master Generous and his wife of over twenty years, the incredulous husband learns to his horror that Mrs. Generous is a black witch in league "with that Fiend / The Enemy of Mankind" (IV. 227). This middle-class housewife is actually the leader of the witches in Lancashire. She is a woman who can turn the Generous groom Robin into a horse with the aid of a charmed bridle; he is then compelled to whisk her away to the forest where she attends a concourse of the "Satanicall sisterhood" (IV. 219). She also has the power to transform herself into a cat, and with her fellow beldames, she tyrannizes and torments the miller at her husband's old mill. Mistress Generous calls up apparitions of the spurious fathers--a pedant for Bantam, a tailor for Shakestone, and Robin the groom for Arthur--to punish the three young

gentlemen for teasing and tormenting her half-wit nephew Whetstone. The reader will perhaps applaud this feat since she puts these hypocritical, insensitive, and cruel young men roundly in their place. In the end, however, Mrs. Generous and her fellow hellcats haunt the mill once too often; this time it is under the operation of a new miller, a soldier recently returned from war, who cuts off the paw-hand of his employer's wife, a mutilation which leads to her exposure and arrest. When Mr. Generous recognizes the wedding band on the severed hand, he confronts his ailing wife with this macabre evidence of her apostasy. Squire Generous had previously forgiven his wife when he had first discovered her association with witchcraft, and he was fooled into thinking she would renounce her black arts. Now, however, he turns Mrs. Generous over to the authorities to stand trial with the other witches of Lancashire who are brought to heel by Doughty, the self-appointed witch hunter. In the _dénouement_, Mr. Generous casts off his wife's young nephew Whetstone and makes the unworthy young gallant Arthur his heir.

For its earliest audience, this drama of Pendle Forest witchcraft must have been highly topical. As Katherine Briggs points out, "The play was written hot on the event," a Stop the Press drama.[59] Heywood and Brome's play was "acted by the King's Company at the Globe in the summer of

[59] Briggs, p. 99.

1634 and published in the same year," according to Boas, who adds that "Heywood must take a larger share than his younger collaborator Richard Brome, of the disgrace of working up popular feeling against a group of unfortunate women from the Pendle district of Lancashire."[60] On another occasion, Boas takes the playwrights to task for working up "popular feeling against the victims" for "their own profit."[61] This seems to be the consensus among Heywood's critics, who have momentarily set aside their usual praise of Heywood as a kindly, genial, and lovable playwright, to accuse him of deliberately stirring up or intensifying public feeling against the unfortunate "witches" of Lancashire. Ward, for instance, contends that "the authors of _The Late Lancashire Witches_ cannot be acquitted on the charge that they had, _pendente lite_, done their utmost to intensify public feeling against 'witches'"; while Heywood's biographer, Clark, goes even further, and after quoting Ward's statement, adds that

> No doubt they did nothing to decrease the popular fury against witches in general, but in this particular case there were rumours of a royal pardon when the play was being written, and more than a suspicion of the _bona fides_ of the two chief witnesses for the prosecution;

[60] Boas, _Heywood_, pp. 154-55.

[61] Boas, _Introduction_, p. 188.

while Reed feels that Heywood and Brome "consistently eschewed any effort at moderation . . . they were not concerned with serious drama; their objective was to exploit the mood of a London set emotionally agog by the reports of the witch trial"; Briggs suggests that "If Heywood had any doubts he acted inconsiderately in producing a play which would be likely to inflame popular opinion against the witches"; and finally Velte maintains that Heywood and Brome

> do their best to make out a bad case against them prior to the examination by the King and the Bishop of Chester. Public feeling against witches was already strong at the time, and the two authors of this drama seem to have endeavored to make it even more bitter. Positive malignity has taken the place of the mocking satire and ridicule of "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon." Heywood obviously regarded her as a fraud, but if he was at all honest--and I believe him so--he had no doubt of the evil deeds of the Pendle witches, and, therefore was unsparing in his efforts to have them convicted.

Velte is one of the few critics who at least attempt to partially exonerate Heywood for his part in making "out a bad case" against the Pendle Forest witches.[62]

In Heywood's defense, we should not lose sight of the fact that he believed in witchcraft, white and black, and he undoubtedly believed in the guilt of this "second

[62] Adolphus William Ward and A. R. Waller, eds., The Cambridge History of English Literature (New York: Macmillan, 1933), VI, 118-19; Clark, Heywood, p. 242; Reed, pp. 187-88; Briggs, p. 100; and Velte, pp. 121-22.

generation" of Pendle Forest witches. A perusal of "The Epilogve" to Lancashire Witches should further convince the reader of his sincerity:

> Now while the Witches must expect their due
> By lawfull Iustice, we appeale to you
> For favourable censure; what their crime
> May bring upon 'em, ripenes yet of time
> Has not reveal'd. Perhaps great Mercy may
> After just condemnation give them day
> Of longer life. We represent as much
> As they have done, before Lawes hand did touch
> Vpon their guilt; But dare not hold it fit,
> That we for Iustices and Iudges sit,
> And personate their grave wisedomes on the Stage
> Whom we are bound to honour; No, the Age
> Allowes it not. Therefore unto the Lawes
> We can but bring the Witches and their cause,
> And there we leave 'em, as their Divels did,
> Should we goe further with 'em? Wit forbid;
> What of their storie, further shall ensue,
> We must referre to time, our selves to you.
> ([my underlining] IV. 262)

Here near the end of his dramatic career, we have the strong, almost irrefutable evidence that Heywood conceived of himself as a social critic as well as a playwright. To a modern reader, Heywood's obvious attempt to intensify animosity against these unfortunate women seems heinous. Yet when we put this most topical of his plays into the context of its time in England (1634) and remember that Heywood believed these women were in league with the devil and further that Heywood's belief in witches was not only genuine but was also shared by most of his contemporaries, we can understand his actions, although as modern readers we cannot condone them.

The primary source material for this tragicomedy of contemporary English life is, according to Reed:

> the trial of seventeen witches arraigned at Lancaster in the early spring of 1634; the accused were the second generation of Pendle Forest witches to be apprehended. The people of Lancashire had not forgotten the trial of 1612, which had culminated in the execution of two men and nine women: Pendle Forest, in their minds, had come to be the dark and foreboding habitat of witches. As a result, a number of extravagant accusations made in a sworn statement by young Edmund Robinson, aged eleven, were widely credited and later accepted as valid testimony against the witches tried in 1634.[63]

And concerning the further outcome of the trial, Katherine Briggs relates that

> The jury pronounced seventeen of the witches guilty; but the judge had doubts, and respited them, pending further inquiry. The matter was examined long and carefully, and at last the boy confessed his fraud. Before the examination several of the accused had already died in prison, and in 1636 ten of the acquitted were still in Lancaster Castle, unable probably to pay their prison dues,[64]

although the king had issued a pardon to them on June 30, 1634.

In the period between the trial in Lancashire and the king's pardon, four of the accused women had been sent up to London, in June 1634, to be examined by the surgeons of

[63] Reed, pp. 186-87.

[64] Briggs, pp. 104-05. For a more extensive background discussion of the play, see Clark, _Heywood_, pp. 120-27.

Charles I and by a committee composed of midwives.[65]

Haywood's biographer Clark suggests that

> Our collaborators probably did not set about the tragi-comedy till they had seen and perhaps conversed with "Those Witches the fat Iaylor brought to Towne" ["The Prologve" IV. 169], towards the end of June. It was staged by the King's men at the Globe when the rumour of a pardon was abroad . . . . The epilogue must have been written before Charles's pardon on June 30 or very early in July in consequence of the confession of Edmund Robinson, the younger of the . . . crown witnesses.[66]

In Lancashire Witches, the playwrights follow their sources very closely.[67] According to R. G. Martin:

> The characters of the play who were taken from real life are the witches Moll Spencer, Mawd (Hargrave), Meg or Peg (Johnson), Gill (Dickison), and the boy, evidently the young rascal Edmund Robinson, who caused all the trouble. The incidents borrowed are those of the boy and the greyhounds (II, iii, iv), the boy's ride through the air with Goody Dickison (II, iv), the milk pail which obeys Moll's summons (II, vi), the witches' feast (IV, i), the boy's story of his fight with a devil (V, i), Peg's confession (V,v). In these incidents the authors, as has been noted by all critics, kept very close to the terms of the depositions.[68]

[65] Martin, "Is The Late," p. 253. Martin further states that "The boy Edmund Robinson and his father were likewise summoned to London and presently confessed that the witchcraft charge was an imposture pure and simple" (pp. 253-54).

[66] Clark, Heywood, p. 125.

[67] Briggs notes that the stories of the Lancashire witches "were rumoured widely abroad before the trial. It is nevertheless surprising with what minuteness Heywood's play followed the details of the confessions and accusations. He must have worked upon a pamphlet giving full details of the trial, been present at it himself, or had copies of the depositions" (p. 102).

[68] Martin, "Is The Late," pp. 256-57. See also pp. 253-65.

Other sources discussed by Martin and other critics include the official report by Thomas Potts, the clerk of the Court for the 1612 trial of the first generation of witches from the Pendle Forest in Lancashire, in which an Alice Nutter, a woman "of good birth and social standing" was found guilty of witchcraft and executed in 1612. Since the other women of both generations of Lancashire witches (1612 and 1634) were of humble birth, the lineage, wealth, and social position of Mrs. Generous, Heywood's heroine, may have been suggested by Potts's account of Alice Nutter.[69] Katherine Briggs further reveals that along with these two accounts of witchcraft trials in Lancashire, the play-wrights used folk tales to round out their own account in Lancashire Witches:

> Into this he [Heywood] weaves various other folk stories, that of the musicians enchanted, of the household turned topsy-turvy, so that the children commanded the parents and the servants the children, of the bewitched bridegroom and the false apparitions of the spurious fathers, of the man witch-ridden with a magic bridle, of the mill haunted by cats, and the paw cut off which turned into a hand. The last can never have been adduced as evidence in court, though it may have run among the rumours of the trials. There is a version of the tale in the Malleus Maleficarum, though without the picturesque circumstance of the severed hand. All these are true folk stories, and among them Heywood introduced a folk custom which survived to the end of the last century, the riding of the Skimmington, an instrument of mob law for

[69] Martin, p. 255. See also Reed, p. 189, and Briggs, p. 100.

> deriding a scolding wife or bullying husband, or any other offender against folk morality.[70]

In this case the offenders are the Seeleys' servants Lawrence and Parnell, and this portion of the play, along with the account of the "topsy-turvy" household of the Seeleys is generally attributed to Brome, while the main plot of Master and Mistress Generous is universally assigned to Heywood.[71]

There seems little if any doubt that the main plot is Heywood's. Clark, among others, notes that "It repeats with appropriate variations the plot" of the domestic tragedies _A Woman Killed_ or _English Traveller_, "with an admixture of the occult art of which Heywood had been a diligent reader for years, and which," according to Clark "by the very frequency of its supposed manifestations in ordinary settings was particularly suitable for the domestic play."[72] The heroine of this tragicomedy of contemporary English life, Mrs. Generous, is an erring wife, not a patient Griselda, as in the case of Mistress Arthur in _How a Man May Chuse_ and the second Luce in _The Wise Woman_,

[70] Briggs, p. 103. For a further discussion of sources, see Cromwell, pp. 180-81; Velte, pp. 120-21; and Clark, _Heywood_, pp. 120-27.

[71] See Clark, p. 126; Cromwell, pp. 181, 184; Velte, p. 123; Fleay, p. 301; Crofts, p. 105; and Martin, "Is _The Late_," pp. 262-65.

[72] Clark, p. 242.

and the hero, Mr. Generous, is decidedly not a prodigal son as in the case of Young Arthur and Young Chartley. In this play, the situation is reversed, for the husband, not the wife, is the abused party. Master Generous, however, is not abused in a physical way as was Mistress Arthur, but rather he is abused in his trust in his wife, as in the case of Matthew Shore, Frankford, and Mr. Wincott. And like these other husbands, Generous pardons his fallen wife, one time at any rate, although he later hands her over to the law. The erring wife motif in _Lancashire Witches_ is handled somewhat differently from the treatment of the motif in Heywood's domestic tragedies. Mrs. Generous is presumably a chaste wife; she errs in being a witch. She betrays her husband in her pact with the devil, not in an affair with another man.

In this play, as in Heywood's domestic tragedies and in his other comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life previously discussed, the playwright is again consciously applying the theme of appearance and reality to underline the very real evil beneath the apparent good. Mrs. Generous, a wife to Generous for over twenty years, is not the good wife she seems to be:

> _Gen_. I know her a good woman and well bred,
> Of an unquestion'd carriage, well reputed
> Amongst her neighbors, reckon'd with the best
> And ore me most indulgent . . . (IV. 192)

And she is definitely not the "seeming Saint" she has appeared to be. As Generous soliloquizes when he half suspects she has been unfaithful with his groom Robin:

> Gen. I see what Man is loath to entertaine,
> Offers it selfe to him most frequently,
> And that which we most covet to embrace,
> Doth seldome court us, and proves most averse;
> For I, that never coo'd conceive a thought
> Of this my woman worthy a rebuke,
> (As one that in her youth bore her so fairely
> That she was taken for a seeming Saint)
> To render me such just occasion,
> That I should now distrust her in her age;
> Distrust! I cannot, that would bring me in
> The poore aspersion of fond jealousie;
> Which even from our first meeting I abhorr'd.
> (IV. 222)

Actually, little in this world is as it seems to be. Respectable women like Mrs. Generous and Goody Dickison and pretty young maidens like Mal Spencer are really black witches. As the smitten "old Batchelour" Doughty (IV. 208) ironically says of the fair Mal Spencer at the wedding celebration of Lawrence and Parnell:

> Thinke! I thinke they [the musicians] are drunke. Prithee doe not thinke of Witchcraft; for my part, I shall as soone thinke this maid one, as that theres any in Lancashire. (IV. 215)

In this world, appearance and reality are turned topsy-turvy as in the Seeley's household. A meeting of Mrs. Generous and her cohorts in an old barn, for instance,

turns out to be a witches' sabbat (IV. 218-22).[73] Even many of the hares and horses, dogs and cats roaming the Lancashire fields and countryside are not really animals at all but witches who have "the power of self-metamorphosis."[74] Consequently, when the soldier-miller cuts off the left forepaw of a "catter-wawling" hell-cat (IV. 248), it is later revealed to be a hand bearing a wedding ring. Master Generous finds the hand, recognizes it by the "most infallible markes" (IV. 249), and carries it around until he confronts his ailing wife with this "infallible" proof of her apostasy, her broken vow to give up the practice of witchcraft. This macabre touch no doubt appealed to the taste of Heywood's Caroline audience long used to large doses of horror served up by the Jacobean playwrights.

Even the earlier penitence of Mistress Generous was dissembled. Like Anne Frankford, she confesses her own fall from grace, but unlike the former erring wife, whose penitence and sorrow are genuine, hers is feigned. Her husband, Generous, however, accepts it at face value; he is unable to sort out appearance and reality, because of his

[73] According to Robert Hunter West: "The witches' gathering, or Sabbat, was not so prominent in English witchcraft as in that of the continent. So far as I know," he says, "this witches' feast in Act IV of The Late Lancashire Witches is the only instance of it in Elizabethan drama, though there are, of course, references to it, as in [Middleton's] The Witch and Macbeth" (The Invisible World [Athens: The Univ. of Georgia Press, 1939], p. 256, n. 37).

[74] A term used by Reed. See p. 188.

wish to believe his old wife.

> <u>Gen</u>. Why hast thou any hope?
> <u>Mrs</u>. Yes Sir I have.
> <u>Gen</u>. Make it appeare to me.
> <u>Mrs</u>. I hope I never bargain'd for that fire,
> Further then penitent teares have power to quench.
> <u>Gen</u>. I would see some of them.
> <u>Mrs</u>. You behold them now.
> (If you looke on me with charitable eyes)
> Tinctur'd in blood, blood issuing from the heart,
> Sir I am sorry; when I looke towards Heaven
> I beg a gracious Pardon; when on you
> Me thinkes your Native goodnesse should not be
> Lesse pittifull than they: 'gainst both I have err'd,
> From both I beg attonement.
> <u>Gener</u>. May I presum't?
> <u>Mrs</u>. I kneele to both your Mercies.
> <u>Gener</u>. Know'st thou what a Witch is?
> <u>Mrs</u>. Alas, None better,
> Or after mature recollection can be
> More sad to thinke on't.
> <u>Gen</u>. Tell me, are those teares
> As full of true hearted penitence,
> As mine of sorrow, to behold what state
> What desperate state th'art falne in.
> <u>Mrs</u>. Sir they are. (IV. 227-28)

Of course, as she later confesses to Mal Spencer, she dissembled to pacify her husband:

> <u>Mal</u>. But thence how scap't you?
> <u>Mrs</u>. Without danger,
> I thank my spirit.
> <u>Mal</u>. I but than
> How pacified was your good man?
> <u>Mrs</u>. Some passionate words mixt with forct tears
> Did so inchant his eyes and eares
> I made my peace, with promise never
> To doe the like; but once and ever
> A Witch thou know'st. . . . (IV. 235-36)

Mrs. Generous is not a young woman like the other erring wives, Jane Shore, Anne Frankford, and Mrs. Wincott,

or like the good patient wives Mrs. Arthur and the second Luce, but one married "this twentie yeares and upwards" (IV. 224). Mrs. Generous is a "consistently strong" character, as Otelia Cromwell observes, who "recalls Mrs. Wincott, but she is more crafty and subtle . . . . To the end she exhibits neither the weakness of Mrs. Wincott nor the remorse of Mrs. Frankford and Jane Shore." Cromwell goes on to say that ". . . As the center, the inspiring force of the witches, she is presented in vigorous action; a vivid, alert creature, she moves in and out of the scenes"; consequently "compared to her, Mrs. Frankford and Jane Shore are lay figures."[75]

Unlike the other wives, Mrs. Generous remains unrepentant to the end. When arrested, she refuses to repent or even to comment. Her last words are defiant and unyielding:

> Mrs. Gen. I will say nothing, but what you know you know,
> And as the law shall finde me let it take me.
> (IV. 258)

With this witch wife who has made a compact with the devil (IV. 227), we have come a long way from a repentant Jane Shore, Anne Frankford, or even a Mrs. Wincott; a long way from the Wise Woman of Hogsdon, a fraud and charlatan, a bogus white witch who, by her own admission ". . . never

[75] Cromwell, pp. 182-83.

had to doe with the devill" (V. 296); and a very long way from a patient Mrs. Arthur. These two are polar opposites--a saint and a witch--a submissive, subservient doormat and a strong, independent leader of witches. The darkening of Heywood's world view, his pessimism and disillusionment is revealed most clearly in the distance--the thirty or more years--separating these erring wives, repentant and unrepentant; these two witches, white and black; and finally and most conclusively, these last two wives, patient saint and devil-possessed witch. An index to Heywood's increasing pessimism may be found in his characterization of women--in his preference late in life for choosing stories with such unsympathetic, degenerate heroines as Mrs. Wincott and Mrs. Generous rather than stories with such sympathetic, exemplary heroines as Lady Mary Audley and Mistress Arthur. Ironically, Mrs. Generous is the only erring wife who is not sincerely repentant in the end, the only one who does not deserve a second chance, while, on the other hand, of all the injured husbands, Generous is the only one who is willing to forgive and forget--to take his wife to his bosom again (IV. 228). When we recall the dates of these plays--Edward IV (1596-99), A Woman Killed (1603), The English Traveller (1624-27), and Lancashire Witches (1634)--and when we remember the situation in each play and especially the characterization of the wife, we can scarcely fail to perceive the progressive

darkening of Heywood's vision between each play, as well as his increasing cynicism and pessimism in each subsequent portrayal of an erring wife.

In the characterization of the husband in Lancashire Witches, Master Generous does not belie his name; he is both kind and generous but ironically to the wrong people and at the wrong time. Like Frankford and Old Wincott, he is unable to distinguish between the deceptive outer appearance and the true inner reality in the nature of people. His trust in the young gallant Arthur, for instance, is misplaced. Arthur is not the "vertuous Gentleman" Generous takes him to be (IV. 256). Arthur is, in reality, an insensitive hypocritical young blade who teases and torments Whetstone, the dimwitted nephew of Mrs. Generous, by hectoring him about his bastardy, among other things, and by calling him "Mr. Byblow" (IV. 175, 213) behind the back of Generous even after he had asked Arthur as a personal favor to at least "seeme to winke at his [Whetstone's] wants" (IV. 177). Whetstone is wanting in wit and intelligence but not in integrity as are Arthur and his fellow tormentors Shakestone and Bantam. It may have been good sport in Heywood's time to tease and torment half-wits, but Heywood himself did not seem to share this sentiment. As a social critic, Heywood generally levels his shafts at the middle class and the upper class, not at the humble folk, and especially not at

those who lack either money or wit. Like almost all of Heywood's clowns, Whetstone is a sympathetic character; he is one of the few people in the play, as a matter of fact, who is presented in a kindly manner. One cannot help but admire his loyalty to his aunt, Mrs. Generous, even if his loyalty is misplaced; he is still "a kinde Kinsman" as Bantam says in the closing words of the play; such constancy and kindness are rare outside of that displayed by Heywood's patient wives or by his clowns and servants. That Generous should disinherit Whetstone and make Arthur (a mere acquaintance) his new heir reveals most clearly his lack of perception. In this he recalls Old Wincott who makes his wife's lover, Geraldine, his heir upon Mrs. Wincott's death.

Generous is even more blind when it comes to sorting out truth from dissimulation where his wife is concerned. This is understandable, of course, because Mrs. Generous, like her master Lucifer, is a master at beguiling people with fair-seeming evil. In discussing the characterization of Generous, most critics note his resemblance to Heywood's other injured husbands of erring wives. The similarity is particularly strong in Generous' pardon of the erring wife and the earlier pardons of Matthew Shore, Frankford, and Old Wincott:

> Gen. Rise, and as I doe, so heaven pardon me;
> We all offend, but from such falling off,

> Defend us. Well, I doe remember wife,
> When I first tooke thee, 'twas for good and bad;
> O change thy bad to good, that I may keep thee,
> As then we past our faiths, till Death us sever.
> . . . . all's forgiven, forgot;
> Only thus much remember, thou had'st extermin'd
> Thy Selfe out of the blest society
> Of Saints and Angels, but on thy repentance
> I take thee to my Bosome, once againe,
> My wife, sister, and daughter . . . (IV. 228)

After reading this moving and heartfelt pardon of Generous, we may all perhaps share the feelings of F. S. Boas when he says:

> It strikes us as a desecration that after this Mrs. Generous should return at once to her black magic and that her husband, after visual proof of her infamy, should himself feel bound to deliver her to justice, which she meets without any further affectation of remorse. The play was intended to drive home the lesson that there could be no limited liability in a contract with the devil.[76]

The play was also intended no doubt to convince its auditors that the infernal black arts of witchcraft should not go unpunished; hence, the obvious effort of an old playwright-social critic like Heywood, along with his younger collaborator Brome, to stir up popular feeling against the Lancashire "witches." Heywood obviously felt

[76] Boas, Introduction, p. 190. See also Boas, Heywood, p. 157: "It is a blow after this that Mrs. Generous again falls from grace, and her husband feels compelled to deliver her to justice. Heywood can allow of repentance and pardon for wives who have been faithless but not ultimately for one who has sold herself to the powers of evil." See also Clark, Heywood, p. 243; Crofts, p. 105; and Velte, p. 123.

that these women, like his heroine Mistress Generous, had "extermin'd" themselves ". . . out of the blest society / Of Saints and Angels . . ." (IV. 228), and out of the society of their fellow Englishmen as well.

In Duane Nichols' reading of the play, however, he suggests that "Heywood and Brome may have been writing a bitterly ironic comment on a society that could so viciously treat old women"--the Lancashire witches--who Nichols believes "are delightful figures." Nichols then goes on to posit that

> . . . the play offers a condemnation of the society that would allow witches or suspected witches to be so wretchedly treated. . . . Nothing the witches do harms anyone; everything they do takes on the nature of a practical joke. Realizing that the crimes for which witches were tried in the seventeenth century were hardly more than pranks and that the playwrights may have been merely reporting, I nevertheless suggest that the play be read in this light for additional evidence in support of possible satire in the play.[77]

As we have seen, Heywood and Brome were, in fact, "reporting" what they had found in their sources. The "practical jokes" of the witches were based on actual trial accounts and depositions and on folk tales. Furthermore, it is not correct to say that "Nothing the witches do harms anyone," since the first miller, for instance, is harmed by the scratching and clawing of the hellcats. He enters "_his hands and face scratcht, and bloudy_" (IV. 195) after a bout with the

[77] Nichols, pp. 5, 72-73.

translated cats at the mill, and he resigns his position as miller in Mr. Generous' mill rather than suffer more harm at their hands. Later his son is harmed by the witches and the young devil he fought with who, as the boy relates ". . . strucke me and layd mee for dead." Afterwards the miller's son lay in a trance until he was found, and

> . . . since which time he has beene haunted and frighted with Goblins, 40 times; and never durst tell any thing . . . because the Hags had so threatned him till in his sickness he revealed it to his mother. (IV. 243);

In addition to this, the soldier-miller who takes the father's place at the mill is ". . . nipt, and pull'd, and pinch'd," although he has "kept [his] face whole" thanks to his "Semiter," which he used to cut off Mrs. Generous' paw-hand (IV. 248).

There is some truth, however, in Nichols' assertion that

> There is, on the other hand, nothing about the life of the ordinary country citizens to indicate particular virtue and it is demonstrably a society that takes great enjoyment from the savage beating of a skimington and his wife [by Lawrence and Parnell (IV. 234)]. If there is anything demonic in this society it is among the normal people whose delight in the torment of the witches is unbounded. . . .[78]

Heywood's satire and criticism are double-edged in <u>Lancashire Witches</u>, directed against both the witches and "the normal people" who make up the society. Here as elsewhere, almost

[78] Nichols, p. 73.

everyone comes under his lash, not only the people who take such "great enjoyment from the savage beating of a skimington and his wife"but also the witches themselves. Heywood did not consider them as harmless old women. He makes it perfectly clear that they are real witches who have contracted with the devil and who actually practice the black arts. Heywood does not gloss over their evil as Nichols would have us believe. These witches are corrupt and evil in every way. Most of these witches even have "familiars" who function as "the incubus."[79] This is made clear in Doughty's examination of the witches after their capture:

> _Dought_. Ah ha, that's her Divell, her _Incubus_ I warrant . . . .
> [to Peg]. And that _Mamilion_ which thou call'st upon
> Is thy familiar Divell is't not? Nay prithee speake.
> _Peg_. Yes Sir.
> _Dough_. That's a good woman, how long hast had's acquaintance, ha?
> _Peg_. A matter of sixe years Sir.
> _Dough_. A pretty matter. What was he like a man?
> _Peg_. Yes when I pleas'd.
> _Dough_. And then he lay with thee, did he not sometimes?
> _Peg_. Tis folly to dissemble; twice a Weeke he never fail'd me.
> _Dough_. Humph--and how? and how a little? was he a good Bedfellow"
> _Peg_. Tis folly to speake worse of him that he is.

[79] According to West, a "familiar" is "a spirit who by agreement serves a man without necessity of incantation." West further points out that "The most ignoble of demonic functions . . . was not that of the familiar or the genius but that of the incubus." He gives part of the quotation from Doughty and Peg in _Lancashire Witches_ as an example (pp. 83-85).

> Dough. I trust me is't. Give the Divell his due.
> Peg. He pleas'd me well Sir, like a proper man.
> Dought. There was sweet coupling.
> Peg. Onely his flesh felt cold.
> Arth. He wanted his great fires about him that he has at home. (IV. 258-59)

Reading this, one can scarcely doubt that Heywood and Brome were sincere in their desire to expose the women from the Pendle Forest as real witches before their fate was settled by a possible King's pardon. Furthermore, it does not seem likely that Heywood, for one, was writing a play simply to capitalize financially on the misfortunes of the real unfortunate Lancashire women, but rather as a social critic and a playwright, he was exposing evil where he saw it, and the evil in this case he evidently felt should be punished.

In this play, we have a clear almost irrefutable indication of Heywood's dark vision of the nature of man and of evil. Here he is treating a very real evil, or so it must have seemed to him, the demonic possession of women. It is also a mark of his avocation as a social critic that, as Nichols says, he castigates the society as well for its own propensities to violence and to evil. Since this is one of his very last plays, if not the last one indeed, it attests to the fact that at the end of his dramatic career, Heywood's vision had darkened considerably. When we compare the skeptical and satirical exposé of the white witch of Hogsdon in The Wise Woman with the serious

and almost bitter portrayal of the black witches of Pendle Forest in _Lancashire Witches_; and when we further compare the saintly patient wife Mistress Arthur in _How a Man May Chuse_ with the devilish witch wife Mistress Generous in _Lancashire Witches_, we can see the progressive darkening of Heywood's world view over a thirty-year period between 1601 and 1634.

Like his fellow Jacobeans, Heywood confronted the problem of evil in his world and in the nature of man; he also took pains to expose that evil which sometimes lurks in the heart of man, especially when he or she has made a pact with the devil as in the case of the Lancashire witches. In this as in his other comedies and tragicomedies of contemporary English life and manners, we see the social critic at work exposing vice and folly whenever and wherever he found it. In the following chapter it should become apparent that Heywood found folly and vice not only in the country and in the town but also in the Royal Court as well. In Chapter IV, we turn to a group of plays in which he employs a romantic plot ostensibly set in other more exotic lands but which often serves to reflect corruption in the Royal Court in England. In these plays, among other moral flaws touched upon previously, Heywood also satirizes the vanity of Londoners, and especially of the courtiers with their foppishness and

extravagance in fashions, as well as criticizes the self-conceit and hypocrisy of sycophants and fawning courtiers, the machinations of dishonorable politicians, and the greed and rapacity of almost everyone.

CHAPTER IV

ROMANTIC COMEDIES AND TRAGICOMEDIES OF ADVENTURE AND INTRIGUE

> Capt. 'Tis geenrall thorow the world, each state esteemes
> a man not what he is, but what he seemes:
> (The Royall King and the Loyall Subject III. 259-60)

In the prologue to the romantic tragicomedy The Royall King and the Loyall Subject, Heywood clearly sums up the principal contribution of his long and prolific career in one succinct statement of purpose: "To give content to this most curious Age" ("Prologue to the Stage" 1-3). Like Captain Bonvile, the hero of the subplot in The Royall King, Heywood traces, in his plays, "The humours of Court, Citty, Campe, and Country . . . and in them [he] can finde no man, but money . . ." (III. 185-86). And like his mouthpiece the cynical captain, Heywood, as a playwright and a critic of society, exposes the follies, vices, and evils of "this most curious Age,"[1] such as the foppishness, hypocrisy, and rapacity of courtiers and the dishonesty, cunning, and conniving of politicians; the

[1] Cf. Kate Watkins Tibbals who feels that "the best and most living character in the play" is ". . . the honest free-spirited Captain, through whom, if through any character, the poet himself speaks" (Intro., The Royall King and the Loyall Subject, by Thomas Heywood [Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1906], p. 32).

vanity, materialism, and greed of "Citty" and "Country" dweller alike; and the poor treatment of the common soldier in "Campe" by rulers or politicians ". . . that respect their profit/ More than the worth of souldiers . . ." (*A Mayden-Head* IV. 113).[2] As in Heywood's other dramas studied thus far, the social critic is obviously at work in yet another group of plays which may be classified as romantic comedies and tragicomedies of adventure and intrigue. In these plays, Heywood attempts, in varying degrees, to combine intrigue and romantic adventure by land and sea with a more realistic portrayal of contemporary life and manners. These romantic comedies and tragicomedies (with dates of composition and publication noted) are: *The Four Prentices of London* (1595; 1615); *The Royall King and the Loyall Subject* (1600-03; 1637); *The Fair Maid of the West*, Part I (probably 1600-04 or possibly 1609-10; 1631); *The Fair Maid of the West*, Part II (1630; 1631); *A Mayden-Head Well Lost* (1632-33; 1634); and *A Challenge for Beauty* (1630-36; 1636). After discussing *The Four Prentices* and *A Challenge for Beauty* briefly, we will study the others at length.

The Four Prentices of London and *A Challenge for Beauty*

The Four Prentices of London is Heywood's earliest extant play, written by his own admission "in my Infancy

[2] Cf. *The Rape of Lucrece*, ll. 1386-88.

of Iudgment . . . and my first practice." In this early romantic play of adventure, the heroes and heroines are pasteboard characters, while the incredible adventure is absurd. In this highly romantic tale of the Crusades, the Earl of Bulloigne, banished from his country and in financial straits, binds his four sons as apprentices in London. Determining to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Lands, the old Earl bids his four stalwart sons and his beautiful daughter adieu. The four prentices, stirred by a thirst for heroic adventure, desert their trades and set sail for France to enlist with Robert of Normandy to fight in the Crusades. The sister Bella Franca, evidently left to fend for herself in London, resolves to follow them. Meanwhile, her brothers are shipwrecked and cast up on four different coasts; each then makes his way toward the Holy Land. Along the route, one courts a French princess and when he resumes his trip to the Holy Lands, she disguises herself as a page and tags along. Others slay bandits along the way, and all fight at the drop of a hat. The brothers eventually meet but fail to recognize one another or their sister Bella Franca, who is not disguised. Indeed, the reader cannot distinguish one brother from the other without their shields bearing crests of their Trades--mercer (Godfrey); grocer (Eustace); goldsmith (Guy); and haberdasher (Charles). They are so quarrelsome that they fight over their own sister as each falls in love with

Bella Franca, failing to recognize her, of course, or one another; they also fight over absurd points of honor or over fancied insults or slights. In reality, however, their honor consists only in words which their actions belie. In this play, the Christians fight other Christians more often than they fight the Saracens. Ironically, the infidels are more honorable, noble, and "Christian" than the Christians. Under the circumstances, it seems evident that Heywood is not flattering apprentices or his own countrymen in The Four Prentices.[3]

It is little wonder that Beaumont chose to satirize The Four Prentices in The Knight of the Burning Pestle.[4] But given the fact that Heywood's play was written just prior to Edward IV, Parts I and II (1596-99), a much improved dramatic production, and also remembering that Heywood's role as a social critic and satirist was already evident in these two early plays, one finds it hard to believe that he was sincere in The Four Prentices, as most critics think. It seems more likely that Heywood himself, like Beaumont, was actually satirizing the medieval romances of adventure so popular at the time with the middle class. As Nichols notes, the play combines

[3] Cf. Nichols, p. 76.

[4] See, for example, Velte, p. 71; Cromwell, p. 95; and Clark, Heywood, pp. 210-11.

> ironical and comic elements in satire, intentional or not, of apprenticeship, crusades, and disguised lovers. The play can very well serve, for the modern reader, in fact, as a parody of the highly adventurous history play of the early 1590's. . . . For a play that is usually interpreted as highly naive praise of apprentices and what they stand for, an unsophisticated early effort of a young playwright, the play surprisingly and disarmingly makes fun of the things it is supposed to be praising. . . . Heywood's audience may have taken The Four Apprentices seriously, but it seems doubtful that he, as a recent student at Cambridge more widely read in both Classical and Renaissance literature than most of his contemporary playwrights, could have been wholly serious about it. He has filled his play with conventional situations and actions of the romance and, without commenting on them, with wit and humor has shown them to be absurd.[5]

Like most critics, Clark believes that Heywood is sincere, but he hastens to add that the play "may never have been much to [Heywood's] taste," for this most unrealistic "play is so unlike anything else he wrote. . . ."[6]

On the other hand, one of Heywood's last plays, A Challenge for Beauty, offers little if anything new. Like Part II of The Fair Maid and A Mayden-Head, it is a Fletcherian drama;[7] and, moreover, it is a reiteration of the themes and motives of Heywood's other romantic comedies and tragicomedies to be studied in this chapter, such as the

[5] Nichols, pp. 75-77.

[6] Clark, Heywood, p. 212.

[7] See, for instance, Herrick, p. 286; Clark, Heywood, pp. 279-80; Rabkin, "Double Plots," p. 62; and Frank Humphrey Ristine, English Tragicomedy (1910; rpt. New York Russell & Russell, 1963), p. 125.

conflict of love and honor; the contest of courtesy and honor; the convention of the rash oath; the old device of bed-tricks; the testing of friend or sweetheart; and the devices of disguise, mistaken identities, or failure of recognition; as well as the employment of dissembling and deception along with self-deception or the failure to see clearly. Unlike The Four Prentices, which represents what Clark calls "the limit of Heywood's unreality,"[8] A Challenge for Beauty effects a grafting of realism onto the romantic plot with its mingling of English and Spanish characters and its setting partly in a realistic England but primarily in a romantic unhistorical Spain and Portugal. But like The Royall King, the emphasis of its realistic social criticism and satire is on the court and courtier;[9] and as in the earlier play, all the plots, ruses, tricks, stratagems, and dissemblings of A Challenge for Beauty make for good plot complications and good characterization but usually not for good and honorable men and women, Spanish or English.

[8] Clark, Heywood, p. 212.

[9] As Lord Bonavida, who is banished from Spain and Portugal for telling the truth, laments: "Is this Trueth's merit? Can the Court find place / For none but flatterers . . ." (V. 9). The court can "find place" only for flattery and for sycophants like Centella and Pineda and not for truth or plain-dealers like Bonavida. See also V. 43-44 for an especially pointed satire on courtiers and fashions. All references from The Challenge for Beauty are from the Pearson edition by volume and page numbers.

It is clear, in this play, that Heywood is criticizing not only the Spanish but also the English as well. For example, he uses the English malcontent Manhurst to point up his criticism of Englishmen who are not always as admirable or as honorable as the Spanish or even the Turks. As Manhurst observes after he has been freed by Valladaura, "A noble Spanish Sea Captaine":[10]

> The Spanyard's noble, beyond thought or expectation noble, instead of a Dungeon hee has furnish'd me with meanes, and sent me home with a letter of his purpos'd friendship to my friend [Mont. Ferrers]. And now,
> though freed both from Turk and Spanyard. I live slave to a more cruell nation than both, my owne countreymen, for suretyship and debt, (diseases that many a gallant lies sick to death on) have tane hold on me. . . . (V. 41)

Here again, in possibly his last play, as in his first, Heywood is not slavishly flattering his bourgeois countrymen, as most critics propose. And, as we shall see in Part II of The Fair Maid, the Moor and Moslem can be noble enemies too, especially the Bashaw Joffer who compares favorably with any Englishman in true and innate nobility and in honorable behavior.

As in his realistic plays discussed in the last chapter, Heywood also uses his romantic comedies and tragicomedies, in large part, as a vehicle for social

[10] "Dramatis Personae," A Challenge for Beauty V. 4. This is also the case in Dick of Devonshire, believed by many to have been written by Heywood.

criticism and satire of contemporary English life and manners. In this too, he is like his fellow Jacobeans, not the Elizabethans. Discussing the transitional developments in English drama between 1600-1610, F. H. Ristine points out that

> During this interval we find the drama undergoing several notable developments in response to altered conditions in social and national life and new standards of dramatic taste. The old imaginative idealism and patriotic fervor that had inspired the age of the Armada had practically subsided by the time of James I; and the chief playwrights of the day were no longer seeking inspiration in the glories of England's past and stories of romantic love, but were finding dramatic material in low London life and domestic crimes, or using romantic plots for satirical presentation of contemporary manners.[11]

We have previously observed that in The Wise Woman, Heywood found "dramatic material in low London life," and in such plays as Lancashire Witches, How a Man May Chuse, and his domestic tragedies, he concentrated on "domestic crimes" or problems, such as witchcraft and adultery. Now in this chapter, we shall perceive how Heywood, like his fellow Jacobeans, used "romantic plots for satirical presentation of contemporary manners." In these romantic comedies and tragicomedies, the principal action has moved from the middle-class home, shop, or establishment in the city or country in England (as in Heywood's more realistic dramas)

[11] Ristine, p. 96.

to the Royal Court in England and abroad. Heywood has set *The Royall King*, amid the mists of an earlier period and an unhistorical medieval English Royal Court, whereas in his other romantic plays, the action is set in exotic and unfamiliar lands or in foreign courts, such as Italy and Spain. As he comes more and more under the sphere of Fletcherian influence, Heywood moves further away from England and further away from the predominance of English characters while concurrently his plots become progressively more romantic and contain fewer realistic elements except for the ever-present underlying social criticism so patently evident in all of these romantic dramas of adventure and intrigue.

The Royall King and the Loyall Subject

In the early romantic tragicomedy *The Royall King and the Loyall Subject* (1600-03; 1637),[12] Heywood has transplanted the Persian story of Bandello and Painter to the soil of medieval England and added a subplot;[13]

[12] Published in 1637, *The Royall King* was written more than likely in 1600-03. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on March 25, 1637. See Velte, p. 13; Crofts, p. 26; Clark, *Heywood*, pp. 29-30; Harbage, *Annals*, pp. 82-83; and Chambers, III, 341. All quotations from this play, by act and line numbers, are from *The Royall King and the Loyall Subject*, ed. Kate Watkins Tibbals (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1906).

[13] Bandello's story of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, and his stewart or seneschal Ariobarzanes was published in

in both the emphasis is on testing the loyalty, love, or charity of others. In the main plot the king tests the marshal; in the subplot, the captain tests everyone. In Heywood's version, generally based on Painter's story, an unnamed English king and his High Marshal have returned victorious from the Holy Wars where the latter had been instrumental in saving his sovereign's life twice in one day. The king soon has occasion to be further indebted to the marshal, "the loyall subject," who pridefully and hypocritically endeavors to outshine his monarch in courtesy and liberality. Meanwhile, two envious and intriguing courtiers, the Earl of Chester and Lord Clinton, set a plot in motion to remove the marshal from favor by convincing the jealous and capricious king that the subject's "magnanimity" is motivated by ambition and pride. Consequently, the king is determined to test the loyalty of his marshal by a series of humiliations and harsh demands, leading initially to his banishment from court. In the course of time, however, the test actually degenerates into a tit-for-tat contest of courtesy and liberality

---

his _Novelle_ as the second tale of the first part. Later it was translated into French by Belleforest in vol. iv of _Histoires Tragiques_ and into English by Painter in _The Palace of Pleasure_, the fourth nouell of Tome II. See Jacobs' edition of Painter, I, lxxxii, and II, 176-208; R. Warwick Bond, "_The Loyal Subject_," in _The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher_, Variorum ed. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1908), III, 225-28; Velte, p. 82; and Tibbals, pp. 14-26.

between "the royall king and the loyall subject," ending in a triple alliance between the two contenders. The marshal is "treble grafted / Into the Royall blood . . ." (V. 8-9). King and subject are each made the son and father of the other when the king marries the marshal's eldest daughter Isabella; while the king's son, the prince, marries the youngest daughter Katherine; and "the loyall subject" himself marries the king's daughter, the royal princess, thus placing the old marshal in the ridiculous position of being his own grandfather through marriage.[14] One would think that such close bonds of kinship would knit king and subject closer together, but such is not the case. The proud and hypocritical marshal, disgruntled over the fact that his young bride, the princess, outranks him "in command" (V. 63), cursorily sends back her "princely dower" (V. 90) and attempts to "buy" her from her father with a "jewell." As he tells the Captain "I thinke her cheape bought at that easie rate" (V. 102). This understandably incenses her father the king, whose anger is once again fanned into flame by Chester and Clinton with the result that the marshal is arraigned before "A Barre, and . . . a Iury of his Peeres" (V. 182) where he is tried, convicted, and condemned. Now the mutual family of king

[14] Bond notes that Fletcher "gets rid of the absurdity of making Archas [the loyal subject] his own grandfather by marriage" as in Heywood's play (p. 227).

and subject--wives, son, and daughters--arrive to plead for his life; and the vacillating king is persuaded to pardon the marshal and to restore him to full favor and honor at court.

As in the main plot, Captain Bonvile, the hero of the subplot, has also just returned from the war where he went to recoup his fortune wasted by his prodigal youth. But now he appears to be ragged and impoverished by the war, not victorious and honored as in the case of the king and marshal. In reality, the captain, dressed in tattered rags and pleading poverty, is merely testing the loyalty of his friends, fellow-soldiers, kinsmen, and betrothed, the Lady Mary Audley; he is determined to try the humours of both men and women in the court, camp, city, and country before divulging the fact that he had actually amassed a fortune in booty during the fighting. But while dissembling poverty, Captain Bonvile, like Charles Mountford in _A Woman Killed_ and Young Arthur in _How a Man May Chuse_, quickly learns that "This is no world in which to pity men," for all forsake him and steadfastly refuse aid or assistance except for one constant and chaste woman, his betrothed and the clown. However, when the captain finally appears in his true guise, with money and dressed in fine clothes, he is united in marriage to Lady Mary and advanced at court.

The testing motive of the main plot, as Freda Townsend demonstrates, is repeated in the subplot through " an inverse parallelism"; for in this double plot play, there is an "implicit contrast between the fortunes of the chief character in each action and between the 'tested' in each action," thus tying both testing plots neatly together.[15] Furthermore, as we shall see, there is also an implied contrast between the character and actions of the chief protagonists, both heroes and heroines, in each action. In fact, to see the marshal and his daughter Isabella as loyal and honorable characters, as in the case of most critics, is to misread the lesson of the subplot--to fail to perceive the important relationship between the two actions. The realistic[16] and satiric subplot seems to be Heywood's own addition to the romantic plot probably taken from Painter; and, in this case, it provides a key to interpreting the play. For to discern what Heywood, the social critic, is actually doing in the romantic tragicomedy of the main plot, it must be seen against the perspective provided by the realistic-satiric subplot,

[15] Townsend, pp. 102-03.

[16] Velte notes the realism of some of the scenes in _The Royall King_, such as the "Hogarthian realism . . . in the picture of low life at the brothel . . . the scene in the inn; the scene where the captain parts company with the corporal; the amusing scene cast headlong into the play of the clown and the Welshman in the forests, disputing as to the comparative greatness of the organs in Paul's and at Rixam (Wrexham)" (p. 84).

which serves both to define it and to comment upon it, as in the case of *A Woman Killed*.

The relationship between the two plots is patently obvious, for early in *The Royall King*, as Norman Rabkin points out, Captain Bonvile, the hero of the subplot, "makes specific comparisons between what he is learning about his own world and what occurs at court, virtually instructing the audience to observe the similarity":[17]

> *Cap*. . . . . is't possible, that even Lords,
> that
> have the best educating, whose eares are frequent to
> the most
> fluent discourse, that live in the very braine of
> the Land, the
> Court, *that these should be gull'd with shadows, and not*
> *be able to distinguish a man when they see him*; thou
> know-
> est me, yet these do not.
> *Cock*.[the clown] Why may not a poore man have as
> good eyes as a
> nother? their eares indeed may be larger than mine,
> but I
> can see as far without spectacles as the best Lord in
> the land.
> *Cap*. *These superficiall Lords thinke every thing to*
> *be as it appeares, they never question a mans wit, his*
> *discre-*
> *tion, his language, his inward vertues, but as hee*
> *seemes he passes*.
> *Cocke*. I warrant if I should looke like an Asse,
> They would take mee for one too ([my italics] I. 500-14)

One may perceive that once again Heywood is presenting

[17] Rabkin, "The Double Plot," p. 56. Rabkin, however, like most critics, sees the marshal as a good, admirable character.

his social criticism through the theme of appearance and reality.

Rabkin has identified the theme of appearance versus reality in The Royall King and has given a few examples from the play to support his point, but no one has given more than cursory critical attention to the play.[18] Outside of Rabkin's observations noted above, only a few critics such as Holaday and Velte have mentioned Heywood's satire or his criticism of the court, and then only briefly and in passing. We will recall Holaday's remark from Chapter I that "corruption in court arouses [Heywood's] ire" in The Royall King where he also satirically "deprecates the courtier's affected dress and cowardly behavior";[19] while Velte points out that

> The whole is a satire, of course, on the power of riches. To the false friends "clothes make the man," just as they do to the inn-keepers and the women

[18] Few critics have dealt with The Royall King at all, except by way of plot summaries in a general discussion of Heywood, or source studies and/or comparisons between Heywood's play and Fletcher's Loyal Subject (as in the Tibbals edition of Heywood's The Royall King and the Variorum edition of Fletcher's play or the short studies of both dramas by Tucker Brooke and by Eugene Waith). Consequently, a critical interpretation of The Royall King is long overdue (as is the case with most of Heywood's dramatic works). See Tibbals, pp. 5-38; Bond, pp. 223-29; Brooke, "Royal Fletcher," pp. 192-94; and Eugene M. Waith, The Pattern of Tragicomedy in Beaumont and Fletcher (1952; rpt. n.p.: Archon Books, 1969), pp. 143-51.

[19] Holaday, "Heywood and the Puritans," p. 197.

> of ill-fame. Just as long as a man can ruffle it in fine raiment and swagger with the most splendid, he is sure to be respected and served, but let true worth wear tattered garments, and no one will be moved.[20]

The purpose of Heywood's realistic-satiric subplot seems to be primarily an exposé of and a protest against the corruption of the royal court, presumably in England, and the growing materialism of the age ranging from the court and courtiers to the brothel and courtesans. Most of the social criticism in the play is projected through Captain Bonvile and the clown in the subplot, but occasionally through the marshal in the main plot as well. The cynical and critical captain, for instance, wanders through the court, camp, city, and country, exposing the follies, vices, and evils of "this most curious Age."

After announcing the aim of his testing plan, the captain decides to begin at the Court:

[20] Velte, p. 83. See also Bond who points out that in Painter's work "the king appears rather as his own instigator: the courtiers' envy and intrigue is not definitely embodied in creatures like Heywood's Chester and Clinton, or Fletcher's Boroskie, whose trait of cowardice is perhaps suggested by Chester and Clinton's confession (Act I.) that they dare not meet the Marshal in personal combat." In other words, even some of the additions Heywood made to the source in the main plot are in the interest of satirizing the court and courtiers or changes in characterization. The king and marshal are even less admirable characters in Heywood than in Painter. Bond notes "The subtlety of the Eastern tale, where generosity is seen passing into selfishness and humility into pride" (pp. 226-27). In Heywood the transformation is more complete: the king is selfish and the marshal is prideful.

> Capt. . . . . . . my purpose is to try the
> humours of all my friends, my Allies, my ancient
> associates,
> and see how they will respect me in my supposed poverty;
> . . . First then I will make some tryall of
> my Friends at the Court . . . (I. 312-14, 327-28)

Beginning with the envious, intriguing lords Chester and Clinton, neither of whom will acknowledge friendship or even acquaintance with him in his ragged suit, Captain Bonvile quickly discovers that like other courtiers, these lords judge a man by his clothes:

> Capt. Folly and pride
> In Silkes and Lace their imperfections shew,
> But let pure vertue come in garments torne
> To begge reliefe, she gets a courtly scorne:
> (I. 390-93)

The courtiers prefer to simply forget him as does his kinsman, a cousin, Lord Bonvile. But the captain reminds Clinton that

> Thou knowst my forfeit lands, thou forget'st me:
> Nay, you would be going too, you are as affraid of a
> torne
> suite, as a younger brother of a Sergeant, a riche
> corne-master
> of a plentiful yeere, or a troublesome Attourney to
> heare of suits put to compremize.
> Sir, I must challenge you, you are my kinsman;
> My Grandsir was the first that rais'd the name
> Of Bonvile to this height, but Lord to see
> That you are growne a Lord, and know not me.
> Bonv. Cousin, I know you, you have bin an unthrift,
> And lavisht what you had; had I so done,
> I might have ebb'd like you, where I now flow.
> (I. 412-23)

Similarly, Lord Audley conveniently forgets the betrothal contract made before the war between the captain and his daughter Mary: "I know no contract," says Audley, to which the captain answers:

> _Cap_. I have one to shew.
> _Aud_. No matter; think'st thou that I'le vent my bagges
> To suite in Sattin him that Jets in ragges?
> _Cap_. The world's all of one heart, this blaze I can,
> All love the money, none esteemes the man. (I. 475-79)

Next the captain's "Allies," the men who served under his command, desert him ". . . to seeke else-where for preferment" (I. 487). Only the clown Cock remains loyal:

> _Cock_. I leave you? who I? for a little diversity, for a wet
> storme? no Sir, though your out-sides fall away. I'le cleave
> as close to you as your linings. (I. 493-95)

Like Lady Mary Audley, who next passes the captain's test, the clown can distinguish between outside appearance and inner worth. These are the only two who know ". . . the person from the garment . . . ," for as the clown remarks, the captain's ". . . fashion is not in request at the Court," and he may not gain entry at the court gate, The intrepid captain, however, will seek his mistress

> Though guirt with all the Ladies of the Court:
> Though ragged Vertue oft may be kept out,
> No gate so strongly kept above the Center,
> But Asses with gold laden, free may enter.
> (I. 517 ff.)

And enter he does and finds his betrothed, Lady Mary, who proves her own virtue and fidelity in recognizing his true worth; she loves the man, not money:

> Were you more worth, I could not love you more,
> Or lesse, affect you lesse; you have brought me home
> All that I love, your selfe, and you are welcome.
> I gave no faith to Money, but a Man,
> And that I cannot loose possessing you:
> 'Tis not the robe or garment I affect,
> For who would marry with a suite of cloaths?
> (II. 80-86)

Lady Mary is the only major character who remains totally uncorrupted by the materialistic world of the court. Like Mistress Arthur in How a Man May Chuse, she is one of Heywood's constant and chaste women.

After proving his betrothed, Captain Bonvile now leaves the court to complete the trial of the "humours" of men, this time of his "ancient friends" (II. 287) and associates at the Ordinary. The host had previously been indebted to the captain who in his "flourishing prime" had ". . . first brought custome . . ." to the Ordinary and had supplied the host with "The Lease of this house . . ." as well as ". . . both the Fyne and Rent" (II. 354 ff.). Now, however, like the others before him, the host does not choose to remember his former benefactor. As he tells a gallant who arrives for dinner and questions the presence of the "ragge-muffin" captain (II. 306): "I did [know him] when he was flush, and had the Crownes; but / since

he grew poore, he is worn quite out of remem- / brance . . ." (II. 314-16). Ironically the captain has shown his money; he has "crownes to spend . . ." (II. 303), but since the ". . . house intertaines none / but Gentlemen . . ." (II. 299-300), he is denied a seat for dinner because of his clothes.

In contrast, however, the captain is allowed to enter the bawdy-house--he is welcomed in fact--despite his ragged apparel precisely because he does have coins to spend. On this occasion, since he has already

> . . . so thorowly made proofs of the humours of men, [he] will . . . assay the dispositions of women, not of the choicest, but of those whom we call good wenches. (III. 209-11)

And, on this occasion, Heywood himself pulls out all the stops to give one of his most scathing castigations of the materialism of the age, and particularly of the rapacious nature of bawds and courtesans. One can almost visualize the indignation and disgust of the fervent young playwright and social critic as he penned the following dialogue between the captain and the whores in the brothel:

> Cap. . . . But I am ashm'd, being such a tatter'd rogue, to lye with two such fine gentlewomen; besides, to tell you truely, I am louzie.
> 1. Whore. No matter, thou shalt have a cleane shirt, and but pay for the washing, and thy cloaths shall in the meane time be cast into an Oven.
> Cap. But I have a worse fault, my skinne's not

perfect:
what shall I say I am?
1. Whore. Itchy? Oh thou shalt have Brimstone and Butter.
Cap. Worse than all these, my body is diseased,
I shall infect yours.
1. Whore. If we come by any mischance, thou hast money
to pay for the cure: come, shall's withdraw into the next
chamber?
Cap. You are not women, you are devils both,
And that your Damme; my body save in warres,
Is yet unskarr'd, nor shall it be with you.
Say the last leacher that imbrac't you here,
And folded in his armes your rottennesse,
Had beene all these, would you not all that filth
Vomite on me? or who would buy diseases,
And make his body for a Spittle fit,
That may walke sound? I came to schoole you Whoore,
Not to corrupt you; for what need I that
When you are all corruption; be he lame,
Have he no Nose, be all his body stung
With the French Fly, with the Sarpego try'd:
Be he a Lazar, or a Leper, bring
Coyne in his first [sic], he shall embrace your lust
Before the purest flesh that sues of trust.
Bawd. What Diogenes have we here? I warrant the Cin-
nicke himselfe sayd not so much when he was seene to come
Out of a Bawdy house.
Cap. He sham'd not to come out, but held it sinne
Not to be pardon'd, to be seene goe in.
But I'le be modest; nay, nay, keepe your Gold
To cure those hot diseases you have got,
And being once cleere, betake you to one man,
And study to be honest, that's my counsell:
You have brought many like yon Gentlemen
That jet in Silkes, to goe thus ragg'd like us,
Which did they owne our thoughts, these rags would change
To shine as we shall, though you think it strange.
Come, come, this house is infected, shall we goe?
Clowne. Why Sir, shall I have no sport for my money, but
even a snatch and away?
Cap. Leave me, and leave me ever, and observe
This rule from me, where there is lodg'd a Whore,
Thinke the Plagues crosse is set upon that doore.
(III. 373-422)

This dialogue was quoted at length because of its obvious importance in showing the young critic at work early in his dramatic career. And if at the end of the captain's sermon anyone has any doubt about Heywood's role as a social critic, he has only to review the summary of this "Diogenes," the captain's, as well as the clown's, testing the humours of men and women in the following lengthy but crucial dialogue:

> Cap. The humours of Court, Citty, Campe, and Country
> I have trac't, and in them can finde no man but money; all
> subscribe to this Motto, Malo pecuniam viro. Oh poverty,
> thou art esteem'd a sinne worse than whordome, gluttony,
> extortion or usury:
> And earthly gold, thou art preferr'd 'fore Heaven.
> Let but a poore man in a thred-bare suite.
> Or ragged as I am, appeare at Court,
> The fine-nos'd Courtiers will not sent him; no,
> They shunne the way as if they met the Pest:
> Or if he have a suite, it strikes them deafe,
> They cannot heare of that side.
> Clowne. Come to the Citty, the Habberdasher will sooner
> call us blockheads, than blocke us; come to the Sempsters,
> unlesse we will give them money we cannot enter into their
> bands: though we have the Law of our sides, yet wee may
> walke through Burchin-lane and be non-suited: come bare-
> foot to a Shooe-maker, though he be a Constable, he will not
> put us into his Stocks; though the Girdler be my brother, yet
> he will not let his leather imbrace me; come to the Glover,
> his gloves are either so little that I cannot plucke them on, or
> so great that I cannot compasse. And for the Camp there's
> honour cut out of the whole peace, but not a ragge of mo-
> ney.

> _Cap_. The Countrey hath alliance with the rest . . .
> (III. 185-209)

Meanwhile, keeping his criticism of corruption at court constantly in the foreground, Heywood also uses the marshal in the main plot to express the pointed observation that corruption and vice are not confined to the court alone:

> _Mar_. Malice, revenge, displeasure, envy, hate,
> I had thought that you had only dwelt at Court,
> And that the Countrey had beene cleere and free:
> But from Kings wraths no place I finde is safe.
> (II. 442-45)

Heywood's heavy-handed criticism of the court is so obvious here that one could scarcely fail to see that it is deliberate satire. A sampling now of the marshal's further comments should prove sufficient to illustrate the point. In answer to the prince's question as to why his two daughters had not been ". . . brought up to be train'd at Court" to attend the princess, the marshal replies:

> They are young and tender,
> And e'er I teach them fashion, I would gladly
> Traine them in vertue, and to arme their youth
> Against the smooth and amorous baits of Court.
> (II. 29, 31-34)

And in exile at his country estate, he muses:

> Of Fortune, thou didst threaten misery,
> And thou hast paid me comfort; neede we ought
> That we should seeke the suffrage of the Court?
> Are we not rich? are we not well revenew'd?

> Are not the Countrey-pleasures farre more sweete
> Than the Court-cares? Instead of balling suiters
> Our eares receive the musicke of the Hound;
> For mounting pride and lofty ambition,
> We in the Ayre behold the Falcons Tower,
> And in that Morall mock those that aspire.
> (II. 380-89)

But then, as we shall see, the hypocritical, self-centered marshal will himself "aspire" again. Ironically, at the first opportunity, he will return to the court posthaste, presumably never to return to the country "Ayre" and "Falcons Tower" again.

Ironically too, even the cynical captain will also take his place at court, high in the king's favor, after his marriage to Lady Mary Audley. Heywood seems to be implying that the powerful and pernicious attraction of the court is well nigh irresistible even for the good man, for even the clown himself is soon well on his way to being corrupted. Like Clem, the clown in The Fair Maid, he aspires to imitate the courtiers. He will trade his "Gun powder" for "Damask-powder":

> Cock. Why this is as it should be; now doe I smell Court-
> tier already, I feele the Souldier steale out of me by degrees,
> for Souldier and Courtier can hardly dwell both together in
> one bosome. I have a kind of fawning humour creeping up-
> on me as soone as I but look't into the Court-gate; and now
> could I take a bribe, if any would be so foolish to gee't me.
> Now farewell Gun powder, I must change thee into Da-
> mask-power; for if I offer but to smell like a souldier, the

> Courtiers will stop their noses when they passe by me. My Caske I must change to a Cap and a Feather, my Bandileero to a Skarfe to hang my Sword in, and indeede, fashion my selfe wholly to the humours of the time. My Peece I must alter to a Poynado, and my Pike to a Pickadevant: onely this is my comfort, that our provant will be better here in the Court than in the Campe: there we did use to lye hard and seldome: here I must practise to lye extreamely, and often . . . . (IV. 526-42)

With the pun on the word "lye," Heywood subtly points out the deceit, hypocrisy, and sham undergirding the structure of life and manners at court where appearance and reality are either constantly confused or deliberately manipulated by craft or deceit to the end that very little in this world is what it appears to be on the surface.

There is no question whatsoever that Heywood is consciously employing the theme of appearance and reality in this early romantic tragicomedy. Norman Rabkin speaks of "Heywood's almost pedantic insistence on the theme of appearance and reality" in The Royall King; and he further observes that "In the subplot, the captain, testing the world, finds that it respects only appearances and external graces such as clothing and fortune displayed (he hides his own)."[21] As a matter of fact, Captain Bonvile sums up his findings perfectly in his assertion that "'Tis geenrall thorow the world, each state esteemes / A man not what he

[21] Rabkin, "Double Plot," pp. 59, 56. See also Rabkin, "Dramatic Deception," p. 2.

is but what he seemes" (III. 259-60). In this world, men are esteemed "gentle" and "noble" on the basis of outward appearance--on the "external graces such as clothing and fortune," as noted above. Lord Audley makes this point clearly when he attempts to instruct his daughter, Lady Mary, in the ways of the world at court:

> *Aud.* Wots thou who's returned,
> The unthrift *Bonvile*, ragged as a scarre-crow,
> The Warres have gnaw'd his garments to the skinne:
> I met him, and he told me of a Contract.
> *Mary.* Sir, such a thing there was.
> *Aud.* Upon condition if he came rich.
> *Mary.* I heard no such exception.
> *Aud.* Thou doest not meane to marry with a begger?
> *Mary.* Unlesse he he a Gentleman, and *Bonvile*
> Is by his birth no lesse.
> *Aud.* Such onely gentile are, that can maintaine
> Gentily.
> *Mary.* Why, should your state faile you,
> Can it from you your honours take away?
> Whilst your Allegeance holds, what need you more,
> You ever shall be noble although poore.
> *Aud.* *They are noble that have nobles; gentle they*
> *That appeare such.*
> *Mary.* Indeed so wordlings say:
> But vertuous men proove they are onely deare
> That all their riches can about them beare. (III. 57-77)

Moreover in this corrupt world, titles are bought with fortunes and even honor can be acquired with gold, as Captain Bonvile (and presumably Heywood himself) laments:

> *Cap.* . . . These are Lords
> That have bought Titles. Men may merchandize
> Wares, ey, and trafficke all commodities
> From Sea to Sea, ey and from shore to shore,
> But in my thoughts, of all things that are sold,
> 'Tis pitty Honour should be bought for gold.
> It cuts off all desert. (IV. 251-57)

This then is the milieu, the setting, of The Royall King; and in the main plot, the royal king and the loyal subject are very much a part of this world--the world of "appearances and external graces" that the captain is inveighing against in the subplot. Both king and marshal are constantly thinking of the appearance they are making. In their contest of courtesy and liberality, each repeatedly tries to surpass the other, to appear more noble or courteous or magnanimous, although the marshal hypocritically disclaims any thought of emulation. Actually, the marshal actively works--plots and schemes--to confuse reality and make some things appear to be what they are not, particularly in the instances where his two daughters are concerned. For example, as Nichols points out, "the Marshall tricks the King into relieving his exile by manipulating the King's lust for Isabel."[22]

Thus as suggested earlier, the key to understanding what is true and what only appears to be true is found in the captain's observations in the subplot. The key to characterization, for example, is supplied in the captain's contention that in the corrupt world of the court--the world of the main plot--a man is esteemed not for what he is but for what he seems to be. The marshal is not a male patient

[22] Nichols, p. 230.

Griselda but rather a scheming courtier--ignoble, proud, and crafty--a good example of the kind of corrupt courtier the captain is castigating in the subplot. The marshal's eldest daughter Isabella appears to be a loving and dutiful wife, an admirable queen, but in reality, she is in league with her father to deceive her husband and king. Her sister Katherine appears to be ill when the king sends for her, but in actuality, she is perfectly well; the old marshal lies about the state of her health. It is instructive that this deception is one of the changes Heywood makes in his play. In Painter, for instance, the daughter (the elder sister in this case) is actually ill, "weake and Impotent."[23] In The Royall King, however, this is all part of the wily old marshal's scheme, for he is stalling for time, waiting for the birth of Isabella's baby before sending both of his daughters to court. And when the marshal follows his daughters he bears a costly cradle as a gift to the king, who, as Rabkin notes, "in unconscious symbolic allusion to the theme of the play, accepts the cradle as a gift, unaware of its contents. 'Tis a brave out-side,' he says" (IV. 457).[24] But the marshal quickly explains that the "jewel" that lies within is more valuable still:

[23] Painter, II, 193. In Heywood, Katherine displays some envy of her sister as wife to the king in one speech (IV. 13-15), but Katherine is too little developed to form a fair estimate of her. She is a chaste maiden and a dutiful daughter like her sister Isabella.

[24] Rabkin, "Double Plot," p. 58.

> *King*. What have we here?
> *Mar*. A jewell I should rate,
> Were it mine owne, above your Crowne and Scepter.
> *King*. A child?
> *Mar*. A Prince, one of your royall blood:
> Behold him King, my grand-child, and thy sonne,
> Truely descended from thy Queene and thee,
> The image of thy selfe. (IV. 465-72)

Again, the marshal has been manipulating reality to appear more magnanimous than the king. But now, the king, not to be outdone by his subject, presents him with his own daughter the princess in marriage.

In a close study of the text, the marshal's hypocricy and deceit are obvious; the king, however, is more ambiguously portrayed. Heywood, for example, even leaves his auditor or reader in some quandary as to whether the king's trial of the marshal is based on conscious design or merely anger and animus. A close perusal of the play seems to indicate that although he begins a trial of the marshal to prove his loyalty and friendship, the king is soon overcome by genuine anger and is acting in earnest, for instance, when he hotly returns his "beloved" wife Isabella to her father whom he hates more passionately than he loves his wife (as he himself clearly states), or when he condemns the marshal to death for treason. If the king is testing the marshal all the while by a pre-conceived plan, he is even more of a heartless monster than if he actually hates and envies his subject as he appears to do. Indeed if all is a test, the king's ill treatment

of his wife and his bringing the marshal to the brink of death make him a cold, calculating man rather than a weak, fallible, vacillating creature one could pity. In either case, one cannot compare the king with Walter who tests or tries his wife Grisilde in Chaucer's "The Clerk's Tale." Heywood's king is too obviously jealous, envious, and capricious to be considered an honorable man like Chaucer's hero. Furthermore, he is testing his wife's father, not his wife, although a test of the latter would not be out of place, since she too is deceitful like her father.

Heywood's intent is easy to discern when one compares the behavior of Isabella with that of her foil Lady Mary Audley, whose fidelity serves to set Isabella's in bold relief. The contrast is most readily apparent when a speech of Isabella is placed in juxtaposition with one by Lady Mary. We must remember too that at the time of Lady Mary's speech, she is only betrothed to the captain whereas Isabella is actually married to the king when she resolves to perform her father's will against her husband, as she had earlier assured her father she would do (II. 507). In the former case, Lady Mary will cleave to her husband even at the risk of being disinherited by her father:

> Princesse. But say your Father now, as many Fathers are,
> proove a true worldling, and rather than bestow thee on one
> dejected, dis-inherite thee? how then?

> *Lady Ma.* *My Father is my Father, but my Husband,*
> *He is my selfe*: my resolution is
> To professe constancy, and keepe mine honour;
> And rather than to Queene it where I hate,
> Begge where I love: I wish no better fate.
> ([my italics] II. 127-34)

On the other hand, it is doubly incumbent upon Isabella (as both a queen and a wife) to prove herself, a mere subject's daughter, dutiful and loyal to her king and husband, but instead she chooses to follow her father's injunction:

> *Queen.* I feele my body growing by the King,
> And I am quicke although he know it not;
> Now comes my fathers last injunction
> To my remembrance, which I must fulfill,
> *Although a Queene, I am his daughter still.*
> ([my italics] III. 449-53)

And if Heywood's audience or reader were to miss the implications of this speech, Heywood clearly underlines Isabella's deceit in a subsequent private conversation with her husband, a speech made only twenty-one lines later when the king admonishes her not to beg her father's ". . . free repeale to Court" and she hypocritically answers:

> You are my King, and Husband;
> The first includes allegeance, the next duty,
> Both these have power above a Fathers name,
> Though as a daughter I could wish it done,
> Yet since it stands against your Royall pleasure,
> I have no suite that way. (III. 474-79)

Then she immediately breaks both "allegeance" and "duty" by following her father's instructions in telling her

husband that her sister Katherine is fairer and dearer to the marshal, all the while concealing the fact that she herself is expecting the king's child.

At this point it would be instructive to review the marshal's hand in this obvious duplicity, because this is one clear and unequivocal indication of his own true nature. The marshal's crafty machinations in dealing with his daughters and his king, and his colossal pride, hypocrisy, and self-serving ambition are unmistakable. To see him as an honorable and loyal subject, as in most previous criticism of the play, is to misread the lessons of the subplot, as previously mentioned. He has clearly devoted his whole life to affairs at Court, while in the meantime his daughters have been reared in the country virtually as orphans. As Isabella says to her father,

> Sir, we have long beene Orphans in the Coun-
>   trey,
> Whilst you still followed your affairs at Court;
> We heard we had a Father by our Guardian,
> But scarce till now could we enjoy your sight.
>   (II. 392-95)

This is but one indication of the marshal's misplaced values or priorities. It should not be surprising, therefore, that he will use his daughters to serve his own self-centered ends, as pawns, so to speak, in his game (or contest) with the king.

When the king demands that the marshal send his fairest and dearest daughter to court (II. 425-27,

III. 497-98), presumably to do his will, the marshal resolves to disobey the royal command deliberately by sending his eldest daughter Isabella, who is the least fair. Furthermore, he will send his daughter (with hardly a demur) to an unknown fate. First, he tells the two young sisters that the king "Commands that she whom I love best must dye," and secondly, he relates that "Her whom I best affect, / The King intends to strumpet" (II. 458, 477-78). For all the marshal knows either death or defloration could be her fate, although he pridefully hopes she will become the Queen. And in the event the latter transpires, he then plots with Isabella, the chosen, to deliberately deceive her husband:

> Mar. . . . I charge thee even by a fathers name,
> If the King daine to take thee to his bed
> By name of Queene, if thou perceiv'st thy selfe
> To be with child, conceale it even from him;
> Next, when thou find'st him affable and free,
> Finde out some talke about thy Sister here,
> As thus; thy Father sent thee but in jest,
> Thy Sister's fairest, and I love her best.
> Isab. It may incense the King.
> Mar. What I intend
> Is to my selfe, inquire no further of it. (II. 496-506)

Thus he lays the first stone in paving his way back to court again.

When the king learns from his wife that he has been tricked by the marshal, he packs Isabella off posthaste, in what seems to be genuine anger, returning her with her "double Dower" (IV. 73) to her father while demanding

the fairest daughter Katherine in return:

> *Chest*. Being thus discharg'd of her [Isabella] I from the King
> Command thee send thy fairer Girle to Court,
> Shee, that's at home, with her to act his pleasure.
> (IV. 79-81)

At this point, the supposedly loyal marshal lies and again deliberately deceives the king by sending word that his younger daughter is unable to travel at the present time. As he tells Lord Chester:

> Pray doe my humble duty to the King,
> And thus excuse me, that my daughter's sicke,
> Crazed, and weake, and that her native beauty
> Is much decay'd; and should she travell now,
> Before recovered, 'twould ingage her life
> To too much danger; when she hath ability
> And strength to journey, I will send her safe
> Vnto my King; this as I am a subject
> And loyall to his Highnesse. (IV. 109-17)

And enlarging further on his lie, a few minutes later, he says:

> *Mar*. I should disgrace her beauty
> To send it main'd and wayning; but when she
> Attaines her perfectnesse, then shall appeare
> The brightest Starre fix't in your Courtly Spheare.
> *Chest*. The King shall know as much.
> *Mar*. It is my purpose,
> All my attempts to this one head to draw,
> Once more in courtesies to o'recome the King.
> (IV. 128-35)

Actually, of course, the marshal has just condemned himself out of his own mouth: his daughter is not ill; he is not "loyall to his Highnesse" except in outward

appearance or except when it suits his purpose to be so; and he is unmistakably emulous in his desire "to o'ercome the King"--to outshine his monarch once again in courtesies.

After Isabella is delivered of her child and has regained her strength, the marshal is at liberty to set his own preconceived plan into motion by sending both daughters to court; he returns the king's wife accompanied by her younger sister to attend her and with her ". . . double dower / Doubled againe . . ." (IV. 343-44). Now too with his own ticket back to court, the princely grandchild, he quickly leaves the dust of the country behind where he has been cooling his heels despite his hypocritical platitudes about "Countrey-pleasures" versus "Court-cares" (II. 384-85). If now, the reader is still not thoroughly convinced that the marshal is not a loyal subject, then either his hypocritical conduct later in Act V with his own wife the princess or his earlier hypocritical attitude portrayed in Act II with his enemy, Lord Chester, should lay the matter to rest.

In the midst of the nuptial celebration, the marshal leaves "discontented" (V. 37). When next we see him, he is soliloquizing upon his dissatisfaction with his new position as husband to the royal princess. "Though some may thinke me happy in this match," he laments,

> To me 'tis fearefull: who would have a wife
> Above him in command, to imbrace with awe,
> Whom to displease, is to distaste the King?

> It is to have a Mistris, not a wife,
> A Queene, and not a subjects bed-fellow.
> State I could wish abroad to crowne my head,
> But never yet lov'd Empire in my bed. (V. 61-68)

Of course, it must be admitted that the marshal's distaste for having a wife "Above him in command" is in keeping with the attitude of husbands in general down through the ages, but in this case, the attitude is also perfectly in keeping with the marshal's egotistical nature. Moreover, his hypocrisy is never more clear than in his complete turnabout seconds later when he lovingly greets his new wife arriving with a train of followers. In one breath the marshal delivers his disgruntled soliloquy, and in practically the next breath he declares "nuptial love" to the princess who has been conducted to his chamber by his daughter the queen:

> Queen. My Lord the King commends his love to you
> In your faire Bride, whom royally conducted
> He hath sent to be the partner of your bed.
> Mar. Whom we receive in the armes of gratitude,
> Duty to him, and nuptiall love to her. (V. 74-78)

Now after he had quadrupled his own daughter Isabella's dower when he had sent her back to her husband at court, the marshal refuses to accept the princess' dower, and going even further, as we have seen, he proposes to buy her by sending a jewel along with the spurned dower. He cannot bear to appear less magnanimous than the king; his pride will not suffer it.

And finally to return to Act II for one last example of the hypocritical, self-centered nature of the marshal, one should examine closely his behavior and speech at the banquet in celebration of the late victories in the war. On this occasion, the king strips the marshal of his honors and offices and confers them upon his enemies Chester and Clinton. When the king asks the marshal which of the lords seated at the table had he ". . . beene most in opposition with?" or whom did he favor the least, the marshall hypocritically answers: "I love all: / But should you aske me who hath wrong'd me most, / Then should I point out Chester" (II. 168-72). It soon becomes apparent, however, that he does not "love all," and especially not Lord Chester, for he subsequently changes his tune and refers to Chester and Clinton as his "enemies." This not so patient and humble subject pleads injured innocence, reminds the king that he had saved his life in the war and he has the wounds to show for it, and ends by calling the king "unkind."

> Mar. . . . . all my deserved honours
> You have bestow'd upon my enemies,
> . . . You might with as much Iustice take my life,
> As seaze my honours: howsoe're my Lord
> Give me free leave to speake but as I find,
> I ever have beene true, you now unkind. (II. 243-50)

There is much truth in Clinton and Chester's allegation against the marshal that "His courtesie is all ambition"

(I. 366). As in the case of the Wise Woman of Hogsdon who is not wise at all except in appearance, the subject of this play is not loyal except in appearance, and the king is not royal except in name. Even the title, *The Royall King and Loyall Subject*, is ironic and reflects the theme of appearance and reality, as do other plays written within the period of 1600-04, such as *The Wise Woman* and *A Woman Killed*.

In *The Royall King*, the king himself reveals his own jealous and emulous nature in the same banquet scene, discussed above, and after the discontented marshal has left:

> *King*. Shall we not be ourselfe, or shall we brooke
> Competitors in reign? act what we doe
> By other mens appointment? he being gone,
> We are unrival'd; wee'le be sole, or none.
> *Prince* The Martiall's gone in discontent my Liege.
> *King*. Pleas'd, or not pleas'd, if we be *Englands* King,
> And mightiest in the Spheare in which we moove,
> Wee'le shine alone, this *Phaeton* cast downe. (II. 274-81)

Actually, as we shall see, this jealous and vacillating English king prefigures, in many ways, the Moorish king Mullisheg in Heywood's next romantic play *The Fair Maid of the West*, a fact which does not say much for Heywood's supposed patriotism and chauvinism for Englishmen and everything English previously stressed by many critics of Heywood. On the contrary, this play reveals that very early in his career, Heywood was attacking folly, vice, error, and evil whenever and wherever he found it, even in the Royal Court in England.

Heywood also exposes the envy, materialism, and hypocrisy of the courtiers. In The Royall King, Lords Chester and Clinton are envious and intriguing; Lord Audley is materialistic and dishonorable in breaking contracts. The marshal is hypocritical, self-serving, and emulous, while the king himself is also emulous, as well as arbitrary and jealous. Even the carping captain is not thoroughly honorable or charitable himself. He has no pity in the end for those who had previously proved unkind or disloyal to him, as he spurns all who had turned deaf ears to his former entreaties; and he becomes a part of the corrupt court after all of his scathing criticism of it. But then what is one to do in a world where there is universal corruption in court, camp, country, and city? Captain Bonvile resolves the problem by seeking his proper station in life (as a man of gentle birth) with a loyal and uncorrupted wife at his side. It is important to note that once Captain Bonvile ends his tests and takes his place in the life at court under the favorable eye of the king, he no longer castigates the court or the courtiers; he can no longer see clearly the faults of the courtiers or the corruptions of the court, no longer distinguish appearance from reality. The implication seems to be that sooner or later the court corrupts or demoralizes almost everyone, good and bad alike.

In this early play, Heywood has shown that heroes and villains alike are rewarded with the king's favor or

with advancement at court or punished with banishment or suspension, depending strictly upon the king's humour at the time, as when in the end, the marshal recoups his offices and honors and is reunited with his bride the princess, when the captain is made a Lord Baron by the king and a bridegroom as well when he weds Mary Mary, while the villains Chester and Clinton are suspended from their "stiles and places" for the time being at any rate or until they can "fashion" their "hearts" to their "faces" (V. 404-05). As Eugene Waith puts it: "The denouement resolves the plot better than it demonstrates the triumph of virtue."[25]

In this world where there is little virtue to triumph, only a few can remain untainted like the faultless, idealized, romantic heroine Lady Mary Audley. This too is characteristic of Heywood, at least early in his dramatic career. We have already witnessed the case of the incorruptible Mrs. Arthur in _How a Man May Chuse_, and now we shall turn to The Fair Maid and review the adventures of another one of Heywood's constant and chaste heroines, the brave and beautiful barmaid Bess Bridges.

[25] Waith, p. 145

The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II

In the romantic two-part play of adventure by land and sea, The Fair Maid of the West, published in 1631 (Part I written before 1610 and Part II around 1630),[26] Bess Bridges, the beautiful and bold daughter of a trade-fallen tanner in Somersetshire, rises like a meteor to become the wife of Spencer, a "well revenu'd" English gentleman (Pt. I, I.ii.5), as well as the celebrated toast of towns such as Morocco and Florence where she is lavishly entertained by the local rulers, respectively the Moorish Mullisheg, an amorous king of Fez and Morocco and the Duke of Florence, prince of the province where Bess is

[26] Both parts of The Fair Maid of the West were published together in 1631 and were entered in the Stationers' Register on June 16, 1631. While Clark dates Part I at 1609-10 (Heywood, p. 110), most critics suggest a date between 1600-04. It is generally agreed that Part II was written much later, probably around 1630 as Gerald Eades Bentley suggests on the basis of "The history of Queen Henrietta's company and of the careers of the individual actors" listed in the first edition (The Jacobean and Caroline Stage [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956], IV, 570-71, 568-69). See also Ross Jewell, "Thomas Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West," in Studies in English Drama, 1st series, ed. Allison Gaw (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1917), pp. 64-69. There are no known sources for the play although the characterization of Bess Bridges was probably influenced by ballad and chapbook heroines such as Mary Ambree and Long Meg of Westminster, mentioned by Bess herself (Pt. I, II.iii.13). See Jewell, pp. 69-70; Warren E. Roberts, "Ballad Themes in The Fair Maid of the West," Journal of American Folklore, 68 (1955), 21-23; and Velte, pp. 74-75. All quotations from the two parts of this play in the text, by act, scene, and line numbers are from The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II, ed. Robert K. Turner, Jr., Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967).

shipwrecked after leaving the coast of Barbary. In this play, which has the usual complications of love intrigue, Bess is a romantic heroine par excellence.

Sent into service by her father and beginning her illustrious career as a tavern wench at the Castle in Plymouth, Bess soon becomes proprietress of the Windmill tavern in Foy (Fowey in Cornwall) owned by Spencer, her gentleman-of-fortune sweetheart, who is forced to flee by sea when, in defending Bess's honor, he kills a man in a brawl at the Castle. While Bess is dispensing food and wine at the Windmill and is gaining a reputation for circumspection and chastity as well as amassing a small fortune, Spencer (attempting to settle a quarrel) is wounded as he kills a second man in a fracas in Fayal in the Azores where he has fled with the Essex expedition after killing the first man in England. When Bess receives an erroneous report, through Spencer's friend Captain Goodlack, that Spencer had died at Fayal leaving her a legacy, the grief-stricken maiden proceeds to commission a ship, orders it painted black, and christens it the Negro in token of her mourning. Dressed as a sailor and accompanied by an English crew including Captain Goodlack, Clem the clown, Roughman, and Forest, Bess sets sail for the Azores to retrieve the body of Spencer from the Spanish who have taken possession of the city. Foiled in her plans to fetch Spencer's body home for burial in England,

she turns to privateering, eventually capturing a Spanish ship aboard which the recovered Spencer is held prisoner. Failing to recognize one another and separated once again, each eventually arrives at Morocco. Spencer is again a prisoner, this time of Mullisheg, while Bess becomes the monarch's honored guest when the lustful Moor becomes hopelessly enamored of the English virgin at first sight. When Bess recognizes her long lost lover among the prisoners in Mullisheg's audience chamber, she begs for Spencer's release. Consequently, after hearing a recital of their true and constant love, an "heroic spirit" is aroused in Mullisheg; and after declaring that "Lust shall not conquer vertue . . ." (V.ii.118-19), he arranges for their nuptials to be celebrated forthwith.

In the sequel, the action is resumed at the Moroccan court on the afternoon of the fair maid's wedding day. But now with the joyous ceremony scarcely over and the marriage of Bess and Spencer not yet consummated, a more somber note is struck at the outset when Mullisheg, suffering an abrupt change of heart, is plunged into gloom and discontent by the loss of Bess. Meanwhile, Tota, his jealous queen, contemplates revenge while she fumes at being made "A mere neglected lady here in Fez, / A slave to others, but a scorn to all" (I.i.3-4) since the arrival of the English beauty at court. Each enlists a member of the English party as an assistant to his/her schemes.

Mullisheg attempts to press Captain Goodlack into service as a panderer in setting up an assignation with the beautiful Bess, while Tota prevails upon Roughman to arrange for Spencer to lie with her that night in revenge upon both Mullisheg and Bess. When Goodlack and Roughman meet and exchange confidences, a new scheme is devised culminating in an exchanged-bed-trick where king and queen spend the night together, both under the illusion they are with their desired bedfellows, Bess and Spencer respectively. Meanwhile Bess and her party return to the _Negro_ under the protection of the king's signet and password. The more closely watched Spencer, on the other hand, has the ill-luck of being taken captive, as usual, this time by Joffer, the chief bashaw, after Spencer has killed six of Mullisheg's subjects in attempting to fight his way to the ship and freedom. After swearing a rash oath (the first of several) to return by an appointed hour, Spencer is permitted to return to the _Negro_ to bid his wife farewell (and to forestall Bess from jumping into the sea if he fails to reach the ship alive). Spencer later returns to court in the nick of time to save Joffer from beheading as punishment for allowing the Englishman to escape, while, in turn, Bess and the others subsequently arrive just in time to save Spencer himself from the axe. Again Mullisheg overcomes his lust, pardons all, and allows the English to

depart in their ship, laden with his bounty of gold and pearls.

On the high seas, Spencer and Bess become separated once again in a sea fight with pirates. Spencer and Goodlack are washed upon the shores of different beaches, like the brothers in The Four Prentices, while Bess is later shipwrecked in Italy where, like Bella Franka, the sister of the four prentices in Heywood's earliest romance, she is set upon by a banditti captain bent on rape. Providentially, she is rescued with her virtue still intact by the Duke of Florence, who promptly becomes smitten with her beauty and charm. Taking her to Florence, the Duke sets Bess up in style and proceeds to woo her for his mistress. Unfortunately, he finds the young beauty unreceptive because she is grieving over the supposed death of her husband. Meanwhile, together again, Spencer and Goodlack inevitably arrive in Florence, where the Duke unwittingly engages the husband to aid him in gaining the love of his chaste mistress, ironically Spencer's own wife Bess. (Like Mont. Ferrers in Challenge for Beauty, Spencer must woo his lady for another man.) Finding Bess at last, Spencer is forced to leave her in a death-like swoon because of another rash oath (made in ignorance of the identity of the Duke's lady) when Spencer had sworn to neither "Lie with her . . . nor kiss her, touch her, / [or] Speake to her one familiar syllable" (V.ii.28-29). Finally, after

Spencer and Bess are both made to experience jealousy and distrust of each other, the dilemma is happily resolved when Bess tricks the Duke into releasing Spencer from his vow. The two lovers are reunited at last, and the Duke promises to reward their virtue even more bountifully than the magnanimous Mullisheg before him.

It should be apparent even from this plot summary that The Fair Maid, Part II, from the first scene, is decidedly darker and more disillusioned in spirit and tone than Part I. For instance, in Part II, Bess is still "a girl worth gold,"[27] but the gold has become somewhat tarnished. In the twenty-five to thirty years which has elapsed between the writing of the two plays, Heywood had come under the influence of Fletcherian tragicomedy; and this play, like his other late romantic plays of adventure and intrigue, A Mayden-Head Well Lost and Challenge for Beauty, reveals both a more decadent drama and a more sophisticated and world-weary but less moralistic playwright. Moreover in Part II A Fair Maid, none of the action occurs in England as in the first three acts of Part I, although the cast of the sequel still features the same major English characters. Without an English setting, however, there is less realism and much more romance in the later play. The Fair

[27] The full title of the play is The Fair Maid of the West, or A Girl Worth Gold. See also Pt. I, V.ii.153.

Maid is, of course, an adventure drama, which by its very nature is the antithesis of realistic drama. As Robert K. Turner, Jr., an editor of The Fair Maid, relates:

> Instead of asking us better to understand ourselves and our world by seeing through experience, it [adventure drama] invites us to reject reality as commonplace and deep concerns as troublesome, and temporarily to substitute for them a fantastic world of simple, straightforward emotions, black and white morality, absolute poetic justice, and, above all, violent rapidity of action. . . . Instead of reaching for a metaphysical or psychological fourth dimension, adventure drama deals in length and breadth only; and its success is in part measured by the degree to which swiftness of movement prevents any significant meaning from arising.[28]

There is understandably less social criticism and satire in these romantic adventure dramas than in Heywood's more realistic plays or even in a romance of intrigue like The Royall King, which is set in England, albeit in the medieval period. This would perhaps explain why this subject has been notably neglected in previous studies of the play, most of which concentrate on structure, on the background of the Moroccan episode, or on a study of theme, such as the themes of honor and chastity in relation to the hero and heroine of the play. As the following discussion will demonstrate, however, social criticism and satire, especially of the court and courtier, are still

[28] Robert K. Turner, Jr., Intro., The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II, by Thomas Heywood, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967), p. xv.

vital parts of these romances of adventure as in Heywood's other more realistic dramatic works. Even in the never-never land of stirring adventure and romance, Heywood cannot refrain from penning satirical or critical comment on the contemporary social order, ostensibly of Fez and Morocco but undoubtedly of English high society and especially of the English court and courtier.

In both parts of The Fair Maid, the clown Clem serves as the major vehicle for Heywood's social commentary. One might recall that it is characteristic of Heywood to use the ubiquitous clown as a mouthpiece for satire, social criticism, and moral or didactic comment, as well as for comic relief, bawdry, punning word play, and jokes; an example of the latter is Heywood's seventeenth century satire on Moors, equivalent no doubt to the modern Polack jokes:

> Spencer.
> Sirrah, what news will you tell to your friends when you
> return into England?
> Clem.
> Brave news, which, though I can neither write nor read, yet
> I have committed them to my tables and the rest of my memory.
> Spencer.
> Let's hear some of your novelties.
> Clem.
> First and foremost, I have observed the wisdom of these
> Moors, for some two days since, being invited to one of the
> chief bashaws to dinner, after meat sitting by a huge fire and
> feeling his shins to burn, I requested him to pull back his
> chair, but he very understandingly sent for three or four

> masons and removed the chimney. The same Morian entreated me to lie with him, and I, according to the state of my travels, willing to have a candle burning by, but he by no means would grant it. I ask'd him why. "No," says he, "we'll put out the light that the fleas may not know where to find us." (Pt. II, II.i.11-26)[29]

And, furthermore, according to John Samuel Lewis, Clem's "purpose, like that of several of Heywood's clowns, is to furnish realistic comment, to distract the audience from the highly romantic plot."[30] Heywood can never lose hold of the thread of reality altogether even in his most romantic plays of adventure and intrigue. The earthy realism of the clown, in this case, as well as in others (such as the clowns in The Royall King and in A Mayden-Head), continually pulls the reader or audience back into the real contemporary world of the English inns and taverns or of the Royal Court in England and abroad.

Heywood also uses other low-class characters, such as servants and drawers of wine, to point up the dishonest, dishonorable and materialistic ways of their betters, as in the following dialogue between the two drawers of wine

[29] In Part II of The Fair Maid, Heywood also indulges in other unflattering comments at the expense of the Moors. See I.i.28-29, 321 ff., 438; and II.i.6-8. For a further discussion of Heywood's treatment of the Moors in The Fair Maid, see Eldred Jones, Othello's Countrymen (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 109-16.

[30] John Samuel Lewis, "Theme and Structure in Thomas Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West," Diss. Univ. of Kansas 1968, p. 107

in the castle in Plymouth following the slaying of Carroll by Spencer:

> 1 Drawer.
> 'Tis well yet we have gotten all the money due to my master.
> It is the commonest thing that can be for these captains to
> score and to score, but when the scores are to be paid _non est inventus_.
> 2 Drawer.
> 'Tis ordinary amongst gallants nowadays, who had rather
> swear forty oaths than only this one oath: "God let me never be trusted."
> (Pt. I, I.iv.1-7)

As has been shown in the cases of the captain and the marshal in _The Royall King_, Heywood is also never loath to press higher class gentlemen into service as mouthpieces for his social satire or his critical vision of the nature of man and his world. In Part I of _The Fair Maid_, Spencer, for instance, serves a similar purpose in his melancholy discourse upon the inconstant way of the world:

> Goodlack.
> What were you thinking, sir?
> Spencer.
> Troth of the world: what any man should see in't to be in
> love with it.
> Goodlack.
> The reason of your meditation?
> Spencer.
> To imagine that in the same instant that one forfeits all his
> estate, another enters upon a rich possession. As one goes to
> the church to be married, another is hurried to the gallows

to be hang'd, the last having no feeling of the first man's joy
nor the first of the last man's misery. At the same time that
one lies tortured upon the rack, another lies tumbling with
his mistress over head and ears in down and feathers. This
when I truly consider, I cannot but wonder why any fortune
should make a man ecstasied.

Goodlack.
You give yourself too much to melancholy.

Spencer.
These are my maxims, and were they as faithfully practiced
by others as truly apprehended by me, we should have less
oppression and more charity. (II.ii.1-17)

These are without doubt the "maxims" of the social critic-playwright who penned them notwithstanding the whole is a set piece on the mutability of fortune, much like the speeches of Matthew Shore in Edward IV.

It is through Clem the clown, however, that Heywood aims his barbs at the corrupt courtiers of his day. When, for example, in Part I, a French merchant offers Clem "Forty good Barbary pieces to deliver" a petition to Bess Bridges, who, like Jane Shore before her, "Can all things with the king," Clem answers in a speech reminiscent of the clown Cock in The Royall King:

Your gold doth bind me to you.--[Aside.] You may see
what it is to be a sudden courtier: I no sooner put my nose
into the court, but my hand itches for a bribe already.
(V.i.136ff.)

The social satire is even more pointed, more explicit, in

Part II when Clem tells Roughman:

> . . . But if you want any money, speak in time, for if I once turn courtier again, I will scorn my poor friends, look scurvily upon my acquaintance, borrow of all men, be beholding to any man, and acknowledge no man; and my motto shall be <u>Base is the man that pays</u>. (V.iii.60-64)

Clem's allusion to turning "courtier again" here in Florence recalls his ill-fated experiences in Morocco in the court of Mullisheg when he had aspired to be like the Barbary courtiers and had been "honored" in being made a Barbary eunuch instead. The ignorant and unwitting young clown had foolishly grasped at the "grace and honor" first offered Spencer to become Mullisheg's "chief eunuch." As he ironically declares:

> Clem.
> Please your majesty, I see all men are not capable of honor.
> What he refuseth, may it please you to bestow on me.
> Mullisheg.
> With all my heart. Go, bear him hence, Alcade,
> Into our Alkedavy. Honor him,
> And let him taste the razor.
> Clem.
> There's honor for me! (Pt. I, V.ii.90ff.)

Clem's castration serves the dual purpose of comedy and criticism. It furnishes opportunities for bawdy double entendres and puns which Heywood's audience no doubt fully appreciated. One can almost hear the peals of laughter from the galleries when Clem tells a merchant: "I am Bashaw of

Barbary, by the same token I sold certain / precious stones to purchase the place" (Pt. II, V.iv.133-34); or when Tota asks "Canst thou be secret to me, Englishman?" and Clem answers "Yes, and chaste too; I have ta'en a medicine for't"; and when he leaves Tota and encounters Roughman who asks "How now, Clem; whither in such post-haste?" Clem replies:

> Clem.
> There; if you will have any grace and honor, you may pay
> for't as dear as I have done. 'Sfoot! I have little enough left;
> I would fain carry home something into my own country.
> Roughman.
> Why, what's the matter? I prithee stay.
> Clem.
> No, Lieutenant, you shall pardon me, not I; the room is too
> hot for me. I'll be gone; do you stay at your own peril. I'll be
> no longer a prodigal; I'll keep what I have.
> (Pt. II, I.i.90-91, 106-13)

But underneath the boisterous humor is the sober reality that a youth scarcely thirteen years old is punished beyond all deserts for his ignorance and for his presumption in aspiring to gain honor and grace as a courtier.[31] More importantly, it serves on several occasions as a tool for Heywood's satire.

[31] Cf. Lewis, p. 101: "Clem's ignorance results in his being punished beyond his deserts. He becomes a <u>pharmakos</u>, a scapegoat."

In another one of the many allusions to his castration throughout Part II of The Fair Maid, Clem confesses to Queen Tota, who asks him if he follows the English Elizabeth (Bess Bridges) that

> . . . I am not her gentleman usher to go before her, for that way, as the case stands with me now, I can do her but small pleasure. I do follow her. (I.i.63-65)

Turner glosses the title "gentleman usher" as "a man of gentle birth who attended one of high rank," and he goes on to point out, "but Clem alludes to the reputation such courtiers had for becoming the lovers of the ladies they served. Hence his obscene pun on 'go' (l. 63), which, taken innocently, means 'walk.'"[32] Clem again carries Heywood's social satire, levelled in this case, at the loose sexual morality of some of the courtiers and their ladies, while at the same time, the clown indulges in the type of bawdy pun Heywood was so fond of inditing.

As we have further seen time and again, Heywood was also extremely fond of using the theme of appearance and reality in his dramatic work, both realistic and romantic, and The Fair Maid is no exception to the rule. Lewis, in fact, reveals that the three major interrelated themes of the double play are: "the contrast of appearance and

[32] Turner, p. 100, gloss on l. 63.

reality, the quest for honor, and the pursuit of constancy." Lewis' analysis (as well as that of Marilyn Johnson)[33] centers upon revealing the sterling qualities of Bess, "a Girle worth gold," and of Spencer, a paragon of honor. This study, on the other hand, will attempt to show that although Bess in Part II is one of Heywood's strongest women and an undoubted paragon of chastity, she is nevertheless a flawed character, while Spencer's monomanic obsession with honor, like that of Sir Charles Mountford in _A Woman Killed_, can scarcely be seen as a pattern of honorable behavior.

In _The Fair Maid_, as in Heywood's other romantic comedies and tragicomedies, the theme of appearance and reality is inextricably interwoven with other themes, motives, and devices, such as the Jacobean conflict of love and honor; the contest of or quest for courtesy and honor and for liberality and magnanimity; the convention of the rash oath; the old device of bed-tricks or the exchanged-bed routine; the testing of friend or sweetheart; and the devices of disguise, mistaken identity or failure of recognition, as well as the employment of dissembling and deceptions including self-deceptions and the failure to see

[33] Lewis, p. 197. For a further discussion of the "Thematic Development in The Fair Maid of the West," see Chapter IV of Lewis' unpublished dissertation, pp. 168-98. See also Johnson, pp. 138-48.

clearly. Since the discussion of character to follow will offer further examples of these points, we need hardly linger over them now except for listing a brief sampling of each to prove the point.

In The Fair Maid, as in Heywood's other plays, appearance is continually conflicting with reality. It is often difficult to determine what is true and what only seems to be true, or to determine if a person is in actuality what he seems to be "in show," as Spencer ironically observes when Carrol and two captains enter his room in the Castle just minutes before the quarrel in which Carrol is slain:

> Spencer.
> I know not, gentlemen, what your intents be,
> Nor do I fear or care. This is my room;
> And if you bear you, as you seem in show,
> Like gentlemen, sit and be sociable.
> (Pt. I, I.ii.120-23)

Ironically, in Part II, while attempting to "bear" himself like an honorable gentleman, Spencer will become caught up in a Jacobean conflict of love and honor in which he will prove to be no gentleman at all where his own wife is concerned. Mullisheg likewise wishing to appear as a gentleman in the presence of the English beauty Bess, becomes, in Jones's words, "a Moorish example of the victim of a typical Jacobean love/honour conflict."[34] And as Lewis

[34] Jones, p. 116.

points out:

> Mullisheg's lust conflicts with his sense of honor and his desire for fame. He resembles the lust-ridden hero of the anonymous Soliman and Perseda, for like Soliman Mullisheg wishes to be known for his magnanimity. . . . Unlike Soliman, however, who almost immediately repents his magnanimity, Mullisheg does not backslide until the second part of The Fair Maid of the West.[35]

In desiring "to be known for his magnanimity," Mullisheg also resembles the two title characters of The Royall King and the Loyall Subject who engage in a contest of magnanimity.

Mullisheg's desire "for fame," noted by Lewis above, is paralleled by Spencer's quest for honor; and, like Mullisheg's "fame," Spencer's "honor" is of an obviously ambiguous nature. Spencer is not the paragon of honor he seems to be, for as we shall see, in his foolish or ill-advised rash oaths he seeks "honor" as a gentleman much as Clem seeks "honor" as a would-be courtier of Barbary. Moreover, Spencer's rash oath to the Duke of Florence is made in ignorance of the true state of affairs--the reality that the Duke's lady is actually Spencer's own wife Bess. This ironic confusion of appearance and reality is similar to Mullisheg's earlier ignorance of the fact that he is bedding his own wife Tota and not the English beauty in the bed-trick perpetrated upon him by Goodlack and Roughman. Queen Tota, too, erroneously thinks she is effecting her "just revenge" by cuckolding Mullisheg and by

[35] Lewis, pp. 211-12.

frustrating Bess in preempting her place on the wedding night (Pt. II, I.i.200). In all cases, the true situation is the antithesis of what it seems to be.

The difference between appearance and reality is naturally inherent in the devices of testing plots, of disguises, mistaken identities or failure of recognition, as well as in the employment of dissembling and deceptions wrought knowingly upon others or unknowingly upon oneself as in the failure to see things clearly. When Bess, suspecting Roughman to be a coward, decides to ". . . try what's in him" (Pt. I, II.iii.35), she dons male attire, passes herself off as ". . . Bess Bridges' brother" (II.iii.78), and promptly brings the _miles gloriosus_ to heel. Later her disguise as a sailor causes a failure of recognition on Spencer's part, which along with Bess's false belief that Spencer was dead and her own consequent lack of recognition, culminates in another unnecessary separation and a delayed reunion until the _dénouement_ of Part I. Similarly in Part II, the false mutual belief that the other spouse is dead, Spencer drowned and buried at sea and Bess raped and killed by the banditti captain, creates most of the plot complications which take place in the court of the Duke of Florence. The other complications are the result of Bess's dissembling and deception in her relationship with the Duke of Florence in the _dénouement_ of Part II.

In the characterization of Part II, the Duke of Florence is more honorable than Mullisheg, but his motives are basically the same, to make Bess his mistress where Mullisheg would have made her his concubine. Both the Duke, "the high-minded but passionate Italian prince," as Turner calls him, and Mullisheg, the lustful king, are conventional characters who have a number of antecedents in both dramatic and non-dramatic romances.[36] The portrayal of a lustful king here, for instance, recalls the characterization of the title characters in The Royall King and in the earlier Edward IV. In his discussion of Mullisheg, Lewis relates that

> By the turn of the seventeenth century, the lustful king had become a thoroughly familiar figure. Furthermore, he behaved in a thoroughly conventional way. Thematically, the lustful king illustrates the notion that to rule a king must learn to govern himself.

Lewis concludes quite accurately that "Mullisheg clearly is intended by Heywood to be understood as a lustful king."[37] His illicit passion for Bess is described in terms of the fires of lust, a favorite image with Heywood:

> Mullisheg.
> . . .--[Aside.] The more I gaze,
> The more I surfeit, and the more I strive
> To free me from these fires, I am deeper wrapp'd,
> In flames I burn. (Pt. II, I.i.209-11)

36 Turner, p. xiv, and Lewis, pp. 108-09, 211.

37 Lewis, p. 111.

And in a lust versus honor speech, which recalls Edward IV's similar passion for Jane Shore and his indebtedness to her husband Matthew, Mullisheg laments:

> . . . Oh, but I have sworn
> And seal'd to her safe conduct. What of that?
> Can a king swear against his own desires,
> Whose welfare is the sinews of his realm?
> I should commit high treason 'gainst myself
> Not to do that might give my soul content
> And satisfy my appetite with fulness . . .
> (Pt. II, I.i.234-39)[38]

At the beginning of Part II, as Jones points out, "Lust, which at the turn of the century [in Pt. I] had gone down before virtue without a struggle, now reappears to present a Jacobean war in the King's mind." In the sequel, "evil is not so easily conquered, and the dark side of the Moor is now dominant."[39] Actually, there is a decided disintegration in characterization between the two parts of *The Fair Maid* not only in the case of Mullisheg but also in the other characters as well, especially in the hero and heroine Spencer and Bess.

In the earlier romance of adventure, Spencer seeks honor not gold in the forthcoming Essex expedition:

> Goodlack. Pray resolve me,
> Why being a gentleman of fortunes, means,
> And well revenu'd, will you adventure thus

[38] Cf. Part II Edward IV I. 60-62.

[39] Jones, pp. 113, 112. See also Clark, *Heywood*, pp. 213-14.

> A doubtful voyage when only such as I,
> Born to no other fortunes than my sword,
> Should seek abroad for pillage?
> Spencer. Pillage, Captain?
> No, 'tis for honor; and the brave society
> Of all these shining gallants that attend
> The great lord general drew me hither first,
> No hope of gain or spoil. (I.ii.4-12)

Later, of course, after he kills Carrol in the tavern brawl, he has little choice in the matter; self-preservation, not honor or spoil, is the impetus for the island voyage. Outside of Spencer's killing two men in quarrels, he is presented more or less as an honorable gentleman in the first romance. And even these slayings do not dim the luster of Spencer's honorable image, since he is defending Bess's honor in the first case and attempting to settle a dispute between two belligerent captains in the latter instance.

In the second play, however, as with Mullisheg, "the dark side" of Spencer's nature surfaces. In the first place, Spencer has become much more materialistic. With the loss of Mullisheg's bounty of gold and pearls at the bottom of the sea after the shipwreck of the Negro, Captain Goodlack and Spencer are drawn by "hope of gain" to the court of the Duke of Florence:

> Goodlack. And at best leisure
> Tender our service to the duke,
> Who fame reports to be a bounteous prince
> And liberal to all strangers.
> Spencer. 'Tis decreed.
> But howsoe'er his favors he impart,
> My Bess's loss will still sit near my heart.
> (IV.v.128-34)

But the hypocritical Goodlack (who does not belie his name in this case) disclaims any "hope of gain" when the two meet the Duke just minutes after he has warned Spencer to

> Beware of these Italians.
> They are by nature jealous and revengeful,
> Not sparing the most basest opportunity
> That may procure your danger.

Goodlack, then in the very next breath, tells the Duke:

> Behold, w'are two poor English gentlemen,
> Whom travel hath enforc'd through your dukedom
> As next way to our country, prostrate you
> Our lives and service. 'Tis not for reward
> Or hope of gain we make this tender to you,
> But our free loves. (IV.vi.76-79,84-88)

Even Bess, "a girl worth gold," is herself more interested in gold in Part II than in Part I. She too is not loath to take any thing--money, clothes, lodging, or an expensive jewel--the infatuated Duke is inclined to hand out. In discussing Bess and Spencer's acceptance of Mullisheg's "largess" which "swell'd" the _Negro_ "with pearl and gold" when they left Barbary (III.iii.183-85), Turner writes:

> And combined with Spencer's and Bess's altruism is an admirable providence; their ideals do not forbid their accepting the fortune pressed on them by Mullisheg, for there is no sensible reason why virtue should not be rewarded in hard cash.[40]

[40] Turner, p. xvii. As we shall see, the same thing can be said about Lauretta and her mother in _A Mayden-Head_. Their ideals may forbid them from begging but not from freely accepting all of the bounty of the Prince of Florence. In this, they are following in Bess's footsteps.

Similarly, their "ideals" do not deter them from recouping their fortune in Florence; for they give no indication they will be adverse to accepting the fortune pressed on them by the Duke when they leave his country to return home to England (V.iv.190ff.).

Besides becoming more materialistic, Spencer's desire for honor becomes a monomanic pursuit for an honorable reputation and name in Part II of The Fair Maid. This play was written "in a different era from the first," says Herndl, and

> Here the hero is trapped in a Fletcherian dilemma of opposed vows. Having sworn to the Duke of Florence to abjure all familiarity with the lady whom he is to woo in the Duke's behalf, he discovers that she is his wife. A "code" fidelity to the later promise forces him to be unfaithful to his marriage vows.[41]

Spencer's second rash oath made to the Duke of Florence is less honorable than the first one made to Bashaw Joffer, a thoroughly honorable man, in Morocco. In this case, Spencer made the rash oath to save Bess from a suicidal leap into the sea. He would save her life in Morocco whereas he would just as readily let Bess die in Florence without lifting a finger to help. Because of an exaggerated "code" honor, Spencer would not only break his marriage vow

[41] Herndl, pp. 181-82. Cf. Clark, Heywood, p. 215. Herndl further notes that "Code ethics" and "A similarly hypothetical moral situation provides the matrix of plot in The Royal King and the Loyal Subject" (p. 182).

to keep a rash oath made to the Duke, an almost complete stranger, he would also sacrifice his wife. It should be remembered that Spencer thinks Bess may well be dying when he walks out, leaving her in a death-like swoon. He flatly refuses to aid his wife in any way because of his vow:

> Spencer.
> She faints, and yet I dare not for my oath
> Once to support her; dies before mine eyes,
> And yet I must not call her back to life.
> (V.ii.56-58)

And to further emphasize the fact that Spencer fully believed his wife was dying, he later explains to Goodlack that when he left, Bess was "I think dying, or the next way to death" (V.iii.31). Spencer thus pushes his inordinate desire for honor to absurd lengths. Actually, he seems more concerned with his reputation and his name than with his wife Bess, with her love for him, or even with her life. In this, he is very much like Sir Charles Mountford in _A Woman Killed_, who was more concerned with his "honor" than with his sister Susan. And yet, we have been asked by most previous critics to see Spencer as a paragon of male honor. A few, however, like Alwin Thaler, have perceived some of Spencer's faults as a romantic hero with some ". . . exaggerated romantic notions," such as "his craving for 'honor,' his unwillingness to be put into the

shade even by his lady's prowess, his melancholy fits, and above all, his 'restless jealousy.'"[42]

The incomparable Bess Bridges is also not above a "restless jealousy" and some dishonorable behavior herself, particularly in her dissembling with the Duke of Florence. Like the other major characters in _The Fair Maid_, Bess becomes a flawed romantic heroine in the later play. In the first part, she resembles Jane Shore, one of Heywood's most sympathetic women because of her charitable nature. In the second part, however, the similarity ends. Bess remains constant and chaste, unlike Mistress Shore, but ironically Bess is a less admirable character nevertheless, because of her lies and deceit.

Initially Bess, a girl of low degree (a tanner's daughter) must prove herself worthy to be the wife of a well-born gentleman. The question of the disparity in social position between Bess and Spencer is first raised by Goodlack:

> Goodlack.
> Come, I must tell you, you forget yourself.
> One of your birth and breeding thus to dote
> Upon a tanner's daughter! Why, her father
> Sold hides in Somersetshire and being trade-fall'n
> Sent her to service.
> Spencer. Prithee speak no more;
> Thou tell'st me that which I would fain forget
> Or wish I had not known. If thou wilt humor me,
> Tell me she's fair and honest. (Pt. I, I.ii.15ff.)

[42] Alwin Thaler, "Thomas Heywood, D'Avenant, and _The Siege of Rhodes_," _PMLA_, 39 (1924), 638.

Next Spencer calls attention to Bess's "low birth," while at the same time he acknowledges her beauty and her chastity as well:

> Spencer.
> To thee I will unbosom all my thoughts.
> Were her low birth but equal with her beauty,
> Here would I fix my love.
> Goodlack. You are not mad, sir?
> You say you love her?
> Spencer. Never question that.
> Goodlack.
> Then put her to't; win opportunity,
> She's the best bawd. If as you say, she loves you,
> She can deny you nothing.
> Spencer. I have proved her
> Unto the utmost test, examin'd her
> Even to a modest force, but all in vain.
> She'll laugh, confer, keep company, discourse,
> And something more, kiss; but beyond that compass
> She no way can be drawn.
> Goodlack. 'Tis a virtue
> But seldom found in taverns. (I.ii.51ff.)

And finally, Bess herself broaches the subject as she too laments the inequality in rank between them:

> Bess.
> What I love best, my heart, for I could wish
> I had been born to equal in fortune
> Or you so low to have been rank'd with me;
> I could have then presum'd boldly to say
> I love none but my Spencer. (I.ii.80ff.)

Throughout the course of the first play, Bess proves herself worthy of Spencer through her exceptional chastity, constancy, and charity. Spencer himself has tested and proved her chastity; Goodlack will test her constancy before giving her Spencer's legacy; and she will prove her own charity and benevolence when, like Jane Shore, she

gives alms, visits prisons, and lends coins to those in need (III.iv.56-57). In her last will and testament made before leaving England, Bess makes the poor her heir. As the mayor of Foy, who deems her "a fit match for his son" (IV.ii.12-14) says to Bess: "You want a precedent, you so abound / In charity and goodness" (IV.ii.45-46). And like Jane Shore, she saves many a man's life as she intercedes with the king. A Florentine merchant later summarizes her charitable accomplishments in Morocco in Part I as follows:

> To see that miracle of constancy,
> She who reliev'd so many Christian captives,
> Redeem'd so many of the merchants' goods,
> Begg'd of the king so many forfeitures,
> Kept from the galleys some, and some from slaughter,
> She whom the King of Fez never denied,
> But she denied him love; whose chastity
> Conquer'd his lust and, maugre his incontinence,
> Made him admire her vertues? (Pt. II, IV.i.106ff.)

Throughout the first part of The Fair Maid, Bess is portrayed as one of Heywood's most virtuous and most admirable heroines. She is beautiful, bold, and brave, as well as chaste, constant, and charitable. Her spotless record is marred by only one vengeful action; she fires upon the church in Fayal in revenge upon the Spanish for their uncharitable disposition of Spencer's supposed bones:

> Bess.
> Our mourning we will turn into revenge.
> And since the Church hath censur'd so my Spencer,
> Bestow upon the Church some few cast pieces.--
> Command the gunner do't.

Goodlack.
And if he can to batter it to the earth. a piece.
(Iv.iv.61-65)

Even taking into consideration the anti-Catholic sentiment prevalent at the time, one can hardly imagine that Heywood himself would applaud Bess's action in bombarding a church with the cannon aboard the _Negro_. Moreover, as Lewis relates

> Queen Elizabeth specifically ordered the Earl of Essex to command his troops during the Islands Voyage not to "spoil or destroy any church or place appointed for Divine service . . . upon pain of death . . ."[43]

This revengeful streak in Bess's otherwise flawless nature becomes more apparent in the second and later play when in her jealousy, she, like Queen Tota, vows revenge upon her husband Spencer after he leaves her without a word in her death-like swoon:

Bess [aside].
Hath some new love possess'd him and excluded
Me from his bosom? can it be possible?
. . . But I'll be so reveng'd
As never woman was. I'll be a precedent
To all wives hereafter how to pay home
Their proud, neglectful husbands. 'Tis in my way;
I've power and I'll do it. (V.ii.75 ff.)

This is a far cry from Bess's desire in Part I "To be a pattern to all maids hereafter / Of constancy in love" (III.iv.93-94). As in the case of Mullisheg and Spencer, there has been

[43] Lewis, p. 153, n. 30.

a disintegration in the character of this romantic heroine in the more than twenty years which had elapsed in composition between the two plays.

Bess's "dark side"--her deceptive and dissembling nature--becomes immediately apparent when, following this speech on revenge, she gulls the Duke of Florence into resigning Spencer ". . . solely to [her] disposure" (V.ii.91) when she falsely promises to be his:

> Florence.
> What interest I can claim, either by oath
> Or promise, thou art commandress of.
> Bess.
> Then I am yours;
> And tomorrow in the public view of all
> The stranger princes, courtiers, and ladies,
> I will express myself . . . .
> Florence. What we have promis'd
> Is in our purpose most irrevocable,
> And so, we hope, is yours.
> Bess.
> You may presume, my lord. (V.ii.99ff.)

And minutes later after the Duke leaves, Bess again vows to revenge herself on Spencer: "Now shall I 'quite him home. Th'ingrate shall know, / 'Tis above patience to be injur'd so" (V.ii.115-16).

When we next see Bess in the <u>dénouement</u> of the play, in the presence of Spencer and all the court, she promises the Duke she has come to keep her promise with him (V.iv.50-51). The Duke then asks her if she is his, whereupon Bess kisses him twice and replies: ". . . It surfeits me 'bove measure / To be a prince's darling and choice

treasure" (62-63). She then deliberately lies about what has happened to the "costly jewel" the Duke has given her, which she had earlier cast away to the then unrecognized Spencer as she passed along the street with the Duke (IV.v.108):

> Florence.
> You had from us, lady, a costly jewel;
> It cost ten thousand crowns. Speak, can you show it?
> Bess.
> I kept it chary
> As mine own heart because it came from you;
> But hurrying through the street, some cheating fellow
> Snatch'd it from my arm. Therefore, my suit is
> With whomsoe'er the jewel may be found,
> The slave may die.
> Florence.
> His sentence thine; we never will revoke it.--
> (V.iv.73ff.)

And finally, now that she herself has the power to sentence Spencer, Bess does a quick about-face, gives him back his life and pardons him of all, as she (like the romantic heroine Hellena of Challenge for Beauty), throws herself into the arms of the man she has just saved.

> Bess.
> Then hear thy doom. I give thee back thy life,
> And in thy arms throw a most constant wife.
> If thou hast rashly sworn, thy oaths are free.
> Th'art mine by gift; I give myself to thee.
> Florence.
> Lady, we understand not this. (V.iv.116-20)

At this point the reader or audience is undoubtedly as confused by Bess's ambiguous actions as is the Duke of

Florence himself. Has a deception been wrought upon us as well as upon the Duke by Bess and Heywood, or was Bess sincere in her desire for revenge? As in the case of the king's ambiguous actions in The Royall King, it is difficult for us to sort out reality from appearance. In either case Bess, like the royal king, is scarcely the honorable character she has seemed to be in appearance. She has in any case lied and deceived the Duke by promising to be his when she evidently had no intention of fulfilling her part of the bargain. Even if her ends justified the means, as in a Fletcherian play, her dissembling actions cannot be seen as a pattern of honorable behavior. This can be seen, of course, as symptomatic of Heywood's darkened world view, his pessimism and disillusionment when he wrote the second romance of adventure and intrigue late in his dramatic career. As Turner puts it:

> Although many of the devices of Part I carry over to Part II just as do the major characters, every critic of The Fair Maid has recognized pronounced differences in the moral tone of the two parts. . . . the atmosphere of Part II becomes viciously charged, and when Spencer and Joffer enter into a contract which requires personal honor to override all other considerations, we are in a world of Fletcherian absolutes that obviously has different moral bases from that of Part I. The same tone is present in the Florentine episode of Part II. In Part I Bess's beauty and goodness were twin shields against evil; Goodlack could no more force himself upon her than a lion can attack a virgin. In Part II, however, her beauty becomes a stimulus to rape, and when she is saved from the Captain of the Banditti by Florence's happy intervention, she is delivered to a man who though more polite is only slightly less aggressive. The exaggerated love-honor conflict in which Spencer is

> subsequently caught up and the deception wrought upon us when Bess declares her desire to be revenged on Spencer (Pt. II, V.ii.78-82) but actually works to effect their escape from another difficult situation are sorts of material dearer to Jacobean than to Elizabethan hearts. Whether Heywood chose to deal with such melodramatic themes because they were fashionable or because he was writing for an aristocratic rather than a popular audience, their effect is to make Part II a less innocent and a less vigorously healthy play than Part I.[44]

Turner's perceptive conclusion has been quoted at length because of its evident importance in supporting the thesis that Heywood was more akin to the Jacobeans than to the Elizabethans and to further point out the Fletcherian influence in Part II. Other critics have also acknowledge the similarity between this play and the work of Fletcher and of Massinger. Clark, for instance, points out that

> In the second part, though he preserves the racy manner, Heywood is deriving his standards from the slippery ethics of Fletcher and Massinger, his plots from situations which are constantly recurring in their world, and his characters from their favourite types.[45]

And in _A Mayden-Head Well Lost_, a decidedly unhealthy romantic comedy of intrigue, written a few years later, there is universal agreement among the critics who care to mention the play at all that Heywood derived "his standards from the slippery ethics of Fletcher."

[44] Turner, pp. xvii-xviii.

[45] Clark, _Heywood_, p. 213. See also pp. 214-16.

A Mayden-Head Well Lost

In Heywood's canon, A Mayden-Head Well Lost (1632-33; 1634)[46] is like the skeleton in the closet that everyone knows is there but no one wishes to acknowledge. Most of his critics, especially those advocating his morality and puritan tendencies prefer to ignore it altogether, to apologize for him, or to make a few perfunctory remarks about its unwholesome moral tone or about the baleful influence of "the slippery ethics of Fletcher" on Heywood after 1620.[47] Even the title of the play is suggestive of its contents. As Crofts points out, "The title aptly conveys the moral quality of the plot; Heywood felt justifiable qualms as to what the readers of Histriomastix would think of him."[48] It is apparent that Heywood fully realized the "hopelessly immoral situation," as Wright calls it, of A Mayden-Head; for he attempted "to provide a moral gloss"[49]--to justify

[46] The date generally set for the composition of A Mayden-Head is either 1632 or 1633. As Crofts notes, "All critics agree that in its present form it must come after 1630" (p. 33). It was published in 1634 and entered in the Stationers' Register on June 25, 1634. See Clark, Heywood, pp. 128-29, and Velte, p. 85. There is no known source for this romantic comedy. All references from the play cited in the text are from the Pearson edition by volume and page numbers.

[47] Some critics such as Clark (Heywood, pp. 246-47); Hudson (p. xlix); Parrott and Ball (p. 119); and Johnson (p. ix) acknowledge that A Mayden-Head is in the Fletcherian mode or bent.

[48] Crofts, p. 103.

[49] Wright, Middle-Class, p. 644.

or to smooth over the immorality of the situation in "To the Reader":

> Courteous Reader, (of what sexe soever) let not the Title of this Play any way deterre thee from the perusall thereof: For there is nothing herein contained, which doth deuiate either from Modesty, or good Manners. For though the Argument be drawne from a Mayden-head lost, yet to be well lost, cleares it from all aspersion. Neither can this be drawne within the Criticall censure of that most horrible Histriomastix, whose uncharitable doome having damned all such to the flames of Hell, hath it selfe already suffered a most remarkable fire here vpon Earth. This hath beene frequently, and publickly Acted without exception, and I presume may be freely read without distaste; and of all in generall: excepting such, whose prepared palats, disgusting all Poems of this nature, are poysoned with the bitter iuice of that Coloquintida and Hemlocke, which can neither relish the peace of the Church nor Common-weale. Nothing remaineth further to be said, but read charitably, and then censure without preiudice.
>
> By him who hath beene euer studious
> of thy fauour,
> Thomas Heywood (IV. 99-100)

This study of the two heroines who indulge in a bit of premarital sex, one even bearing an illegitimate son as a consequence, does not fit neatly into the usual discussion of Heywood as the spokesman for middle-class morals and ideals, for instance, or as an optimistic Elizabethan who staunchly believed in man's (or woman's) better nature. Furthermore, these two unchaste heroines do not fit the "Images of Women" portrayed in Heywood's favorite types as discussed by Marilyn Johnson.[50]

[50] Johnson dismisses the play with the comment that it "presents two women's attempts to cope with the problems arising out of pre-marital sex" (p. 53). See also Bentley, p. 583.

In *A Mayden-Head*, the royal lovers, Princess Julia, daughter of the Duke of Milan, and the prince of Parma, who have consummated the marriage contract without benefit of clergy, are separated by the machinations of Stroza. This villainous secretary to the Duke of Milan seeks revenge on General Sforsa who had formerly cashiered him from the army. On the one hand, Stroza implies to Parma that Julia has been unfaithful, while, on the other hand, he convinces Julia that Lauretta, General Sforsa's daughter, has secretly usurped her place in Parma's bed by becoming his mistress. As a result of Julia's jealousy, Lauretta and her mother (widowed now by the General's untimely death) are banished from the court in Milan. With their servant, the clown, they seek refuge in a forest in Florence where they are found by the Prince of Florence while hunting. As in the case of the Duke of Florence and Bess Bridges, the Prince of Florence showers his bounty on both this lovely damsel in distress and her mother. Struck by Lauretta's beauty, the prince promptly falls in love with her at first sight and she with him in true romantic fashion. Meanwhile, back in Milan, the Prince of Parma leaves the court after renouncing Julia and the bastard issue she will later bear. However, when the child is born and is exposed by the grandfather and Stroza, it is providentially rescued by Parma who has wisely begun to suspect Stroza's villainy. Seeking to salvage Julia's "shipwrackt" honor (IV. 107), as well as his own

good name as her father, the Duke of Milan arranges a marriage of state between Julia and the Prince of Florence through Stroza as emissary. But Parma, hearing of the forthcoming nuptials, disguises himself and conveys a letter to the Prince of Florence which reveals that his bride-to-be is unchaste. Julia and Prince of Florence are subsequently married but only after the prince vows that he will revenge himself on all concerned if Julia proves to be flawed in her virtue. Like DeFlores in Middleton's _The Changeling_, Stroza then hatches a scheme to save the day by arranging an exchanged-bed-trick with the hated Lauretta for the wedding night. All goes well until the next day when Lauretta contrives to inform the Prince of Florence of the substitution by showing him the diamond ring and the charter for her dowry he had supposedly given his bride Julia the night before. To complicate matters further for the dishonorable trio (Stroza, the Duke, and Julia), the Prince of Parma arrives at the court in Florence with Julia's illegitimate son, proposing that "_'Tis fit, if Iustice bee not quite exil'd / That he that wedds the mother, keepe the child_" (IV. 159). All is made plain when Stroza is forced to confess his villainy after which he is let off without any punishment whatsoever. Then setting aside the encumbrance of a lawful marriage performed by a Bishop, as though it had never taken place, the Prince of Florence gives his own bride Julia back to the Prince of Parma to

wed and himself takes the lower class Lauretta to wife as the curtain falls on this morally degenerate romantic comedy of intrigue.

Structurally and artistically, if not morally, this play is a vast improvement over the early romance The Royall King. The love stories of the two couples are skilfully interwoven. As Velte points out, "There is no marked division into main plot and sub-plot, for all the threads of the complicated story are closely bound together."[51] Heywood has also become more sophisticated and more subtle in criticizing the court and courtiers in the later Caroline romance. In addition to the usual satirical or critical comments on corruption at court, Heywood has added the dishonest and dishonorable statecraft perpetuated by a Machiavellian villain as well as the social problem of moral corruption in high places. Neither of these problems had been developed in his earlier romantic plays, although the latter had been touched upon in The Fair Maid. Both had been explored in his classical plays The Four Ages, especially The Iron Age, and The Rape of Lucrece, and the reader will undoubtedly recall the machinations of Richard III and the illicit affair of Edward and Jane Shore in Edward IV discussed in Chapter II. But whereas the setting of the early romance The Royall King was an unhistorical medieval English court, the setting of the late A Mayden-Head

[51] See Velte, p. 85.

is the courts of two Italian duchies, which Heywood's contemporaries would easily accept as politically and morally decadent. Furthermore not one of the characters in the latter romance is English. It is, as Clark points out, the only extant play of Heywood's in which the plot is not "linked to England by English men and women."[52] Having covered himself against any hazard, Heywood is thus free to criticize and satirize at will.

As in his other romantic plays, The Royall King and The Fair Maid, Heywood uses the clown to convey the more general satire and criticism of court and courtier, and to project what little realism and common sense there is into an otherwise wholly romantic plot. General Sforsa's widow, for instance, being the romantic and unpractical woman she is, prodigally but very charitably distributes her wealth to uphold her husband's honor after his death. When she subsequently finds herself exiled with her daughter in a forest in Florence penniless except for one piece of gold, she proposes to squander it on wine. All the while, she is bemoaning her fate and declaring that she would rather starve to death than beg:

> Wife. Yet here, since no man knowes vs, no man can
> Deride our misery: better dye staru'd,
> Then basely begge.

[52] Clark, Heywood, p. 247. See also p. 280.

to which the clown, honest like Nicholas in _A Woman Killed_, replies in a double-edged satire on both beggers and their betters:

> _Clow_. How better starue then begge; all the Ladies of _Florence_ shal neuer make me of that beleefe. I had rather beg a thousand times, then starue once, doe you scorne begging? Your betters doe not, no Madam; get me a Snap-sacke, I'le to _Florence_: I'le make all the high-wayes ring of me with for the Lords sake. I haue studied a Prayer for him that giues, and a Poxe take him that giues nothing: I haue one for the Horse-way, another for the Foote-way, and a third for the turning-stile. No Madame, begging is growne a gentleman-like Calling here in our Countrey.
> _Wife_. I haue yet one poore piece of Gold reseru'd Step to the Village by and fetch some Wine.
> _Clow_. You had better keepe your Gold, and trust to my begging Oratory, yet this is the worse they can say to mee, that I am my Ladies Bottle-man. (IV. 121-22)

The widow may scorne begging, but, like her betters or like Bess and Spencer, her ideals do not deter her one whit from accepting the "bounty from a Prince," who begins by moving his huntsman out of the lodge in the forest to install mother and daughter there as his guests:

> _Prince_ . . . . You shall receiue some bounty from a Prince.
> _Enter_ a Hunts-man.
> Who keepes the Lodge below?
> _Hunts_. Your Highnesse Hunts-man.
> _Prince_ Command him to remoue, and instantly
> We giue it to these Ladies: besides, adde
> Vnto our Guest three thousand pounds a yeare:
> We'll see it furnisht too with Plate and Hangings.
> 'Las pretty Maide, your Father's dead you say,
> We'le take you now to our owne Patronage,
> And trust me Lady, while wee're Prince of _Florence_,
> You shall not want nor foode, nor harborage.
> _Wife_. Pardon Great Sir, this our neglect of duty

> Vnto a Prince so gracious and compleate
> In vertuous indowments.
> _Lau._ To excuse
> Our former negligence, behold I cast
> Me at your foote.
> _Prince._ Arise sweete, pray your name?
> _Lau._ _Lauretta_.
> _Prince._ Faire _Lauretta_, you shall be henceforth ours.
> Oh Mounsieur! I ne're saw where I could loue
> Till now. (IV. 124-25)

It should be said in behalf of the impetuous and infatuated young prince that he later provides for his dispossessed huntsman, although it could also be said in the disfavor of the two women that they are never in the least concerned that the huntsman has been evicted from the lodge because of them. This is particularly in keeping with the self-centered nature of Lauretta.

Later, when the clown appears in gallant apparel, he again alludes satirically to beggars great and small in a conversation with the huntsman:

> _Clow._ Nay, nay, the case is alter'd with mee since you saw me last: I was neuer in any hope to purchase any other suite then that I wore yesterday; but now I can say _Ecce fignum_, the case is alter'd. Now euery begger comes vpon me with _good Gentleman, good Gentleman_: when yesterday Gentlemen would haue shun'd the way for feare I should haue begg'd of them. Then comes another vpon mee with _good your Worship, good your Worship_, then doe I double my fyles, and cast him a single two pence.
> _Hunt._ Sirrah, thou mayst thanke the Prince for this.
> _Clow._ Thou say'st true; for he hath chang'd our wooden Dishes to Siluer Goblets: goodly large Arras that neuer yet deseru'd hanging, he hath caus'd to be hang'd round about the Chamber: My Lady and

> Mistresse, now my Lady and Mistresse lyes ouer head and eares in Downe and Feathers. . . . . But Sir, does not the new Gowne, the Prince sent my Mistresse, become her most incomparably?
>
> Hunt. 'Tis true: 'tis strange to see how Apparrell makes or marres.
>
> Clow. Right: for yesterday thou wouldst haue taken me for a very Clowne, a very Clowne; and now to see, to see.-- (IV. 130-31)

This, of course, recalls the proposition that "clothes make the man" or woman presented earlier in The Royall King. In a materialistic society, it is not what a man is but what he appears to be that counts.

As in the earlier play too, the plight of the soldier in camp or field is touched upon in this play, and particularly the ingratitude of politicians or of rulers who fail to pay or properly feed the soldier in a long siege or war. The social criticism is undisguised, for instance, in a soldier's account of the Milanese victory "After a nine Moneths siege" and of the death from heartbreak of the brave and charitable General Sforza:

> Soul. . . . No Duke, 'twas thy vnkinde ingratitude
> Hath slaine braue Sforza.
> Duke. Speak the cause?
> Soul. I shall:
> This citty seaz'd, his purpose was the spoyle
> To give his Souldiers; but when his seal'd Commission
> He had vnript, and saw expresse command,
> To deale no farther then to victory,
> And that his great Authority was curb'd,
> And giuen to others, that respect their profit
> More then the worth of souldiers: euen for griefe,
> That he could neither furnish vs with pay
> Which was kept back, nor guerdon vs with spoile,

What was about him he distributed,
Euen to the best deseruers, as his garments
His Armes, and Tent, then some few words spake,
And so opprest with griefe, his great heart brake.
<u>Str</u>. There's one gone then. (IV. 112-13)[53]

Stroza, as his comment suggests, is hardly grief-stricken by the news of the hated general's death. Actually, he is largely responsible for the death because Stroza was the "Officer" whose intentional "negligence" had no doubt caused the delay in "men and money" from reaching the camp, a "negligence" that had put the general and his men ". . . to much extremity Of Dearth and Famine . . ." (IV. 109).

Once again using the clown as his mouthpiece, Heywood satirically comments on the havoc that can be wrought by dishonest, self-seeking, vengeful, and cunning politicians like Stroza.

> <u>Clowne</u>. . . . These
> Politicians can doe more execution with a pen in their studies, then a good Souldier with his sword in the field . . . (IV. 143)

Most of Heywood's audience must have identified Stroza as a Machiavel. Stroza himself actually underlines the point for any who might have missed it in his allusion to Machiavelli after the Prince of Florence has called Julia's chastity into question:

[53] For further criticism on the lot of the soldier, see IV. 108-09, 111-13.

> Stro. All goes not well, This iugling will be found,
> Then where am I? would I were safe in Millaine.
> Here Matchiuell thou wast hatcht: Could not the same
> Planet inspire this pate of mine with some
> Rare stratagem, worthy a lasting Character: (IV. 146)

When Stroza is inspired to use the old "strategem" of the exchanged-bed routine, he egotistically compares himself with the villainous Synon who had conceived the "Rare stratagem" of the Trojan horse, as depicted in Haywood's Part II of The Iron Age (1612; 1632):

> Stro. Hee was a meere Asse
> That rais'd Troy's Horse: 'twas a pritty structure.
> . . . Synon, a foole, I can doe more
> With precious Gold, then hee with whining Teares. (IV. 148)

Not since the portrayal of Richard III in Edward IV and of Synon and Cethus in The Iron Age, Part II had Heywood developed such a consummate Machiavellian villain as in Stroza in A Mayden-Head.[54] Moreover, Heywood's Machiavels are clearly cast in the Jacobean mold, not in the Elizabethan. Richard III, Synon, Cethus, and Stroza "are the prime movers of political action," not the ranting "inhumanly cunning Elizabethan intriguer." As Robert Ornstein relates:

> Outside of Shakespeare's and possibly Marlow's plays, the Elizabethan Machiavel has little political significance. His raison d'être is a primitive criticism and aesthetic appreciation of his own villainies. He has an

[54] Crofts maintains that A Mayden-Head contains "the most distinct Machiavellian type in Heywood" (p. 104).

> instinctive appetite for horrendous crimes but only the vaguest interest in holding a scepter. He is, in short, not a political subversive but an archenemy of the moral order, a "modern" representative of ancient evils, a diabolical incarnation of at least six of the Deadly Sins.

In contrast, in the case of the Jacobean dramatists, Ornstein points out that

> In their tragedies the Machiavels are not isolated villains or seeds of ungodly infection in a Christian society. In their tragedies the politicians "belong," at least in the sense that they dominate the political scene and are the prime movers of political action. The norm of politics is no longer conceived in medieval terms as the well-governed state; it is the Machiavellian jungle in which the fittest survive.

Ornstein goes on to say that in the seventeenth century, the Jacobeans are

> Caught between a dying feudal order and a modern society struggling to be born, perplexed by conflicting interpretations of political fact which they can neither reject nor wholly accept, the Jacobeans seek to moralize about the very political realities which, if admitted, vitiate moral conclusions. They cling to a traditional moral view of politics even though they sense that medieval ideals are no longer meaningful to their society.[55]

Here Ornstein has very accurately though unwittingly described both the Jacobean playwright Heywood and his Machiavels.[56]

[55] Ornstein, Moral Vision, pp. 25, 27-28, 31. For a fuller discussion of the Machiavellian influence in Renaissance drama, see Ornstein, pp. 24-31, and Ellis-Fermor, pp. 10-16.

[56] Ornstein omits Heywood entirely in his full-length study of Jacobean drama outside of a few cursory remarks on Heywood's "competent mediocrity," for instance. See <u>Moral</u>

By now it should be quite clear from this study that Heywood himself is not in reality what he has appeared to be on the surface to most of his previous critics. He is clearly a Jacobean not an Elizabethan in his world view and in his dark vision of the nature of man and of evil. As we shall see in our further discussion, Heywood's vision of men and especially of women is darker, more pessimistic, more disillusioned in _A Mayden-Head_ than in any other drama with the possible exception of _Late Lancashire Witches_, which was probably written only a year later.

In both dramas, the image of women has undergone a degrading transformation from the usual Heywood heroine, the chaste maiden, the constant wife, or even the sympathetic adulteress (excepting Mrs. Wincott, of course, another late heroine). In _Lancashire Witches_, the heroine is an old witch who practices the black arts, and in _A Mayden-Head_ one heroine is a dishonorable dissembler and an unchaste, unwed mother while the other one is a conniving, revengeful hypocrite and an adulteress as well. Consequently, the tone and tenor of the latter play lends itself to anti-feminist satire, such as Heywood employed previously in _A Curtaine Lecture_ and in scattered passages in his dramatic works such as _The Four Ages_. In _A Mayden-Head_, for example, the cynical Stroza

---

Vision, pp. 165-66. See also, p. 149. He is more flattering to Heywood, however, in his recent article "Bourgeois Morality . . . ."

informs Parma that "All women are not / Sincerely constant . . ." (IV. 107), while Parma himself later cruelly taunts Julia, "a broken lady," when he satirically says: ". . . why do you weep? / You are not hungry, for your bellie's full" (IV. 118); the clown satirizes both the parsimony and prodigality of women in admonishing the general's wife for her liberality:

> Because you are too liberall a Mistress: and that's a fault seldome found among Ladies: For looke, you vse to giue away all, and I am all that is left; and I am affraide when you come into a strange Countrey, you'le give away me too, so that I shall neuer liue to be my owne man. (IV. 116);

or when Lauretta asks: "Wherein I haue offended by my chastity," the jealous Julia retorts:

> How chastity?
> A thing long sought'mongst Captains wiues and daughters,
> Yet hardly can bee found. (IV. 110)

As a matter of fact, there is little if anything to be found in this late romance that is actually what it seems to be in outward appearance, including chastity in women. As in Heywood's other romances, the disparity between appearance and reality is so pervasive, one can only conclude that Heywood was again consciously employing this favorite theme. The disparity between appearance and reality is ironically and cryptically set forth as a maxim by Stroza himself at the

beginning of the play when he begins to work on Julia by hints and false insinuations:

> Jul. Thou shouldst be honest Stroza.
> Stro. Yes many should
> Be what they are not: but I alwayes was,
> And euer will be one, (that's still my selfe.)[57]

To everyone but the clear-sighted clown, Stroza, like Iago, seems to be "honest," but in reality, of course, he is a cunning, revengeful liar. The Machiavellian Stroza accomplishes his machinations by making things appear to be what they are not. He convinces the Prince of Parma, as Iago convinces Othello, that his lady is unfaithful; he convinces Julia that Parma is pursuing an affair with Lauretta; he works, for the Duke of Milan, to conceal Julia's looseness and disgrace from the world by exposing her bastard son, by contracting marriage with a noble husband "to shadow" Julia's dishonor (IV. 129), and by standing as "The champion for her honour," as he assures the Prince of Florence and his father that he ". . . will auerre / Her Chaste, aboue degree; infinitely honest" (IV. 145); next his solution in arranging the exchanged-bed-trick is a classic example of appearance and reality, for the prince is "most palpably deceived" (IV. 147) into thinking he is consummating his marriage to Julia while he is actually bedding the virgin Lauretta; and

[57] See also Lauretta's comment on appearance and reality when she first sees the Prince of Florence and says: If by the front we may beleeue the heart, / Or by the out-side iudge the inward vertue" (IV. 123).

finally, as in all good romantic stories (and in mysteries), "the truth will out" in the end, and, in this case, Stroza confesses his villainy while the Duke of Milan also admits their attempt to conceal the painful truth. Now, he says all is laid ". . . ope most plaine and palpable / Which most wee thought to conceale" (IV. 162).

Moreover, wishing to conceal her untoward condition, Julia had secluded herself for two full months under the guise of grieving for the absent Parma. As a Lord of Milan relates in a conversation with the prince:

> Parm. . . . But I pray you tell me, since I left the Court,
> How is my absence taken?
> Lord. Of the Duke,
> With much distaste.
> Parm. But of the Princesse Iulia?
> Lord. Full two moneths
> Shee kept her Chamber, grieuously distracted,
> They say, meere griefe for your departure hence.
> Parm. Brauely manag'd,
> The Duke I see was more kind to her fame,
> Then to his prettie grand-childe . . . (IV. 137)

Parma conceals his own identity when in disguise he delivers the letter to Florence; and he also later conceals the Duke's "prettie grand-childe" in a covered dish, much as the marshal had concealed his own royal grandson in a costly cradle in The Royall King. In both cases, the outside appearance disguises or hides the true "gift" inside, a "gift" which Parma for one declares: ". . . I should bee loath to part with, / But vpon good conditions . . ." (IV. 160). Even

when the dish is uncovered at the wedding feast just prior to Parma's arrival, the true identity of the child is not disclosed; Julia is "perplexed," Florence is puzzled, and Stroza shrewdly guesses its paternity:

> Stro. From whom? whom, Parma? breake the bastards necke,
> As I would doe the Fathers, were hee here.
> (IV. 159)

Stroza's dishonorable villainy is only too apparent, but then the other characters are not paragons of virtue themselves. As a matter of fact, there is not an entirely honorable character in the lot except for the lowly clown and Monsieur, the tutor to the Prince of Florence. Parma and Florence, for instance, are more admirable by far than their future wives, but even they are flawed characters. Parma is too easily deceived; he cruelly renounces Julia, leaves the court in haste and then repents in leisure for abandoning his betrothed. Florence's actions also leave much to be desired. When, for example, he receives Parma's warning that his fiancée Princess Julia is "flawd in her Virginitie," he is asked to handle the situation with ". . . that Princely management, / Her honour bee not slandered . . ." (IV. 141). His management is anything but "Princely," however, as he blurts out his suspicions about the "Ladies Chastity" and openly slanders "her honour" before everyone assembled for the wedding. Had the report

been untrue, his behavior would have been unconscionable as in the case of Claudio's unjust accusations against Hero in _Much Ado about Nothing_. Julia, dissembling injured innocence, ironically points out that Florence's actions are not "Princely," as she asks him: "Haue you sent for me, to accuse he heere / In this strange Clime? It is not Princely done" (IV. 145). And in answer to the prince's suspicions, her father hypocritically says:

> _Millaine_. I came in termes of Honour,
> Brought with me, all my comforts here on earth,
> My daughter; to bestow her on thy son:
> Poor Lady, innocently comming, forsaking all,
> Father and Countrey, to betake her selfe
> Vnto his bosom; and is she for all this,
> Branded with shame? (IV. 144-45)

The Duke's "termes of Honour" is to palm off his "deflowred" daughter (IV. 141) on a prince of royal blood. Of course, the Duke's deceptions are understandable though not honorable; he is acting as a parent not as a politician or a Prince and acting as well in a world where appearance is considered more important than reality. After Julia confesses she is "strumpeted" and "A bastard issue growes within [her] wombe," her father in his anger and shame admits that "Nature prevails 'boue honour" and ". . . I cannot change a father and a Prince / Into a cruell Hang-man . . ." As he subsequently contemplates the best course to take, he rails against the "cursed age" and concludes that "When children 'gainst their Parents all things dare, /

Yet Fathers still proue Fathers in their care" (IV. 119-21). But lest we begin to think of the Duke too sympathetically, it should be remembered that "nature" does prevail in the case of a grandson, for as a grandfather, the Duke does not prove kind in his "care."

Julia goes along with the grand deception unprotesting. She obeys the instructions of both her father and Stroza and plays her role to the hilt. All the while, she has no idea what has happened to her son:

> Iul. Durst I presume my Lord, to know
> Whither you haue sent my sonne?
> Mil. I'le not haue it question'd.
> I striue to salue thy honour, and thou seek'st
> To publish thy disgrace: my study is
> Where I may picke out a noble Husband,
> To shadow these dishonours, and keepe thee
> From the like scandall.
> Iul. Whom but Parmaes Prince.
> Mil. Oh name him not thou strumpet.
> Iul. I haue done.
> Mil. There's a Prince of noble hopes and fortunes,
> The Prince of Florence: what if I sent to him
> About a speedy Marriage? for I feare,
> Delay may breed strange doubts.
> Iul. Since I haue lost the name of Child,
> I am a seruant now and must obey. (IV. 129)

A marriage of state is hastily arranged between Julia and the Prince of Florence. And again the young prince's actions prove to be unprincely or at least unconventional when he rises from the bridal bed at the break of dawn and rushes off straight to the lodge in the forest to visit another woman (or so he thinks), his real bedfellow

Lauretta, who ironically had risen from the bed only shortly before to give place to the bride Julia. When Lauretta left the prince's bed, she soliloquized:

> And for my part, it was not much amisse,
> Because my Lord the Prince had such content
> Which caus'd him giue his Charter to my hand,
> The full assurance of fair Iulia's dower:
> Day gins to break, and I must to the Lodge.
> Oh what a griefe it was to leaue the Prince!
> But leaue those thoughts: These Gifts to me assign'd,
> Are nothing worth the Iem I left behind. (IV. 153)

This is a far cry from the set speeches on chastity of Heywood's young maidens prior to this play. In this case, the hypocritical and materialistic Lauretta has sold her chastity after all, and she even thinks ". . . it was not much amisse." Ironically, like Susan Mountford in A Woman Killed, Lauretta had earlier declared: "Wee hold our honour at too high a price, / For Gold to buy" (IV. 150).[58] In this most instructive dialogue between Stroza and Lauretta, she had self-righteously and uncharitably descanted on Julia's dishonor when she had told Stroza to "Pray tell the Duke [of Milan], all Women are not Iulia." Ironically, of course, Lauretta is like Julia, as she subsequently follows suit and miscarries in her own honor. Lauretta then consents to lie with the prince ostensibly only because of her love for him. And to put a better

[58] Cf. A Woman Killed ix. 53.

face on the matter, to justify her own dishonor, in other words, Lauretta later hypocritically tells Florence, when he comes to visit the morning after the bridal night, to

> Pardon great Prince; for all that loue you spake
> To Iulia, you whisper'd in my eare:
> Shee is vnchast; which, lest you should haue found,
> Her father sent mee here, fiue hundred crownes
> By Stroza; but neither his gold, nor all
> His sly temptations, could one whit mooue mee;
> Onely the loue I euer bare your honour,
> Made me not prise my owne. No lustfull appetite
> Made me attempt such an ambitious practise,
> As to aspire vnto your bed my Lord. (IV. 156)

It all sounds very selfless and noble on Lauretta's part, but one is at a loss to see how she consented to Stroza's bed-trick plan out of concern for the prince's honor, since Julia is his legal wife, unchaste though she is, not Lauretta. Adultery is scarcely less dishonorable than bedding one's own impure bride.

Also one cannot help but notice that Lauretta succumbed to Stroza's "sly temptations" only and immediately after he suggests that it would be a fitting revenge on Julia who had wronged her:

> Lauret. Sir bee answered,
> If Iulia bee disloyall: Let her bee found
> So by the Prince she wedds: Let her be branded
> With the vile name of strumpet: Shee disgrac'd
> Mee, that nere thought her harme; publickely strucke mee,
> Nay in the Court: And after that, procur'd
> My banishment: These Injuries I reap't
> By her alone, then let it light on her.

And picking up his cue from the vengeful Lauretta, the shrewd Stroza answers:

> Stro. Now see your errour,
> What better, safer, or more sweete reuenge,
> Then with the Husband? what more could woman
> aske?
> Lauret. My blood rebells against my reason, and I
> no way can withstand it: 'Tis not the Gold
> Mooues mee, but that deere loue I bear the Prince,
> Makes me neglect the credit and the honour
> Of my deare Fathers house: Sir, what the Duke desires
> I am resolued to doe his vtmost will.
> Wife. Oh my deare daughter.
> Lauret. Good Mother speak not, for my word is
> past,
> And cannot bee recall'd, Sir will you away?
> I am resolute.
> Stro. Shee yeeldes vnto her shame; which makes
> me blest,
> Let Millions fall, so I bee crown'd with rest.
> Wife. Oh mee, vnhappie, that nere knew griefe
> till now. (IV. 151)

Prior to this, all of Stroza's "sly temptations" as well as her mother's pleadings to think upon her father's honor or her mother's promised "curse" on her "for euer" after had not "mooue[ed]" Lauretta "one whit." But when Stroza slyly suggests revenge, she immediately capitulates.

One might add that Lauretta's fall was predictable, because she had earlier confessed her proclivity to moral weakness when she begged her mother never to leave her alone with Florence:

> I doe begin to fear lest that his shape
> Should tempt me, or his bounty worke aboue
> My strength and patience; pray Mother leaue vs
> neuer,

> Lest that without your Company, my loue
> Contending with my weaknesse, should in time
> Get of't the vpper hand.
> *Wife*. For this I loue thee. (IV. 132)

When her "weakness" and her desire for revenge "do in time" get "the vpper hand," Lauretta's mother does not "loue" her then. One may note, however, that the widow's shame and her lifelong "curse" are both short-lived when Lauretta's "mayden-head" proves to have been indeed "well lost." Susan Mountford's Pamela-like chastity before the wedding had only netted her a knight for a husband whereas Lauretta's adultery has netted her a royal spouse, a handsome young prince. Under the circumstances, it is small wonder that Heywood's critics have either panned this play for its unhealthy Caroline plot or have ignored it altogether.

It is worth while remarking here that obviously there has been a total disintegration in the moral and ethical values in the corrupt heroines Lauretta and Julia in this late romantic comedy. One can scarcely imagine such an admission of moral weakness like that of Lauretta's above, much less the loss of her "mayden-head" before marriage, from any one of Heywood's young maidens prior to this play, outside of the courtesans or whores he occasionally depicts. Luce, second Luce, Gratiana, Katherine, Lady Mary Audley, Bella Franca in *Four Prentices*, Hellena and Petrocella in *Challenge for Beauty* to name a

few, as well as both Isabella and Bess Bridges before their marriages, are all militantly chaste; their chastity is their most prized possession and as such is inviolate and invincible.

Furthermore, there has also been an obvious degeneration in the whole moral tone of A Mayden-Head, even from that of the unhealthy moral tone of The Fair Maid, Part II. This can readily be seen, for instance, in comparing Heywood's use of the exchanged-bed-trick in both plays. In discussing the bed-trick in Part II of The Fair Maid, Turner relates that

> So many bed-tricks had been successfully executed by 1630 that one wonders why Goodlack had such difficulty in thinking of this device as a solution to the heroes' problems, but the very fact that he did has a bearing on the moral tone of the play. However familiar the device may have been, it seems nevertheless to have carried with it certain moral ambiguity, although in this instance Heywood plays safe by doubling the number of dupes and having them married to one another rather than merely betrothed.[59]

In A Mayden-Head, in contrast, Heywood does not play it "safe," because here not only are Lauretta and the Prince of Florence not even betrothed, the "dupe" Florence is actually married to another woman, Julia, although this marriage is conveniently slurred over in the end as in the earlier case of Young Arthur's marriage to Mistress Mary in

[59] Turner, pp. xvii-xviii.

How a Man May Chuse.[60] In the interest of resolving these plot complications in the two plays, Heywood evidently decided just to sweep these untidy and broken plot threads under the rug in the hope that no one would notice or would care if they did, since "All's well that ends well," as one of his fellow dramatists had earlier shown. Then too, since A Mayden-Head is a romantic comedy, the couples must be properly paired off according to their heart's desire in the end, for as everyone knows romantic heroes and heroines must "live happily ever after." Under the circumstances, it may be quibbling to mention the fact that both Parma and Florence are rewarded with undeserved spouses, which is a complete switch from How a Man May Chuse where the villainous Young Arthur is rewarded beyond all deserts with a spotless paragon of chastity and patience. But this realistic tragicomedy was written very early in Heywood's career whereas A Mayden-Head, a romantic comedy of intrigue, was written very late. And Heywood's late plays, as we have seen here and in the two previous chapters, are without exception more pessimistic, cynical, and morally degenerate.

The darkening of Heywood's world view is clearly evident, for instance, in Heywood's characterization of his heroines in these romantic comedies and tragicomedies of adventure and intrigue. As a general rule, the women become morally more corrupt as one goes up the social

[60] See p. 201 above.

scale and as the time passes between the composition of *The Royall King*, *The Fair Maid*, and *A Mayden-Head*. One obvious exception to the rule is Lady Mary Audley, a sub-plot heroine in the early play. But between Isabella a marshal's daughter and Lauretta a general's daughter and between Isabella and Julia a Duke's daughter, there is a world of difference. In the former case, both Isabella and Lauretta are deceptive dissemblers and hypocrites but Isabella is thoroughly chaste. Like Susan Mountford, she even threatens suicide at the prospect of dishonor. In the latter case, whereas both Isabella and Julia follow their father's instructions, Isabella is concealing the pregnancy of a lawful marriage while Julia is concealing the pregnancy of an illicit affair.

We have also noted in our previous discussion of *The Fair Maid* that there has been an obvious disintegration in the character of Bess Bridges between the early and later romance--between Bess a lowly tanner's daughter in Part I and Bess an upper-class gentleman's wife in Part II. There is an even more pronounced degeneration between Bess and both Lauretta and Julia. In the former case, both Bess and Lauretta (like the earlier Isabella before them) are of a lower class than their spouses or husband-to-be. As in the earlier *The Fair Maid*, much is made of the disparity in social position between Lauretta and the prince who had earlier sworn to Monsieur

that

> It is with no intent
> To make the Maide my wife, because I know
> Her fortunes cannot equall mine. (IV. 127)

Like Bess who wished she were equal in fortune and rank with Spencer, Lauretta tells the Prince of Florence:

> I was wishing with my selfe that you were
> poore:
> Oh pardon me my Lord, a poore, a poore man.

And finally, the prince likewise confesses his wish that Lauretta were a Duchess instead of a general's daughter.

> By all my hopes,
> I haue in _Florence_, would thou wert a Dutchesse,
> That I might court thee vpon equall tearmes;
> Or that I were of low deiected fortunes,
> To ranke with thee in Birth: for to enioy
> Thy beauty, were a greater Dowre then _Florence_
> Great Duke-dome. (IV. 134)

But Bess proves herself deserving of her spouse whereas Lauretta proves herself unworthy of her royal husband-to-be. When we compare Bess Bridges, the paragon of chastity with Lauretta, who does not trust herself without her mother's restraining presence, who then overrides her mother's pleadings and protestations when she wilfully decides to take Julia's place in bed and when she decides she has not done "much amisse" in the process, we can perceive the disparity between the moral values of the two heroines. Flawed though she is in Part II, Bess Bridges would never

descend to Lauretta's debased level or to Julia's either, for although Julia is a princess, she is also an unwed mother who dishonorably marries a royal prince to "shadow" her disgrace.

Tota, the jealous queen of Mullisheg, is also not an admirable woman. She plots to cuckold her husband in revenge because of his neglect of her while he is lusting after the beautiful English virgin, Bess Bridges. She is saved from adultery through trickery and not through any last minute scruples on her own part. She fully believes she is usurping Bess's place with the latter's bridegroom Spencer when she is actually filling her own place in her husband's bed. As she later muses when she learns the truth: "Howe'er my mind, then yet my body's chaste" (Pt. II, III.iii.117). Tota, however, is a minor figure who plays only a small part in _The Fair Maid_, Part II.

And finally, a word should be said about poetic justice, or rather the distinct lack of it in these romantic plays. In _The Royall King_, heroes and villains are rewarded or mildly punished in the end in accordance with the whim of the king, poetic justice having nothing to do with it. In _The Fair Maid_, virtue is rewarded in hard cash, gold, and pearls, whereas villainy, such as Tota's and Mullisheg's goes unpunished. Only the banditti captain who intended to ravish Bess is punished when Roughman cuts off his head and brings it in for the thousand crowns reward. And

as in the case of Clem who is cruelly rewarded beyond all deserts with castration, there is no poetic justice at all in Heywood's world of the Italian court. Stroza is not punished at all for his machinations, as Julia makes clear when she says: "*Stroza* was cause of all, but his submission / Hath sau'd him from our hate, arise in grace," to which Stroza ironically declares: "Who would striue, / To bee a villaine, when the good thus thriue?" (IV. 163-64). Heywood's obvious critical point, however, is that there are very few "good" people in this corrupt and degenerate world. The Duke of Milan and Stroza are dishonorable villains; Julia and Lauretta are dishonorable, revengeful, and unchaste; and even Parma and Florence are flawed characters. But then, Heywood was too much of a social critic, too much of a realist, even when writing romantic plots, to depict man as a flawless character or as an exemplar of honorable and charitable behavior. Even in the never-never land of romantic adventure and intrigue, one can see that "This is no world in which to pity men."

CHAPTER V

"THIS IS NO WORLD IN WHICH TO PITY MEN"

> Old Mount. You say my nephew is in great distress--
> Who brought it to him but his own lewd life?
> I cannot spare a cross. I must confess
> He was my brother's son; why, niece, what then?
> This is no world in which to pity men.
> (A Woman Killed ix. 1-5)

Thomas Heywood, the most prolific English playwright of the Renaissance, tried his hand at almost every type of drama popular in his age, except the pastoral. Like Middleton and Massinger, his dramatic range is wide; he swings from realistic-satiric comedies of London life to romantic plays of intrigue in an imagined Italy, from the somber domestic tragedies of adultery to the bitter tragicomedy of witchcraft, from a chronicle-history of the reign of Edward IV in late medieval England to the chronicle-history of the reign of the Tarquins in ancient Rome, and from stirring tales of high adventure by land and by sea to a royal masque depicting the high adventures of the gods and goddesses on Olympus. Through all of his twenty-four extant plays, however, one thing seems patently clear: Heywood never loses sight of his own time and place--seventeenth-century Jacobean England, and he never loses his desire to instruct and entertain, to criticize and satirize. He remains from first to last a Jacobean social

critic. This is apparent even in plays which have nothing to do with England or with the contemporary period. As previously noted, Allan Holaday relates that Heywood's allusions are often "veiled" in his plays; "presumably he refers to ancient Greece or the gods on Olympus," says Holaday, "but inevitably the thrust is toward his own England."[1]

This is true of the fourth group of plays hitherto discussed only briefly and parenthetically--the chronicle-histories based on English history (If You Know Not Me, Parts I and II) or on classical history and myth (The Rape of Lucrece, and the cycle of the Four Ages), as well as those inspired by the classics (The Captives and Love's Mistress).[2] In these, the setting may ostensibly be Olympus, ancient Greece, Troy, or Rome, but often the scene is actually a local landmark, such as a London tavern or Newgate prison. In The Rape of Lucrece, for instance, the editor Holaday points out that "Heywood piles up reference to English dress, customs, and taverns

[1] Holaday, "Heywood and the Puritans," p. 196. See also Chapter I, pp. 10-11 above.

[2] All references from If You Know Not Me, the Four Ages, and Love's Mistress cited in the text are from the Pearson edition by volume and page numbers. All line references from The Rape of Lucrece are from the edition edited by Allan Holaday (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950); and all act, scene, and line references from The Captives are from the edition edited by Alexander Corbin Judson (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1921).

until it is the occasional Roman allusion which seems misplaced." Actually, says Holaday, "the employment of anachronism" by Heywood is ". . . even for an Elizabethan [a] little short of amazing."[3] Even one of the two songs appended to the end of the play entitled "The Cryes of Rome" actually describes, among other things, old women imprisoned for debt in Newgate prison: "Hungry cold and comfortlesse night and day, / Pity the poore women in the dark dungeon" is the plea of the lyricist (ll. 3057-58). But then, this anachronism is in perfect keeping with the tone and tenor of the play Heywood has just presented, for Rome under the evil, tyrannical Tarquins is ". . . no world in which to pity [women]."

The same could be said of the _Four Ages_, especially the two parts of _The Iron Age_, in which Heywood delineates his two most thoroughly evil and despicable characters, the consummate Machiavellian villains Synon and Cethus who between them wreak their merciless vengeance on one and all. Synon seeks the total ruin of the enemy, the Trojans, man, woman, and child, whereas Cethus seeks revenge on his own countrymen the Greeks. Between the machinations and intrigues of these two arch-villains almost all of the Trojans and most of the Greeks die. In the end the two villains kill each other in envious spleen when each

[3] Holaday, "Introduction," pp. 36, 43.

wishes to be the world's most incomparable villain. The two plays of The Iron Age present scene after scene of nothing but revenge, war, adulterous love, lechery, duplicity and treachery. Even the presumably jaded appetites of Heywood's Jacobean audience, long used to large doses of blood, gore, and horror must have been satiated after viewing these plays.

In studying the dramas of this fourth group, one should note that Heywood's characters may wear Roman togas or carry Trojan shields, but, as a rule, they talk like English men and women. For example, the noble Roman lady Lucrece makes sententious little speeches on wifely duties which are interchangeable with those made by the middle-class housewife Mrs. Arthur in How a Man May Chuse. And as Nichols notes, "Heywood was generally very casual with the divine beings, characterizing them only as ordinary human beings faced with problems reduced to human levels."[4] Characteristically then, in Heywood even the gods are scaled down to size. All of this is no doubt part and parcel of Heywood's purpose as a social critic. His audience may easily learn the lessons taught by the illustrative examples of virtues and vices furnished by the classics, while at the same time classical literature is being popularized for the benefit and education of the

[4] Nichols, p. 158.

unlettered and unlearned. Again as in past discussions, Heywood's own writings provide the material upon which we may base our ideas about his purpose in writing his plays; it is the same in these chronicle-histories (or "forreigne History"), as in his comedies, tragedies, and tragicomedies--to instruct and to entertain. In *An Apology for Actors*, Heywood makes this indisputably clear when he relates the "Vse of Historicall playes" as follows:

> If wee present a forreigne History, *the subiect is so intended, that in the liues of Romans, Grecians, or others, either the vertues of our Country-men are extolled, or their vices reproued*, as thus, by the example of *Casar* to stir souldiers to valour, & magnanimity: by the fall of *Pompey*, that no man trust in his owne strength: we present *Alexander*, killing his friend in his rage, to reproue rashnesse: *Mydas*, choked with his gold, to taxe couetousnesse: *Nero* against tyranny: *Sardanapalus*, against luxury; *Nynus*, against ambition, with infinite others, by sundry instances, either animating men to noble attempts, or attaching the consciences of the spectators, finding themselues toucht in presenting the vices of others.
> (F3^{v} [my italics in ll. 1-4])

One will notice that the emphasis is on the vices rather than on the virtues of the ancient Greeks, Romans, and others. One should perceive, too, even in a cursory reading of this group of plays based on history and myth that they also fit into the same mold as Heywood's other dramatic works; in these, too, as previously mentioned, he is clearly instructing, entertaining, satirizing and criticizing man and society under the guise "of Romans, Grecians, or others."

Although these plays are beyond the scope of this study, a sampling of examples will illustrate the points that here again (1) Heywood is again acting as a social critic; and (2) he is again employing his favorite theme of appearance and reality. In the early play _If You Know Not Me, You Know No Body: or The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth_, Part I (1603-04), Heywood's animus against "the Romish faction," expressed in his late pamphlets, such as _The Rat-Trap_,[5] comes across loud and clear as he delineates the story of a Catholic sister (Queen Mary) who commits her Protestant sister (Elizabeth I) to the tower under the custody of the cruel Constable, a vindictive Catholic who hates Elizabeth (I. 217) and vows to "venge" himself on her (I. 219). As he maliciously and unpityingly exclaims: "Oh! that I could but drain her hearts deare blood. / Oh! it would feede me, do my soule much good" (I. 218). Benningfield will likewise ". . . pursue her with [his] deadly hate" (I. 229), and the Cardinal of Winchester repeatedly plots against her life and attempts to sow enmity between the young princess and her sister the queen both before and during the time Elizabeth is a prisoner in the Tower of London (I. 237-38 for example). Velte points out that in this play, "Protestant propaganda is obviously Heywood's purpose; propaganda and a natural

[5] See Chapter I, p. 12 above.

desire to flatter the great Queen, whose fleet had overcome the Armada."[6] In the sequel, Part II of If You Know Not Me, You Know No Body (1605), Heywood's purpose is obviously social criticism, as Nichols perceptively discerns when he notes, for instance, the "conspicuous consumption" of Sir Thomas Gresham, the builder of the Royal Exchange, after Gresham learns of the loss at sea of merchandise valued at sixty thousand pounds. On this occasion, says Nichols,

> Gresham immediately shows that such losses are to him mere trifles by magnanimously endowing Gresham College and by quaffing a glass of wine into which he has put a ground-up pearl valued at fifteen hundred pounds. It is surely not accidental that the next scene shows a starving Tawneycoat grubbing in a potato field in rags for three pence a day trying desperately to earn twenty pounds he owes Hobson.

Moreover, "The contrast between Gresham's excesses and Tawneycoat's poverty is clear," says Nichols, when Tawneycoat (or John Goodfellow), "an honest poore pedler of Kent" (I. 286) says:[7]

> Hard world, when men dig liuing out of
>   stones,
> As wretched miserable I am enforst.
> And yet there liues more pity in the earth,
> Then in the flinty boscmes of her children;
> For shee's content to haue her aged brest
> Mangled with mattockes, rent and torne with spades,

[6] Velte, p. 33.

[7] Nichols, p. 68. He goes on to quote the same passage.

> To giue her children and their children bread;
> When man more flinty then her stony ribs
> That was their mother, neither by intreats,
> Tears, nor complaints, will yeeld them sustenance,
> *But tis our ages fault; the mightier*
> *Tear liuing out of vs, we out of her.*
> (I. 302 [my italics])

Here Heywood is clearly writing as a social critic of his age. Heywood's world drawn from the classics and other sources is a fallen, corrupt world. As Vulcan tells Cyclops, in *Love's Mistress*: "And now my Ciclops lay't on lustily; / There's halfe a hundred Thunder-Boults bespoake," by the god Jupiter, "Which argues that the World is full of sinne" (V. 135). This is borne out further in both plots of *The Captives*. In the subplot, the lecherous and hypocritical friar John has a "leering ey" (I.ii.46) for his patron's wife, the Lady of Averne. Like Mrs. Arthur, this chaste and true wife has a villainous husband, the Duke of Averne, who kills the friar in a jealous rage and attempts to pin the crime on another man, John's hated adversary friar Richard. This friar Richard, in turn, is not loath to have another blamed for his own supposed murder of John. Ironically, he will leave the monastery--". . . leave [his] patron / To answer for the falt, that hathe more strength / Then [he has] to tugge with benshes" (IV.ii.60-62). Providentially, however, it is the Duke's wife who has the "strength" to save her husband, as Mrs. Arthur had saved hers in *How a Man May Chuse*. Lady De Averne rescues the now repentant Duke by securing a pardon

from the king. And again, as we have seen so often in Heywood, all the villains including the Duke's man Dennis, get off scot free except for the lecherous friar John who was slain. In the Plautine main plot of The Captives, Heywood alludes to "England [which] they saye is full of whormaster[s]" (I.i.226); and he exposes the hypocrisy and dissembling of men who frequent bawdy houses run by men such as Mildew:

> Mildew. This is the curse
> Belonges to all vs bawdes: gentle and noble,
> Even th' ouldest fornicator, will in private
> Make happy vse of vs with hugges and brybes;
> Butt lett them take vs at the publick bensh,
> 'Gainst consciens they will spitt at vs, and doome vs
> Vnto the post and cart. Oh the corruptnes
> Of these dissemblinge letchers! (V.iii.6-13)

Heywood also deals again with money-grabbing usurers, here the creditors who have dogged the heels of John Ashburne, an English merchant, until he finds himself in Marseilles where he takes up "the trade of fishinge" (V.iii.221 ff.). It is through Ashburne's man, the fisherman Gripus, that Heywood returns once more to his critical social commentary on the pitiful lot of the poor of his day. Gripus sings a ballad, for example, which is supposed to show ". . . the poore man's state most blest," but which, in reality, clearly contrasts the hard lot of the poor with the easy one of the rich (IV.i.416 ff.).

And it is through Gripus, the servant in The Captives, that Heywood combines his social criticism with the theme

of appearance and reality, when the fisherman catches his "sea booty." This turns out to be Palestra's casket which had been lost at sea in a shipwreck, and which later proves that she is the long-lost daughter of John Ashburne, the very man who has befriended her. As Gripus tells the clown: "I will dissemble, as most ritch men doo, / Pleade poverty and speake my master fayre." With the money Gripus hopes to obtain for his treasure, he plans to "By out [his] freedom for som little soom," and then go to sea where in time he ". . . may proove a noble marchant" (IV.i.33 ff.). The "sea booty," however, like so much else in Heywood's world, is not what it appears to be.

One could multiply examples from this fourth group of plays to illustrate Heywood's conscious use of the theme of appearance and reality, but a few should be sufficient. In _If You Know Not Me_, Part II, Gresham, speaking of the hypocritically pious Puritan Timothy Thinbeard, says: "He is a fellow seemes so pure of life, / I durst haue trusted him with all I had" (I. 281). But Thinbeard owes Gresham five hundred pounds which the hypocritical Puritan had spent in the bawdy house where he had sometimes gone directly from Bow Church (I. 275). In _The Golden Age_ and _The Silver Age_, the lusty and lustful Jupiter is constantly appearing in assorted disguises or assuming different shapes in his pursuit of mortal women, as when he takes the shape of the husband Amphitrio in order to bed

his wife Alcmena. Such a blatant juggling of appearance and reality elicits a momentary twinge of pity from Ganymede who, in turn, has assumed the shape of Amphitrio's servant Socia:

> Gani. Alas poore Amphitrio I pitty thee that art to be made cuckold against thy wiues will, she is honest in her worst dishonesty and chast in the superlatiue degree of inchastity: but I am set heere to keepe the gate: now to my office.
> (The Silver Age III. 102)

Finally, a word may be said about The Rape of Lucrece, where good clashes with evil and appearance clashes with reality. The noble Brutus who feigns madness, like Hamlet, is not what he seems to be; he even tells Sextus the truth under the guise of a "mad" fool's utterances: ". . . for what I seeme to be, / Brutus is not, but borne great Rome to free"; and as he leaves he retorts: "Behold I vanish since tis Tarquins minde, / One small foole goes, but great fooles leaves behinde" (ll. 219-20, 225-26). Like the noble Dane, too, Brutus is intensely concerned with the whole question of appearance and reality, for "Something is rotten in the state of [Rome]," as in Denmark (Hamlet I.iv.90).[8] In this play, as in Hamlet, the evil is located in the Crown, but in Rome this fact is clearly discernible to everyone with the eyes to see, whereas it

[8] William Shakespeare, Hamlet, in The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1961), p. 910.

is not so readily apparent in the state of Denmark. In Rome, under the oppressive, tyrannical rule of the Tarquins, the noble lords, such as Valerius, the singing "fool" who supplies much of the bawdry and comic relief in his songs, as well as Horatius and Mutius Scevola, must assume various "humours" since it is dangerous to appear as one really is or to reveal one's true opinions too openly in public. Collatine makes this obvious when he says:

> Thou art not what thou seem'st Lord _Scevola_,
> Thy heart mournes in thee, though thy visage smile,
> And so doe's thy soule weepe, _Valerius_,
> Although thy habit sing, for these new humours
> Are but put on for safety, and to arme them
> Against the pride of _Tarquin_, from whose danger,
> None great in love, in counsell, or opinion,
> Can be kept safe: this makes me loose my houres
> At home with _Lucrece_, and abandon court. (ll. 630-38)

But even home is not the safe haven it might appear to be. When Horatius asks Lucretius, "Whither will you my Lord?" the latter ironically replies:

> No matter where if from the court, Ile home to Collatine
> And to my daughter _Lucrece_: home breeds safety
> Dangers begot in Court, a life retir'd
> Must please me now perforce. . . (ll. 504-08)

Home affords no "safety" from the "Dangers begot in Court," however, as Lucretius soon learns. His daughter is basely raped in her own home by her own guest Sextus Tarquin, a kinsman and friend of her husband Collatine. Home proves

to be an unsafe harbor for Agamemnon, too (in The Iron Age, Part II) when he is murdered in his own bed by his wife and her paramour the very night he returns home safely from a ten years' war in Troy. We will recall, too, that Frankford and Old Wincott are betrayed in their own homes by their wives and friends, while Mr. Generous discovers to his horror that he has been boarding and bedding a witch (his wife) in their home; Mrs. Arthur is "poisoned" at her own table in her home; and the Duke of Averne strangles the friar in his own home when the latter comes to call on his wife. Heywood's world is permeated with evil extending from the home up to Olympus where Jupiter rules and down again to hell where Pluto reigns.

We must also remember Patricia Spacks's analysis of A Woman Killed where she proposes that "As men rise in the social scale, it would seem, their evil increases: the ultimate symbol of corruption is the court."[9] In applying her observation to Heywood's other dramas, one finds that the corruption and evil extend beyond the courts of mortals on earth to the court of the gods on Olympus. The gods and goddesses portrayed in the Four Ages and in Love's Mistress are even more lustful, deceitful, dishonorable, and revengeful than most mortals. Only Heywood's greatest villains, such as the Greeks, Synon and Cethus; Romans, the

[9] Spacks, p. 332. See Chapter II, p. 129 above.

Tarquins; Englishmen, Richard III, Dr. Shaw, and their confederates; Englishwomen, the witch Mrs. Generous and her cohorts; and the Italian, the Machiavellian Stroza can come anywhere close as rivals in this corrupt and almost pitiless world portrayed by Heywood in all of his plays.

In a word, "This is no world in which to pity men," and moreover, it is not the world of (1) a genial, tolerant, and lovable playwright; (2) the spokesman of middle-class morality and ideals; (3) a man with a staunch faith in human nature; or (4) the last of the Elizabethans and an apostle of Renaissance optimism in the age of Jacobean pessimism.

Like his own characters, Heywood is not the genial man he appears to be in the view of so many critics. He is not a kindly and good-humored playwright who, according to Hazlitt, "describes men's errors with tenderness," or who, according to Saintsbury, resembles Shakespeare in "his aversion from the fantastic vices which many of his fellows were prone to attribute to their characters . . . ."[10] Herndl observes that Shakespeare "celebrates the greatness of the human spirit whose travail he describes."[11] Heywood,

[10] Hazlitt, p. 44; and George Saintsbury, A History of Elizabethan Literature (New York: Macmillan, 1927), p. 280.

[11] Herndl, p. 283.

in contrast, emphasizes the fallibility of the human spirit whose follies, vices, and evils he describes. And in his plays, men's errors and vices include murders, assassinations, rapes, revenge, wars, fights and duels, decapitations and mutilations, treason, duplicity, betrayal, and broken trusts, inordinate pride and unbridled ambition leading to tyranny and war, rapacious greed and materialism, to name a few. Furthermore, Heywood generally describes man's manifold errors and vices with heavy-handed realism or with the corrective lash of satire of the social critic, not with the "tenderness" or the idealism of a more lovable playwright. Heywood's disposition, as displayed in his plays, is dark, gloomy, pessimistic, not sunny, genial, or friendly. Even his imagery tends to be gloomy and somber, as a rule, and stresses the more "repellent" rather than the more pleasant sides of nature in both the physical world and in man.

Moreover, Heywood's unflattering treatment of the middle class does not lead one to believe that he was writing as the spokesman of or for middle-class morality and ideals. As a rule, his bourgeois characters are decidedly not models one would wish to emulate. The women are prone to be either weak or unchaste, hypocritical or self-satisfied about their virtues, or worse yet deceitful or depraved; the men tend to be either avaricious or self-seeking, unkind and uncharitable, hypocritical or

self-righteous, or worse yet vengeful and debased villains. For example, in his most famous play, A Woman Killed, an adulterous though charitable and kind wife and her chaste though uncharitable and unkind husband are hardly exemplars of middle-class morality and ideals. Ironically, in this world of false appearances and of hypocritical people, the only honorable people, the only kind and clear-sighted characters are of the lowest class, the servants. We have seen that the poor, the servants, the clowns, and other representatives of the lower class are, as a rule, the real models of virtue and honor, the ones who exemplify the virtues of kindness, pity, and Christian charity, not the middle class to whom Heywood is supposed to be pandering. The lower class characters are generally keen-sighted enough to distinguish good from evil, and they are able to discern the realities that lie hidden beneath the deceptive appearances; consequently, the servant or clown serves most often as a mouthpiece for Heywood's social criticism and satire or as an anchorman for Heywood's reality, keeping his plays from degenerating into sentimentalism or drifting off into romantic excesses. The servants and clowns also supply most of the comic relief, the bawdy, and the humorous puns and jests; they are, in other words, Heywood's principal tool or vehicle for both instruction and entertainment.

After completing a study of Heywood's plays, one may well ask where are the "well-nigh faultless" characters, the "wholesome types of Elizabethan men and women" that Otelia Cromwell proposes as the _dramatis personae_ who people Heywood's world?[12] There are some good, honorable people in Heywood's world, but they are in the minority and usually are not in any position to change things for the better or to overcome the evil in the world or even to act as models of middle-class behavior--or for morality and ideals--for others to follow. As previously noted, they are generally of the lower classes, or they are people without power, such as the Ayres and Brackenburys, or women, who outside of Queen Elizabeth I, have little authority or influence in the Renaissance world dominated by men. The middle class fare better than the upper class, the aristocrats, or royalty, but not as well as the lower class. Their bourgeois morality is not held up for admiration since so many of them are wenchers, adulterers, murderers, prodigals, rioters, and dissemblers, among other things. Indeed, their highest ideals are revealed as a materialistic pursuit of money and position and a self-centered concern with an often twisted sense of honor or of reputation to the exclusion of other more important

[12] Cromwell, p. 206. See also Chapter I, p. 8 above.

ideals, such as true loyalty and honor, or Christian charity, kindness, forgiveness, pity, and mercy.

Heywood is clearly not depicting the better side of life, and he is not exhibiting a staunch faith in human nature in characterizing his dramatis personae. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that Heywood is a critic of society, not a misanthrope; even though his vision does become more pessimistic, cynical, and disillusioned with time, he never seems completely to lose his sympathy for weak, fallible, sinful man; and more importantly, he never ceases to point out his faults and shortcomings, his follies, vices, and evils. As he relates in Apology for Actors: "We present men with the vglinesse of their vices, to make them the more to abhorre them. . . ."[13]

As time passed in Heywood's dramatic career, he seemed to suffer a loss in sympathy with man, on the one hand, and a gain in pessimism with the human condition, on the other hand. When one looks at Heywood's plays chronologically, it becomes apparent that there is a progressive disintegration in the nature of his men and women, and, consequently, an increasing degeneration and corruption in the world they inhabit. As he points out in the opening to The Brazen Age: "The Ages in their growth wax worse & worse," for as time passes and the world grows older,

[13] See Chapter I, p. 14 above.

"Mens sinnes increase . . . ."[14] To Heywood, as to his fellow Jacobeans, the playwrights and the metaphysical poets like John Donne, man was living in a sick and disintegrating world. As Donne laments in An Anatomie of the World:

> So did the world from the first houre decay,
> That evening was the beginning of the day,
> And now the Springs and Sommers which we see,
> Like sonnes of women after fiftie bee.
> And new Philosophy calls all in doubt,
> The Element of fire is quite put out;
> The Sun is lost, and th'earth, and no mans wit
> Can well direct him where to looke for it.
> . . . 'Tis all in peeces, all cohaerence gone;
> All just supply, and all Relation: (ll. 201 ff.)[15]

Marjorie Hope Nicolson is correct in saying that "There is no more somber poem in the English language than Donne's threnody, An Anatomie of the World," which she calls, "a dirge upon the decay and death of man, of the world, of the universe."[16] Nicolson also points out that for Donne and the Jacobeans:

> The Circle of Perfection was gone from the heavens. Not only the world, but the whole universe suffered corruption. As man decayed and the world decayed,

[14] See headnote to Chapter I, p. 1 above.

[15] John Donne, An Anatomie of the World: The First Anniversary, in The Poems of John Donne, ed. Herbert J. C. Grierson (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1912), I, 237.

[16] Marjorie Hope Nicolson, The Breaking of the Circle, rev. ed. (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1962), p. 81.

> the universe too was dying. The old animate world, of which man was a living part, as it in turn was part of a living universe, was at its end. And indeed it was. To a greater extent than he realized, John Donne was present at the death of a world. Gabriel's trumpet had sounded. . . . Luther and many other chronologists had predicted that the last thousand years would not be completed; the world would end before its appointed time. Luther and the chronologists were right. The world created four thousand years before the birth of Christ did perish seventeen centuries after that event. The world of Aristotle, of Ptolemy, of Augustine and Dante, of Shakespeare, was gone. In its place was only a lesser planet, turning upon its axis, taking its orderly way among other planets, moving about the Sun that had usurped the "proud Centre" that for centuries had been the world of Man.[17]

Clearly, Heywood was an inhabitant of this "lesser planet"; clearly too, he was a part of Donne's world, not of Shakespeare's. Like Donne, Heywood felt that the world was "decrepit" and near its "vniuersall graue." Heywood makes this clear in a passage which seems to echo Donne. It is delivered to Heywood's audience through the voice of Homer at the beginning of _The Golden Age_:

> . . . Oh then suffer me,
> You that are in the worlds decrepit Age,
> When it is neere his vniuersall graue,
> To sing an old song; and in this Iron Age
> Shew you the state of the first golden world,
> (III. 6)

This is scarcely the observation of a confirmed optimist, yet Heywood has generally been regarded as the

[17] Nicolson, p. 122.

last of the optimistic Elizabethans, and as a man who stands apart from his fellow Jacobeans in this "Iron Age" of pessimism, insecurity, anxiety, and doubt. Donne, Heywood, and the other Jacobean dramatists share the same world, the same universe. Herndl recognizes this when he says:

> A true dividing line lies between the high Renaissance, which endorsed and celebrated things as they are, which accepted and embraced the universe and its order, and the following ages, whose literature very often rebels against or laments the way things are.[18]

Herndl makes the point even more explicit when he points out that the vision of Heywood and his fellows is not the vision of Shakespeare and the Elizabethans:

> Shakespearean tragedy often opens from a focus upon its final personal catastrophe to regard a wider scene of order, reasserted and restored by the convulsion which has engulfed the innocent with the guilty. The universe of Heywood, Webster, Chapman, Tourneur, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Ford allows no such vision. Here the axiologies by which heroes are measured may be Stoic or Platonic or Calvinist-Christian but are generally unrelated to the surrounding natural world.[19]

In the conclusion to Heywood's tragedies order is not "restored by the convulsion which has engulfed the innocent with the guilty," except in The Rape of Lucrece. Irving Ribner, we will remember, maintains that "Evil in Heywood

[18] Herndl, pp. 164-65.

[19] Herndle, pp. 290-91.

appears as a temporary disruption of the natural goodness of the world," but the typical motif illustrated in his tragedies is that of ". . . love and Christian charity destroying evil and restoring harmony on earth."[20] But we have observed that in Heywood's world evil is never completely destroyed; it remains a powerful and pervasive force at the conclusion to almost every drama. In this, Heywood is closer to his fellow Jacobean playwrights than is generally supposed. Like Chapman, Tourneur, Webster, Middleton, Marston, Ford, and Jonson, Heywood is grappling with the question of good and evil in the world, trying to come to terms with moral and ethical values or ideals in a degenerate, corrupt world of suffering and death. Like his fellow Jacobeans, he defines some of the crucial problems of his age, but he offers no acceptable solutions; he reaches no conclusions.

Unlike Shakespeare who ". . . was not of an age, but for all time!"[21] Heywood was very much of an age--the Jacobean--and he rarely transcends his own time, although his plays do have something to say to a modern audience. Within his own more narrow limits of time and place (as

[20] Ribner, p. 55. See also Chapter I, p. 33 above.

[21] Ben Jonson, "To the memory of my beloued, The Avthor Mr. William Shakespeare: And what he hath left vs," in Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), VIII, 391, l. 43. Jonson's poem was prefixed to the First Folio of 1623.

compared with the universality of Shakespeare), Heywood has done an admirable job of mirroring the life and manners of his fellow man. As a Jacobean social critic, Heywood has exposed the follies, vices, and evils inherent in contemporary English life. And like much of the drama of his fellow Jacobeans, Heywood's plays have more relevance for an audience now than at any time in the past since the closing of the theatres in England in 1642. Just as the poetry of the seventeenth-century metaphysicals has found a receptive audience among poets and poetry lovers in the twentieth century, so some of the drama of the Jacobeans likewise speaks directly to this modern age. For example, the two most noted works of Heywood, *A Woman Killed* and *The English Traveller*, seem modern in their psychology.[22] Heywood's use of the common man and his emphasis on domestic situations, in these plays, is something we have become accustomed to since the dramas of Ibsen; but more importantly, Heywood is presenting an ironic, a negative, and a pessimistic vision of the world and of human nature which is familiar to a modern reader--familiar because in temper and outlook the twentieth century has much in common with the Jacobean age. Patricia Spacks also feels that *A Woman Killed* "has lost none of

[22] Cf. Eliot, p. 105; Legouis and Cazamian, p. 492; and Robert G. Lawrence, ed., *Early Seventeenth Century Drama* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1963), p. 77.

of its power for readers in the twentieth century," for, as she points out, "It speaks directly to the cynicism of an age more disillusioned than its own, and it deals with important problems in a surprisingly unified fashion."[23]

Heywood's plays, as we have seen, are unified and governed by the same theme--appearance and reality--which is inextricably intertwined with both characterization and social criticism. In portraying his *dramatis personae*. Heywood spotlights the darker side of human nature and reveals man in the often unflattering light of realism. This inner reality is usually at variance with outward appearance. As Alexander Pope once said: "Not always actions show the man: we find / Who does a kindness, is not therefore kind" (*Moral Essays* I. 109-10).[24] Pope's epigram could well serve as a perceptive footnote to Heywood's plays, because generally the actions of Heywood's characters do not reveal their true nature; their actions may actually be the antithesis of true kindness, honor, or charity. Moreover, Heywood uses this favorite theme of appearance versus reality as a means of conveying his social message--his criticism or satire of man and society. Indeed, in the fabric of Heywood's plays, this theme often

[23] Spacks, p. 322.

[24] Alexander Pope, "Moral Essays [Epistle I]," in *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope (1881; rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1967), III, 62.

forms the web upon which he weaves the warp of characterization with the woof of social criticism. Characteristically, the threads he chooses are the neutral shade of grey or the darker hue of black, both of which reflect his own pessimistic vision of life.

At the beginning of this study, it was noted that Heywood is often compared to Dekker and Shakespeare in terms of personality and attitude toward life. Clark, comparing Heywood with Dekker, maintains that both are "good-humoured, patriotic, devout, and sentimental. . . . In both were the same impulsive sympathies and unflagging interest in their fellows without cynicism or weariness."[25] And in discussing one of Dekker's collaborations, this time with Ford, Parrott and Ball note that "it is pleasant to find in the Dekker scenes of [*The Sun's Darling*], his last known work for the stage, a late flowering of his happy humor and his lilting lyric."[26] Shakespeare, too, seems to have achieved a vision of "calm cheerfulness," if not optimism, in his last plays after the darker vision of his greatest tragedies and more somber comedies.[27] But when we look in Heywood's late plays for a more cheerful

[25] Clark, *Heywood*, p. 251.

[26] Parrott and Ball, p. 113.

[27] Cf. Edward Albert and G. G. Urwin, *A Short History of English Literature* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1965), p. 33.

or positive note, we find instead a playwright who has grown older, and, in truth more pessimistic and negative.

After a re-examination of Heywood's plays then, one is not easily persuaded by the traditional stereotyped views of Heywood. Indeed, after looking at his dramas again, it is hoped the reader will concede that Heywood is not a kindly dramatist but a disillusioned social critic, not the middle-class spokesman but its critic and satirist, not an idealist about human nature but a realist, not an optimistic Elizabethan but a pessimistic Jacobean. And finally, it is hoped the reader will conclude that in Heywood's dark vision, "This is no world in which to pity men." The world as depicted by this pessimistic social critic is patterned after the corrupt, decadent world of his fellow Jacobeans, not the orderly, harmonious world of the Elizabethans. It is a world of false appearances where more often than not people and their actions may be easily mistaken or confused for reality. It is a fallen world of flawed and sinful people, a vitiated world where all too often folly, vice, and evil dominate, as, in reality, they tended to dominate outside of the Red Bull, Curtain, or Rose theatres in the real world of Heywood's Jacobean England.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Henry Hitch. English Domestic Or, Holiletic Tragedy 1575 to 1642. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1943.

Adams, Joseph Quincy, Jr. "How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad, edited by A. E. H. Swaen." Modern Language Notes, 28 (1913), 107-12.

Adams, Joseph Quincy, Jr. "Thomas Heywood and How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad." Englische Studien, 45 (1912), 30-44.

Albert, Edward, and G. G. Urwin. A Short History of English Literature. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1965.

Aronstein, Philipp. "Thomas Heywood." Anglia, 37 (1913), 163-268.

Bates, Katharine Lee, introd. A Woman Killed with Kindness and The Fair Maid of the West by Thomas Heywood. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1917.

Bentley, Gerald Eades. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage: Plays and Playwrights. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Bernbaum, Ernest. The Drama of Sensibility. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

Bescou, Yves. "Thomas Heywood Et Le Problème De L'Adultère Dans Une Femme tuée par la Bonté." Revue Anglo-Américaine, 9 (1931), 127-40.

Boas, Frederick S. An Introduction to Stuart Drama. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946.

Boas, Frederick S. Thomas Heywood. London: Williams & Norgate, 1950.

Bond, R. Warwick. "The Loyal Subject." In The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. Variorum ed. 4 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1908

Bowers, Fredson Thayer. Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1940.

Bradbrook, M. C. *The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1956.

Bradford, Gamaliel. *Elizabethan Women.* Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin, 1936.

Briggs, K. M. *Pale Hecate's Team: An Examination of the Beliefs on Witchcraft and Magic among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and His Immediate Successors.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Brodwin, Leonora Leet. *Elizabethan Love Tragedy 1587-1625.* New York: New York Univ. Press, 1971.

Brooke, Tucker. "Jacobean Drama: I. Dramatists of the Old School." In *A Literary History of England.* Ed. Albert C. Baugh et al. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Brooke, Tucker. "The Royal Fletcher and the Loyal Heywood." In *Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds.* Univ. of Colorado Studies Series B. Studies in the Humanities. Boulder: Univ. of Colorado, 1945.

Brooke, C. F. Tucker, and Nathaniel Burton Paradise, eds. *A Woman Killed with Kindness.* In *English Drama 1580-1642.* Boston: D. C. Heath, 1933.

Brown, Arthur. "Citizen Comedy and Domestic Drama." In *Jacobean Theatre.* Ed. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris. New York: Capricorn, 1967.

Brown, Arthur. "Thomas Heywood's Dramatic Art." In *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig.* Ed. Richard Hosley. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1962.

Bryan, Margaret B. "Food Symbolism in *A Woman Killed with Kindness.*" *Renaissance Papers* (1974), 9-17.

Buland, Mable. *The Presentation of Time in the Elizabethan Drama.* New York: Henry Holt, 1912.

Camden, Carroll. *The Elizabethan Woman.* Houston: The Elsevier Press, 1952.

Camp, Charles W. *The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature.* New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1924.

Canuteson, John. "The Theme of Forgiveness in the Plot and Subplot of A Woman Killed with Kindness." Renaissance Drama, n.s. 2 (1969), 123-41.

Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Clark, Arthur Melville. "A Bibliography of Thomas Heywood." Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings & Papers, 1 (1922-1926), 97-153.

Clark, Arthur Melville. "Thomas Heywood as a Critic." Modern Language Notes, 37 (1922), 217-23.

Clark, Arthur Melville. Thomas Heywood: Playwright and Miscellanist. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931.

Cook, David. "A Woman Killed with Kindness: An Unshakespearian Tragedy." English Studies, 45 (1964), 353-72.

Coursen, Herbert R., Jr. "The Subplot of A Woman Killed with Kindness." English Language Notes, 2 (1965), 180-85.

Craig, Hardin. The Enchanted Glass: The Elizabethan Mind in Literature. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1950.

Cranfill, Thomas Mabry, ed. Rich's Farewell to Military Profession 1581. By Barnabe Rich. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1959.

Creizenach, Wilhelm. The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare. 1916; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

Crofts, Alfred. "The Canon of Thomas Heywood's Dramatic Writing." Diss. Stanford Univ. 1935.

Cromwell, Otelia. Thomas Heywood: A Study in the Elizabethan Drama of Everyday Life. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1928.

Cunningham, Dolora Gallagher. "The Doctrine of Repentance as a Formal Principle in Some Elizabethan Plays." Diss. Stanford Univ. 1953.

Donne, John. The Poems of John Donne. Ed. Herbert J. C. Grierson. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1912.

Doran, Madeleine. Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1954.

Downer, Alan S. The British Drama: A Handbook and Brief Chronicle. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

Eliot, T. S. Essays on Elizabethan Drama. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation. London: Methuen, 1936.

Feldman, Sylvia D. The Morality-Patterned Comedy of the Renaissance. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.

Fleay, Frederick Gard. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama: 1559-1642. 2 vols. 1891; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1962.

Freeburg, Victor Oscar. Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama: A Study in Stage Traditions. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Gilbert, Allan H. "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 12 (1913), 593-611.

Greene, Robert. A Disputation Betweene a Hee Conny-catcher and a Shee Conny-catcher 1592. Elizabethan and Jacobean Quarto Series. Ed. G. B. Harrison. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966.

Grivelet, Michel. "The Simplicity of Thomas Heywood." Shakespeare Survey, 14 (1961), 56-64.

Grivelet, Michel. Thomas Heywood et le Drame Domestique Élizabéthain. Paris: Didier, 1957.

Hapgood, Robert, and Robert Y. Turner. "Dramatic Conventions in All's Well That Ends Well." PMLA, 79 (1964), 177-82.

Harbage, Alfred. Annals of English Drama 975-1700. Rev. by Samuel Schoenbaum. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1964.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Harrison, G. B. Elizabethan Plays and Players. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1961.

Hazlitt, William. Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845.

Herndl, George C. The High Design: English Renaissance Tragedy and the Natural Law. Lexington: Univ. Press of Kentucky, 1970.

Herrick, Marvin T. Tragicomedy: Its Origin and Development in Italy, France, and England. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1962.

Heywood, Thomas. An Apology for Actors. 1612; rpt. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1941.

Heywood, Thomas. The Captives; or, The Lost Recovered. Ed. Alexander Corbin Judson. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1921.

Heywood, Thomas. The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood. [Ed. R. H. Shepherd] ("The Pearson Edition") 6 vols. 1874; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.

Heywood, Thomas. The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II. Ed. Robert K. Turner, Jr. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Heywood, Thomas. Gunaikeion or, Nine Bookes of Various History Concerninge Women. London: Adam Islip, 1624.

Heywood, Thomas. How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad. Ed. A. E. H. Swaen. 1912; rpt. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1963.

Heywood, Thomas. The Royall King and the Loyall Subject. Ed. Kate Watkins Tibbals. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1906.

Heywood, Thomas. Thomas Heywood's The Rape of Lucrece. Ed. Allan Holaday. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950.

Heywood, Thomas. A Woman Killed with Kindness. Ed. R. W. Van Fossen. London: Methuen, 1961.

Holaday, Allen, introd. Thomas Heywood's The Rape of Lucrece. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1950.

Holaday, Allan. "Thomas Heywood and the Puritans." Journal of English and German Philology, 49 (1950), 192-203.

Hudson, Robert Jackson. "A Critical Edition of Heywood's The English Traveller." Diss. New York Univ. 1962.

Hyde, Mary Crapo. Playwriting for Elizabethans 1600-1605. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1949.

Jewell, Ross. "Thomas Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West." In Studies in English Drama, 1st series. Ed. Allison Gaw. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1917.

Johnson, Marilyn L. Images of Women in the Works of Thomas Heywood. Salzburg, Austria: Universität Salzburg, 1974.

Jones, Eldred. Othello's Countrymen: The African in English Renaissance Drama. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965.

Jonson, Ben. Ben Jonson. Ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.

Kelso, Ruth. Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1956.

Lamb, Charles. Specimens of English Dramatic Poets. In The Works of Charles and Mary Lamb. Ed. E. V. Lucas. 7 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

Landis, Allyne Wilder, ed. "The Wise Woman of Hogsdon by Thomas Heywood." Thesis Duke Univ. 1939.

Lawrence, Robert G., ed. Early Seventeenth Century Drama. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1963.

Leggatt, Alexander. Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1973.

Legouis, Emile, and Louis Cazamian. A History of English Literature. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Leonard, Michael Heaton. "A Critical Edition of Thomas Heywood's The Wise Woman of Hogsdon With Introduction and Notes." Diss. Univ. of Southern California 1967.

Lewis, John Samuel. "Theme and Structure in Thomas Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West." Diss. Univ. of Kansas 1968.

Lo. Yucheng Irving. "A Critical Edition of Edward IV, Parts I and II, Ascribed to Thomas Heywood." 2 vols. Diss. Univ. of Wisconsin 1954.

Mackenzie, Agnes Mure. The Playgoer's Handbook to the English Renaissance Drama. New York: Cooper Sauare, 1971.

Martin, Robert Grant. "A New Source for A Woman Killed with Kindness." Englische Studien, 43 (1911), 229-33.

Martin, Robert Grant. "Is The Late Lancashire Witches a Revision?" Modern Philology, 13 (1915-16), 253-65.

McNeir, Waldo F. "Heywood's Sources for the Main Plot of A Woman Killed with Kindness." In Studies in the English Renaissance Drama in the Memory of Karl Julius Holzknecht. Ed. Josephine W. Bennett, Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr. New York: New York Univ. Press, 1959.

The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Vol. I: 600-1660. Ed. George Watson. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974.

Nichols, Duane C. "Dramatic Convention in the Plays of Thomas Heywood." Diss. Univ. of Kansas 1964.

Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. The Breaking of the Circle: Studies in the Effect of the "New Science" Upon Seventeenth-Century Poetry. rev. ed. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1962.

Ornstein, Robert. "Bourgeois Morality and Dramatic Convention in A Woman Killed with Kindness." In English Renaissance Drama: Essays in Honor of Madeleine Doran & Mark Eccles. Ed. Standish Henning, Robert Kimbrough, and Richard Knowles. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1976.

Ornstein, Robert. The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Painter, William. The Palace of Pleasure. Ed. Joseph Jacobs. 3 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1966.

Parrott, Thomas Marc, and Robert Hamilton Ball. A Short View of Elizabethan Drama. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Patterson, McEvoy. "Origin of the Main Plot of A Woman Killed with Kindness." Texas Univ. Studies in English, 17 (1937), 75-87.

Pope, Alexander. The Works of Alexander Pope. Ed. Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope. 10 vols. 1881; rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1967.

Powell, Chilton Latham. English Domestic Relations 1487-1653. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1917.

Prior, Moody E. The Language of Tragedy. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1947.

Rabkin, Norman. "The Double Plot: Notes on the History of a Convention." Renaissance Drama, 7 (1964), 55-69.

Rabkin, Norman. "Dramatic Deception in Heywood's The English Traveller." Studies in English Literature, 1 (1961), 1-16.

Rauchbauer, Otto. "Visual and Rhetorical Imagery in Th. Heywood's A Woman Killed with Kindness." English Studies, 57 (1976), 200-10.

Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr. The Occult on the Tudor and Stuart Stage. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1965.

Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1957.

Ribner, Irving. Jacobean Tragedy: The Quest for Moral Order. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1962.

Ristine, Frank Humphrey. English Tragicomedy: Its Origin and History. 1910; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.

Roberts, Warren E. "Ballad Themes in The Fair Maid of the West." Journal of American Folklore, 68 (1955), 19-23.

Rowan, D. F. "Shore's Wife." Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966), 447-64.

The Roxburghe Ballads. Ed. William M. Chappell. 9 vols. 1875; rpt. New York: Ams Press, 1966.

Saintsbury, George A. A History of Elizabethan Literature. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Sampson, George. The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1961.

Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. Hardin Craig. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1961.

Sherbo, Arthur. English Sentimental Drama. East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1957.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Honor and Perception in A Woman Killed with Kindness." Modern Language Quarterly, 20 (1959), 321-32.

Stagg, Louis Charles. An Index to the Figurative Language of Thomas Heywood's Tragedies. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the Univ. of Virginia, 1967.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson. Ed. Sidney Colvin. 4 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Stoll, Elmer Edgar. Shakespeare Studies: Historical and Comparative in Method. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1960.

Sturgess, Keith, introd. Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies. Baltimore: Penguin, 1969.

Swaen, A. E. H., introd. How a Man May Chuse a Good Wife from a Bad. By Thomas Heywood. 1912; rpt. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, 1963.

Swinburne, Algernon Charles. The Age of Shakespeare. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908.

Symonds, John Addington. Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama. New York: Cooper Square, 1967.

Symonds, John Addington. "Thomas Heywood." In [Plays] Thomas Heywood. Ed. A. Wilson Verity. Mermaid Series. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A. Thomas Heywood (A Concise Bibliography). In Elizabethan Bibliographies, No. 6. New York: Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 1939.

Taylor, William Edwards. "The Villainess in Elizabethan Drama." Diss. Vanderbilt Univ. 1957.

Thaler, Alwin. "Thomas Heywood, D'Avenant, and The Siege of Rhodes." PMLA, 39 (1924), 624-41.

Thorp, Willard. The Triumph of Realism in Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1612. 1928; rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1970.

Tibbals, Kate Watkins, intro. The Royall King and the Loyall Subject. By Thomas Heywood. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1906.

Townsend, Freda L. "The Artistry of Thomas Heywood's Double Plots." Philological Quarterly, 25 (1946), 97-119.

Turner, Robert K., Jr., intro. The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II. By Thomas Heywood. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Ure, Peter. "Marriage and the Domestic Drama in Heywood and Ford." English Studies, 32 (1951), 200-16.

Van Fossen, R. W., intro. A Woman Killed with Kindness. By Thomas Heywood. London: Methuen, 1961.

Velte, Mowbray. The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood. 1924; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1966.

Ward, Adolphus William. A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queene Anne. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1899.

Ward, Adolphus William, and A. R. Waller, eds. The Cambridge History of English Literature. 15 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Waith, Eugene M. The Pattern of Tragicomedy in Beaumont and Fletcher. 1952; rpt. n.p.: Archon Books, 1969.

West, Robert Hunter. The Invisible World: A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama. Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1939.

Wright, Louis B. "Heywood and the Popularizing of History." Modern Language Notes, 43 (1928), 287-93.

Wright, Louis B. "The Male-Friendship Cult in Thomas Heywood's Plays." Modern Language Notes, 42 (1927), 510-14.

Wright, Louis B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1935.