

characterize these accounts. Where Dawson reads *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet* to make his case, Yachnin offers up *The Staple of News*, *A Game at Chess*, and *All's Well That Ends Well*. Ironically, it is in this chapter that the two critics' views seem most compatible. Both agree that the playhouses took special interest in representations of representation. For Yachnin, that process looks forward to the newspaper and scandal sheet; for Dawson, it looks backward to the cultural cohesion of rituals in catholic England.

What's refreshing about this wonderful book is its intellectual seriousness. Both authors are aware that positions, as well as ideas, have consequences. So while it is possible to finish this study and grant to both authors their respective points, it is unlikely that a serious reader will feel comfortable saying (merely) that the heterogeneous audiences of early modern London probably featured some Dawson-like playgoers and some Yachnin-like ones. Although such may be true, it is not enough. The stakes, as Dawson and Yachnin realize, are higher than easy rhetorical compromise admits.

Well written and cogently argued, *The Culture of Playgoing* is one of the most exciting books on its topic in recent years. It deserves a wide audience, and Cambridge University Press would do the field (and itself) a favor by reissuing it immediately in paperback form. Anyone interested in the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, and in the history of performance, will find its arguments stimulating.

Douglas Bruster

Ben Jonson. *Every Man Out of His Humour*. Ed Helen Ostovich. The Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001. Pp xvi, 400.

Considered an experimental failure by many modern critics, *Every Man Out of His Humour* was in fact Jonson's most notable early success and the first of his plays to be published, receiving an unusually large print-run of three quarto editions in the course of 1600. Exploiting the notoriety of the recently banned genre of formal verse satire, Jonson labelled the play a 'comical satire' and described it as 'strange and of a particular kind by itself, somewhat like *Vetus Comedia* [ie, Old Comedy]' (Induction 227–8), thereby emphasizing its connections with the satirical comedies of Aristophanes rather than with earlier Elizabethan 'humour' comedies. In fact, however, *Every Man Out* was original

only in providing a 'Grex' or chorus of two interlocutors who interrupt the dramatic action with commentary about Jonson's aims and dramatic methods, in bringing on stage in the person of Asper the type of the whip-yielding Elizabethan verse satirist, and in stripping away the attenuated romantic intrigue derived from classical New Comedy that had previously provided the framework for Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour* and Chapman's *A Humorous Day's Mirth*. In those plays Chapman and Jonson had pioneered a dramatic structure in which one or more witty gallants observe and comment on a series of affected or passionate humour characters, gradually drawing them together in more complex groups and heightening their folly until they are deflated or exposed, often quite aggressively, as in the derisive mischief-making of Chapman's Lemot. *Every Man Out* is thus as much a testament to Jonson's skill at creating the illusion of classically inspired innovation as it is a totally new dramatic kind, and its 1600 quarto is an important document in the history of Jonson's developing public image – a document unfortunately overshadowed by the seeming authority of Jonson's 1616 folio *Works*, which gives pride of place to its predecessor, *Every Man In*, not originally published until 1601.

Helen Ostovich's edition of *Every Man Out* for the Revels Plays presents the text largely as readers found it in 1600 and restores the original ending, in which the appearance of Queen Elizabeth purges the envious humour of Macilente, Jonson's satiric agent, to bring the action full circle. The only modern critical edition besides the now out-dated Oxford edition by Herford and the Simpsons, Ostovich's edition offers all the virtues of the Revels Plays series: a carefully collated and sensitively modernised text, ample notes that illuminate the dialogue's witty wordplay, sources, and contemporary allusions, and an expansive introduction that comments insightfully on its dramatic mode. Her decision to base her text on Q1 rather than on the Folio version, except where F makes obvious corrections, is a bold but defensible choice. In contrast to Jonson's substantial revision of *Every Man In* for the 1616 folio, which involved condensing the final scenes and 'Englishing' the play's language to match its new London setting, the changes to *Every Man Out* in the Folio were minimal. Moreover, the great majority were merely innocuous substitutions for oaths necessitated by the 1606 statute against blasphemy or were variant forms of punctuation that may possibly reflect compositorial, rather than authorial preferences. In a very few cases, it is true, Jonson heightened comic effects through greater exaggeration or more precise language or invented substitute oaths that reflect amusingly on character or situation. So at 5.3.206 Sogliardo swears by his recently purchased 'gentry' in F, rather than 'by Jesu' in Q; Fastidious Brisk's foolish extravagance is heightened by bor-

rowing four hundred pounds at 2.2.307 rather than fourscore pounds; and Puntarvolo makes a more pointed response to Carlo's praise of whorehouses at 4.3.79 by calling him 'a salt one' (ie, a lecher) rather than 'a villain'. Readers interested in the subtle refinement of Jonson's comic art over time might welcome greater cross-referencing in the commentary notes to the relatively few instances of this type. There is, however, much to be gained by seeing the play as Jonson originally published it, and Q's scene divisions, marked by a clear stage, rather than by the entrance of each new character as in F, give a better sense of the play's major units than a text based on the folio.

Ostovich's ninety-five page introduction brings a great variety of perspectives to bear on Jonson's satire, including such literary antecedents as Aristophanic comedy and contemporary Inns of Court revels and such critical approaches as the feminist concept of the gaze and sociological theories of self-presentation or group interaction. In focusing on Aristophanes as Jonson's model for satiric comedy without a romantic interest, Ostovich is following Jonson's lead, though she adds the sensible caveat that 'to note the similarity in attitude is not ... to imply exact correlations with Aristophanes' (15). In light of the fact that the one copy of Aristophanes' works Jonson is known to have possessed was not published until 1607 and that *Every Man Out* contains none of the specific borrowings or echoes that establish Aristophanic influence on such later works as *The Staple of News*, it is, I think, something of an open question whether Jonson intended his reference to Greek Old Comedy in the induction to be anything more than a general analogy to loosely plotted comedy with a satiric 'bite', but Ostovich uses it to open up aspects of Jonson's satiric method for examination. Her detailed discussion of Aristophanic form finds numerous connections with *Every Man Out*, linking the Greek conception of *hubris* with Jonsonian humour, comparing the Aristophanic *parabasis* to Jonson's induction, and finding Aristophanic influences at work in his use of bawdry as 'an earthy contrast to artificial stances' (24), in his expulsion of humourous impostors, and in Macilente's transformation by Queen Elizabeth at play's end.

Closer to home, Ostovich finds another model for Jonson's satiric mode in the revels at the inns of court, the Elizabethan law societies to which Jonson dedicated *Every Man Out* in the 1616 folio. Noting Jonson's familiarity with various members of the inns, she argues that his equation of 'intellectuality with moral superiority' and his appeal to standards of judgment that were 'intellectual and social, rather than sentimental and religious' would have been particularly congenial to these bodies. Jonson, she argues, tried to establish with his audience a rapport similar to that in the inns' revels, 'a rapport growing

out of in-group jokes and playfully aggressive put-downs which provide an implicit extradramatic commentary on events, characters, and observers both fictive and real' (33). Moreover, she finds in the pattern of the revels, which move from the disruption of order through the bringing of culprits to trial to the restoration of authority, a parallel to the patterned action of *Every Man Out*, and in Jonson's use of Queen Elizabeth at the end as 'an emblem of the perfectability, or at least corrigibility, of human nature' (38) a parallel to her actual role in the inns of court masques. The culture of the inns also figures more broadly in Ostovich's many citations to inns of court satirists like Guilpin, Donne, and Marston and in her repeated use of the diary of the lawyer John Manningham to gloss incidents in the play.

Ostovich's wide-ranging search for parallels to Jonson's effects in such disparate forms as Greek Old Comedy, the commoning of Elizabethan lawyers, Tudor farce (16), the 'alienation effects' of Bertold Brecht, and the aggressive humour of Monty Python (41) serves her larger purpose of interpreting how Jonson's self-conscious mode of drama creates 'a multiple complex tension on the stage that denies the audience comfortable or simple responses' (68). 'Jonson's crowded stage', she suggests, 'gives a sense of almost cinematic montage, surveying a whole world of self-absorbed individuals' (52) who are grouped into a nest of frames indicating 'the relativity of human perspective and intelligence' (53), from the more self-aware Macilente and Carlo Buffone to the inane Clove and Orange. 'By diffusing the satiric functions through several graduated frames of increasingly more limited and distorted perspectives, and by making each chorus-figure double, in that he is both satirically attacking and satirically attacked, Jonson forces the audience to participate more fully in a wide range of ethical and aesthetic choices' (57–8). Ostovich finds Jonson's satiric choreography to be at its most complex in the Paul's Walk sequence of Act 3, which exposes the affectations of the participants but turns 'random and narcissistic individual movements and desires into a celebratory ballet, no matter how ironic' (68).

Ostovich's account is a provocative analysis of Jonson's dramaturgic strategies, and she is at her best in pointing out how the subtle interactions of Jonson's characters expose and comment on their self-presentation or their mode of relating to others. 'Satirists', she notes, 'conceive of ... their characters in terms of performance, mimicking their victim's voice, or caricaturing his or her image, making distinctions between the impression the performer wishes to make, or thinks he or she is making, and the impression received by critical observers' (70). In an original and perceptive application of the concept of 'the gaze' to the treatment of the play's wives, Ostovich examines how they respond

to the varying demands made on them by their spouses, contrasting the 'compliant wife, Lady Puntarvolo, who ends up rejecting the pornographic role imposed ... by her husband' with 'Fallace, the wilful wife who seizes the pornographic advantage, turns her gaze lustfully beyond her husband, and asserts her own erotic pleasure' (73). And in a detailed reading of the humiliation of the Lady Saviolina, Sogliardo, and Carlo Buffone in Act 5, she applies to Macilente's manipulation of the situation some striking insights derived from the works of Erving Goffman and other social theorists about the value of laughter as a bonding agent, the problems of loyalty to a group, and the distinction between insiders and outsiders. Her introduction thus makes a strong case for her claim that 'Jonson may have been the first "social psychologist" to make extensive use of the overtly dramaturgical standpoint both as an "analytical tool" and as a "determinant of action", in order to elucidate the complexity of human behaviour' (71). By showing in detail how Jonson's dramaturgy achieves these aims, Ostovich makes possible a new appreciation of *Every Man Out's* satiric method.

W. David Kay

Anne Lancashire. *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp xix, 355.

In the introduction to her book, Anne Lancashire notes that scholarly interest in early drama has been overwhelmingly focused on the provincial drama. This is understandable given the major problem of the lack of extant dramatic material associated with London, and the relative scarcity even of records, certainly before the mid-sixteenth century. Observing that London-based theatre did not suddenly spring up in the late 16th century, but that long before this there was a tradition of city sponsored dramatic activity, she sets out to examine civic theatre from London's founding by the Romans to the accession of Elizabeth I. Her approach is historical and speculative rather than theoretical and interpretative, attempting to piece together from available clues and informed guesswork the history of a tradition or range of traditions. Because the availability of records improves as the history of the city progresses, the earlier the period the more the deductive work that needs to be done. In the