ROUTLEDGE REVIVALS

Walter Hawkesworth's Labyrinthus

An Edition with a Translation and Commentary

Volume I

Susan Brock

Routledge Revivals

Walter Hawkesworth's Labyrinthus

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Walter Hawkesworth's Labyrinthus

An Edition with a Translation and Commentary

Volume I

Susan Brock

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

First published in 1988 by Garland Publishing, Inc

This edition first published in 2018 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Publisher's Note
The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this book but regrets to inform the customer that previosly available online resources are no longer available with this title.

Disclaimer
The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and welcomes correspondence from those they have been unable to contact.
A Library of Congress record exists under ISBN:

ISBN 13: 978-0-367-19036-1 (hbk)
ISBN 13: 978-0-429-19991-2 (ebk)

GARLAND PUBLICATIONS IN AMERICAN AND ENGLISH LITERATURE

Editor
Stephen Orgel
Stanford University

GARLAND PUBLISHING, INC.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Walter Hawkesworth's *Labyrinthus*

An Edition with a Translation and Commentary

Volume I

Susan Brock

GARLAND PUBLISHING, INC.
NEW YORK & LONDON 1988

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hawkesworth, Walter, d. 1606.
[Labyrinthus. English]
Walter Hawkesworth's Labyrinthus: an edition with a translation and commentary/ Susan Brock.
p. cm. — (Garland publications in American and English literature)
Thesis (Ph.D.)— University of Birmingham, 1974.
Bibliography: p.
ISBN 0–8240–6381–3
1. College and school drama, Latin (Medieval and modern)— England— Cambridge— Translations into English. 2. College and school drama, Latin (Medieval- and modern— England— Cambridge. 3. English drama— Translations from Latin (Medieval and modern) I. Brock, Susan. II. Title. III. Title: Labyrinthus IV. Series.
PA8523.H85L313 1989 862'.4— dc19 88–38462

Printed on acid-free, 250-year-life paper
Manufactured in the United States of America

For J. W. Binns

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

PREFACE

This thesis is reproduced as it was submitted to the University of Birmingham in 1974 without emendation or revision. Since that date no new work on Hawkesworth has appeared with the exception of a facsimile reprint of the 1636 edition of *Labyrinthus* and the Trinity College, Cambridge, manuscript of *Leander* published by Georg Olms Verlag in its Renaissance Latin Drama in England series (Hildesheim, 1987). In my introduction to these texts I was able to update the bibliography and to correct and amplify some details concerning Hawkesworth's life and the dating of performances of his plays.

My thanks are due to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for permission to reproduce the title page of *Labyrinthus* (Douce P. 589), to Ann Cotton for putting me on the track of the Spanish source, to my *alma mater* the Shakespeare Institute, to Jim Binns for his help and guidance in the original preparation of this work -- and since, and to my parents for everything.

Susan Brock

Birmingham, 1988

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

CONTENTS

Volume I

Volume II

ABBREVIATIONS OF STANDARD WORKS

Adagia	Desiderius Erasmus, Adagia quaecunque ad hanc diem exierunt, Paulli Manutii studio atque industria (Florence, 1575).
Annals	C.H. Cooper, Annals of Cambridge, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1842-5).
Athenae	Athenae Cantabrigienses, compiled by C.H. Cooper and T. Cooper, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1858-1913).
College Plays	G.C. Moore Smith, College Plays Performed at the University of Cambridge (Cambridge, 1923
Cooper, Thesaurus	Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Brittanicae, compiled by Thomas Cooper (London, 1578).
Elizabethan Stage	E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923).
Progresses	J. Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First, His Royal Consort, Family, and Court, 4 vols (London, 1828).
University Drama	F.S. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age (Oxford, 1914).
Jahrbuch	G.B. Churchill and W. Keller, "Die lateinischen Universitäts-Dramen Englands in der Zeit der Königin Elisabeth", Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 34 (1898), 221-323.
DNB	Dictionary of National Biography
MLR	Modern Language Review

PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association
STC	Short Title Catalogue

All references to the works of William Shakespeare are from the Globe edition, edited by W.G. Clark and W.A. Wright (London, 1956).

All references to classical Latin texts are from the Teubner edition, unless otherwise stated.

All references to classical Greek texts are from the Loeb edition, unless otherwise stated.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR THE TEXTS OF LABYRINTHUS

P	Printed edition of 1636
C	University Library, Cambridge, MS Ee.v.16
D	Bodleian Library, Oxford, Douce MS 315
Y	Yale University Library MS
N	Warwick County Record Office, Newdigate MS CR136/B761
L	Lambeth Palace Library, MS 838
J	St John's College, Cambridge, MS J.8
T	Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.3.9

INTRODUCTION

1. Latin Drama at Cambridge and the Influence of Italy

The earliest reference to the performance of plays in the colleges of the University of Cambridge is found in a fragment of an account roll of Michael House for 1386, where expenses were entered "Pro ly pallio brusdato et pro sex larvis et barbis in comoedia."[1] This payment probably referred to some Christmas entertainment for the students of the College, as at that time the students were in residence for almost the whole year and were accustomed to celebrate festivals and holidays with disguisings and mumming.[2] Such customs were formalized in the fifteenth century with the annual institution of lords of misrule in the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, who had mock authority over their colleagues from Christmas to Candlemas. One of the duties incumbent on the holder of this position was to produce so many shows or dialogues during the holiday period, the costs being borne by the College.[3]

In the beginning then the dramatic entertainments were purely for recreation, but, as the spirit of the Renaissance infiltrated the universitites, it was realized that the acting of plays could serve as a means of education too. College statutes began to stipulate that a number of plays should be produced at certain times of the year under the supervision of the senior members of the University. At St John's, Cambridge, the regulations of 1545

made provision for several comedies and tragedies to be produced between Epiphany and Lent (Chapt. 26),[4] and recommended that in the short vacations students should engage in acting among other things (Chapt. 20).[5] Chapter 36 of the Statutes of Queen's College, 1546 instructs the Professor of Greek and the examiner to put on two comedies or tragedies each year in the College Hall between 20 December and the beginning of Lent, and moreover lays down fines if these instructions are not carried out, and threatens punishment if any student should refuse to act in these plays.[6]

As well as reintroducing the study of the ancient dramatists, humanism brought a new atmosphere to places of education by encouraging the pleasurable aspects of learning. In Institutio Oratoria Quintilian had put forward the theory that recreation should be combined with learning[7] and this idea was taken up by the educational theorists of the sixteenth century, Ascham, Erasmus, Vives. Much of the importance attached at this period to the acting of plays by students may be attributed to the precepts of John Sturm of Strasburg, whose teaching methods were passed on to English teachers by Ascham, with whom he corresponded.[8] In his scheme of education Sturm enjoined a weekly performance of some one or other of the plays of Plautus and Terence. One of the fundamental aims of the humanists was to restore the Latin tongue to its original purity of expression and pronunciation, and drama was seen as an instrument not only for conveying moral lessons in the form of entertainment but as providing exercise in the

speaking and appreciation of Latin. William Gager, the Oxford dramatist, set out the reasons behind academic drama in a letter to Dr John Rainolds:

> We ... doe it to recreate owre selves, owre house, and the better parte of the Universitye, with some learned Poeme or other; to practyse owre owne style eyther in prose or verse; to be well acquaynted with Seneca or Plautus; honestly to embowlden owre yuthe; to trye their voyces, and confirme their memoryes; to frame their speeche; to conforme them to convenient action; to trye what mettell is in evrye one, and of what disposition thay are of.[9]

In the face of objections to acting, the humanists could justify their action by quoting the classics: Horace's declaration that the object of comedy was to combine information and pleasure, delight and instruction;[10] Cicero's concept of drama as the imitation of life, the mirror of human intercourse, the expression of reality.[11]

Nevertheless most teachers had some reservations in their recommendation of acting for students, usually because of the subject matter of the Roman plays which were available for performance. Vives recommended Plautus and Terence, but only after expurgation. Erasmus had doubts about the suitability of Plautus, but edited Terence. Despite these provisos, however, it [illegible] with the plays of Plautus and Terence that formal academic [illegible] productions began. An unnamed play of Terence performed [illegible] Hall in 1510 or 1511 is the first dramatic production

at Cambridge of which the nature is specified,[12] and Plautus' Aulularia was chosen for performance on the first night of Queen Elizabeth's visit to the University in 1564.[13] In the next one hundred years fourteen of the twenty plays of Plautus were produced, some like Menaechmi and Miles Gloriosus being performed more than once, as well as Terence's Phormio (1562/3), Eunuchus (1563/4) and Adelphi (performed twice in 1547/8 and once in 1562/3). There were also productions of Aristophanes' Plutus (1536) and Pax (1546/7), of Sophocles' Ajax Flagellifer (produced in Latin in 1564), and of some of Seneca's tragedies, Hecuba and Oedipus (1559/60), Troas (1551/2, 1560/1), and Medea (1560/1).

Interspersed among these purely classical plays were the works of neo-Latin writers whose edifying themes made them suitable for the academic stage, such as Gnapheus' Acolastus (1560/1) and Macropedius' Asotus (1565/6), plays modelled on Roman comedy but usually carrying a moral. Senecan tragedy was utilized as a model in biblical drama such as Christopherson's Jephthes (1566/7), Watson's Absalom (1535-44), and Goldingham's Herodes (?1570-5).

However in the 1570s and 1580s a gradual change can be seen to have taken place in the nature of the plays performed within the colleges. The didactic element dwindles and the plays are chosen for entertainment rather than for edification. At Cambridge comedies began to outnumber other types of plays, and a study of extant university drama shows that after this period it was mainly comedies that were performed at Cambridge and tragedies

at Oxford. G. C. Moore Smith describes this development thus:

> A cleavage had taken place in the once united body of Humanist-Reformers. The Puritans saw in the drama not a means of edification, but a stone of stumbling; the academic playwright dropped the rôle of moralist and was content to amuse. Even Plautus, Terence and Seneca were discarded - at least our records no longer mention their names. A new source of inspiration had been found in Italian novels and Italian Comedy ...[14]

Just as the university productions had earlier reflected humanist interest in the classics, they now showed the growing influence of Italy which was making itself felt in every facet of Elizabethan life.

During the early part of the reign of Elizabeth a flood of Italian novelle caught the imagination of English readers of all classes. The popularity of the novels, a form unknown in England before, gave an immense impulse to the study of Italian literature of all kinds. Noone was considered accomplished at the court of Elizabeth unless he could speak Italian or at least scatter his speech with Italian proverbs. M. A. Scott estimated that about one third of the extant Elizabethan drama demonstrates Italian

influence in one way or another, either because their plots were taken wholly or partly from Italian sources, or because the setting of the play is Italian, although the play may be English in character.[15]

It is highly unlikely that Italian was officially taught at the universities; the colleges were dedicated to the professions and students were not free to devote themselves to the study of history or modern languages.[16] In his work on education, Queene Elizabethes Achademy, Sir Humphrey Gilbert suggested that a gentleman should learn French, Italian, Spanish, and High Dutch.[17] But although a knowledge of French and Italian was taken for granted, the teaching of these languages was neither included in the regular curriculum of any school until after 1600 nor recommended specifically in any scheme for a gentleman's education apart from Gilbert's.

It seems that Italian was usually taught by private teachers, although this does not necessarily imply a low standard of tuition. In 1578 John Florio was forced for financial reasons to take on "the burden of teaching the Italian language to some scholars in this celebrated university of Oxford".[18] The demand for such teaching is illustrated by the fact that Florio published three educational books on the Italian language within twenty years: Florio his Firste Fruites: a Perfect Induction to the Italian and English Tongues (1578), Florios Second Frutes (1591), and

Worlde of Wordes; or, Dictionaries in Italian and English (1598). Between 1550 and 1567 William Thomas' Principle Rules of the Italian Grammer, with a Dictionarie went through three editions. Certainly there was no shortage of Italian books, either in translation or in the original. M.A. Scott noted that over four hundred literary works of Italy are known to have been in England during the Elizabethan period.[19] It was not unusual for books to be printed in Italian in London at this time. In 1588 John Wolfe printed Quattro commedie del Divino Pietro Aretino, as well as Machiavelli's Clizia and Mandragola, as the works of both writers had been placed on the index of forbidden books by the Inquisition and could not be printed in Italy. Wolfe also printed Il pastor fido and Tasso's Aminta in one volume in 1591. It has also been suggested that Italian books were brought from the book market at Frankfurt to be sold at St Paul's book stalls or at Sturbridge Fair.[20] That this enthusiasm for things Italian was prevalent at Cambridge also is attested by Gabriel Harvey's description of the studies carried on at the University in 1579, where, he asserts, the old authors were discarded for Castiglione, Guazzo, Javio, Guicciardini, and above all Machiavelli. [21]

[redacted]bridge plays which show obvious signs of Italian [redacted]can be divided into three types: comedy, pastoral, and [redacted]. The first plays which may properly be termed italianate were two comedies produced at St John's College between 1578 and

1579: Victoria and Hymenaeus. The author of both plays was probably Abraham Fraunce, although the attribution of Hymenaeus to him is not definite. The source of Hymenaeus is acknowledged by the author in his prologue to be Boccaccio's Decameron (the 10th novel of the fourth day), although he adapts some of his characters, like the boastful physician Pantomagus and the German Fredericus, from Plautus' plays, in this case from Miles Gloriosus and Poenulus. Victoria is based on Luigi Pasqualigo's Il Fedele (Venice, 1576). In his version Fraunce retained all the original episodes of the source but also added a story from the Decameron (5th novel of the 2nd day). The main changes, however, in both additions and omissions were to make the Italian play more suitable for a college audience. Fraunce played down the immoral intrigues of the characters and emphasized the pedant Onophrius who would specially appeal to a Cambridge audience.

Pedantius, which was probably first produced at Trinity College in 1580-1 and is attributed to Anthony Wingfield, is included by F. S. Boas in University Drama in the Tudor Age with Cambridge comedies of Italian origin, but, although its main character is the pedant so popular with Italian dramatists, there is no known source for the play. The plot in which Pedantius vies with a servant for the love of a slave girl and is duped of his money by the servant to buy the girl is derived from Plautus. But the play

is a satire on Gabriel Harvey, a Cambridge scholar, and this fact lifts it beyond the confines of pure Italian influence.

Similarly Laelia is not really the product of the literary influence of Italy but rather of the interest in things Italian, which prompted its author to adapt Les Abusez, Charles Estienne's translation of Gl'Ingannati, acted before the Academia de Gli Intronati in 1531, and printed at least as early as 1538. Laelia was produced at Queen's College but the date of the first performance is disputed, guesses ranging from 1546/7 to 1594/5, although the latter date is usually now accepted.[22] The author of the play is unknown.

The next group of italianate comedies was again produced at St John's, between 1596 and 1598. The sources for Hispanus, Silvanus, and Machiavellus are unknown, although, in the case of Silvanus especially, it seems likely that they are based on Italian plays or novels not yet identified. In many ways these plays epitomize the italianate play. All three plays are set in Italy, at Tarentum, Mantua, and Florence, and present the intrigues produced as lovers woo those who love others, only for everything to be resolved happily at the end. Also as G. B. Churchill and W. Keller point out the plays are full of Plautine reminiscences.[23]

Closely related to the St John's group of plays is Zelotypus, performed in 1596 or 1597, which shares some members of its cast list with those of Hispanus, Silvanus, and Machiavellus. The

dating of the play is uncertain, and is given by Churchill and Keller as between 1600 and 1603,[24] but it is usually accepted as c 1606, as suggested by Moore Smith on the basis of the evidence of the cast lists.[25] Again Zelotypus displays features of Italian comedy without a definite source being apparent. Churchill and Keller write: "Ebenso wenig kann ich über die zweifellos italienische Quelle sagen, aus der er den Stoff genommen hat. Mit dem Geloso des Bentivoglio oder mit Lasca's Gelosia hat Zelotypus nichts zu thun."[26]

Walter Hawkesworth's two plays Leander and Labyrinthus, both performed at Trinity College, Cambridge, herald a period when scarcely a comedy was written at Cambridge which did not have Italy or Italian literature as its inspiration. Leander was performed twice, in 1598 and in 1602. For some years Leander was believed to have been adapted by Hawkesworth from Giambattista Della Porta's play La Fantesca (Venice, 1592). Churchill and Keller suggested that "die Quelle für Leander bildet wohl hauptsächlich des Neapolitaners Giovanni Battista della Porta Komödie La Fantesca", but point out that there are some large discrepancies between the plots of the two plays and suggest that there may be some influence also from Ariosto's I Suppositi. They finally come to the conclusion however that the play might be an adaptation of a yet unknown Italian original.[27] It was the first suggestion that was taken up by other writers, whether modified by some doubt, as did Boas ("probably suggested

Leander")[28] or as a statement of fact, as did M. T. Herrick in Italian Comedy in the Renaissance.[29] The true source of Leander was discovered to be Sforza degli Oddi's Erofilomachia by J. M. Lothian in 1930.[30] The plot of Erofilomachia is identical to that of Leander although Hawkesworth made some adjustments, firstly by changing the names of some of the characters, and secondly by adding a new first act, most of which is taken up by the bufoonish antics of the servants Spinetta, Mincio, Cocalus and Grillus.

Labyrinthus was performed in 1602 and for a second time before King James at an unspecified date. It is a simple reworking, with some additions, of its source, Della Porta's La Cintia. Hawkesworth amplified the character of Tiberius who becomes the epitome of a jolly old man, of Don Piedro who is developed from the capitano, and added the servant Grillus, who also appeared in Leander, thus adding to the play certain Plautine elements in the persons of the senex, miles gloriosus, and parasite.

Hawkesworth's use of the works of Della Porta as source material was only the first in a series. Samuel Brooke also of Trinity College, wrote three plays for the academic stage, all of which were of Italian origin, one of them based on a play by Della Porta. Adelphe, a reworking of La Sorella (Naples, 1604), was performed for the first time in 1611/12 and several times subsequently,

although it was never published. Brooke adapted La Sorella by rearranging a few of the scenes and speeches and by changing some of the names. The effect of these alterations was to make the play somewhat less immoral. Brooke substituted a pleasant character for the parasite Gulone and softened the harsh attitude displayed by Attilio towards his mother. La Sorella was Della Porta's most often adapted comedy perhaps, as Louise Clubb suggests, "because of its theme of incest, an evil which had a special piquancy for late Renaissance taste".[31] Brooke eliminated this element from the play by keeping the lovers apart until the matter of blood relationship could definitely be settled, and also deleted a project for forcing his wife into prostitution devised by the soldier. Further scenes were added and substituted from a second play by Della Porta I due fratelli rivali (Venice, 1601). However it remains to be determined whether Adelphe is simply a Latin translation of an embellished version of La Sorella produced by an unknown writer or a result of Brooke's reading of Della Porta's plays.

Two further adaptations were made of Della Porta's works for the occasion of James I's first visit to Cambridge in 1614/5, both achieving a popularity and success unusual in academic drama. [redacted] was adapted by George Ruggle, Fellow of Clare Hall, from [redacted]'s Trappolaria. It was performed twice before the King, the second occasion by royal command, went into 5 editions in

the seventeenth century and five more in the eighteenth,[32] and was even translated into English by R. Codrington in 1622 and performed on the London stage.[33] Louise Clubb writes

> Ignoramus was the first of the English adaptations to differ greatly from its source. Ruggle paraphrased twenty-one scenes from Trappolaria and more loosely imitated another sixteen, but unlike Hawkesworth or Brooke, he added something of his own: eighteen new scenes and seven characters, which turn Ignoramus into a satire.[34]

The nature of the play is changed by the shifting of emphasis from Trappola, who in the original manipulates the other characters, to Ignoramus, a pedantic lawyer who replaces Della Porta's Capitano Dragoleone.

Ignoramus was followed on the next evening of the King's visit by Thomas Tomkis' Albumazar, derived from L'Astrologo of Della Porta. Although this play is in English and therefore not strictly within the scope of this review it is too much a product of Italian influence to be omitted. Like Ignoramus it met with great success. It had been printed five times by 1688, was performed publicly in 1668, and was revived three times by Garrick. Tomkis played fairly close to his source, changing nothing of the story. He did however eliminate some of the coarser material, and he strengthened the structure of the play by shortening and rearranging the scenes, thus increasing the dramatic tension of the play. He

also changed the emphasis of the Italian play slightly away from an attack on astologers and towards a satirical view of the social climber represented by Trincalo.

Louise Clubb speculates about the nature of the fourth play performed at this time, Edward Cecil's Aemilia:

> The latter is now lost, but we have John Chamberlain's word that it was a Latin comedy about a foolish tutor of physic. This description brings to mind several Italian comedies, but especially Della Porta's Fantesca and Furiosa. Two of the four plays performed that week were adapted from his works, and the third was by another of his adapters; it is highly possible that when and if the lost manuscript of Aemilia is unearthed, it will prove to be one more result of the vogue Della Porta was enjoying at the university during this period.[36]

The source of Cancer is given by Moore Smith as Lionardo Salviati's Il Granchio.[36] The play is anonymous and the dating of the piece is uncertain. Moore Smith suggests, with a query, that it was performed at Emmanuel College in 1625,[37] but J.Halliwell claims that it was performed before King James in 1622 although there seems to be no evidence for this statement.[38] However G. E. Bentley has studied the cast list for the play and from the many similarities with that of Brooke's Adelphe, performed at Trinity in 1611/2, suggests that Cancer was performed at that College between 1611 and 1613.[39]

Paria is associated with Cancer as both plays appear in a collection of drama printed in 1648. It is probably the last Latin play to be performed at Cambridge to show direct Italian influence. The author, Thomas Vincent of Trinity College, adapted it from Eusebio Luchetti's Le due sorelle rivali (Venice, 1609), and it was performed before King Charles in 1627/8.

At the same time as comedy was yielding more and more to the influence of Italy, the Cambridge dramatists tried their hands at a genre which was almost entirely Italian, the pastoral. Although pastoral drama had its own independent development in England the academic examples of the genre are entirely derivative from the Italian.

It is difficult to say which was the first pastoral to be performed at Cambridge. Pastor Fidus was taken from Battista Guarini's Pastor Fido as the title makes clear. There is no evidence for the authorship or dating of the play, although it was probably performed at some time before 1605 at King's College.[40] The Latin play is a straight translation from the Italian except that a dialogue between the characters "Prologus" and "Argumentum" takes the place of Guarini's long topical prologue, and a short conventional epilogue is added at the end. The original Italian play was printed in England,

together with the other great Italian pastoral Aminta, the year after its first appearance in Italy, that is in 1591.

Parthenia has an even vaguer history than Pastor Fidus, nothing being known about it except that it was performed at Cambridge. It is a translation of Luigi Groto's Pentimento amoroso which was printed in 1576 in Venice. The playwright followed his source closely changing only a few names. The Italian play has been condemned as excessively grotesque and apparently had no other influence in England.

Samuel Brooke, who had adapted a play by Della Porta in his Adelphe, also wrote two pastorals. In Scyros (performed at Trinity in 1612/3) Brooke took as his source a pastoral play by Bonarelli called Filli di Sciro. Brooke multiplied the double love story of nymphs and satyrs, changed some of the names, and generally substituted spectacle and humour for poetry and sentiment. The second play, Melanthe, was performed before King James in 1614/5. Brooke is chiefly indebted here to Guarini's Pastor Fido for its elements of plot and atmosphere, but he owes something as well to Tasso's Aminta and Bonarelli's Filli di Sciro. There is however no immediate source for the play but it follows the pastoral tradition so strictly that it is unlikely to be original with Brooke.

The only tragedy drawn from the Italian by the Cambridge playwrights was William Alabaster's Roxana based on Luigi Groto's

La Dalida. The English translation was performed at Trinity College in 1592. Like the Italian original the play makes use of the classical Senecan conventions of ghosts, messengers, and choruses.

Obviously many plays written and performed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England reflected the influence of Italy as the result of the contemporary preoccupation with the country as a nation, with Italian history, politics,etc. As always when dealing with the question of influence it is frequently impossible to distinguish between the conscious and the unconscious, the first hand and the fifth hand imitations. However the first plays clearly based on Italian dramatic models (rather than the novelle) were those produced at the Universities and Inns of Court. Italian drama was not as important to English dramatists of this period as some critics has claimed. Stephen Gosson may have complained that not only the novelle but Italian comedies were ransacked to furnish the playhouses,[41] but David Orr points out in his book Italian Renaissance Drama in England before 1625 that there are only about twenty-three extant plays with indisputable Italian dramatic sources from this period, of which ten (according to his list) are in Latin and meant for performance before university audiences.[42]

It is difficult to discern how and why it was the scholars of Cambridge who chose to base their work on Italian plays rather than on the poems and romances which seemed to have greater appeal for the writers of the popular stage. It may be the result of their long-standing familiarity with Latin comedy. The Commedia Erudita,which the

university playwrights chose to follow for the most part, sprang from the adaptation of types and techniques from the Roman comedies to the conditions of the Renaissance, preserving the familiar features and traditional structure, adding new types and modifying others. Piero Rebora writes:

> L'influsso plautino ed italiano vi è evidente; e sarà appunto questa la prima traccia d'influenza italiana, ... L'Italia è l'intermediaria per l'Europa del dramma latino, ch'essa tuttavia non tramanda immutato, ma bensì ravvivato e ritoccato con notevoli caratteristiche sue proprie.[43]

A contributory factor may have been the greater opportunities for learning the language in the University milieu for, although the tales of Boccaccio and Bandello were available in translation, plays generally were not, and there were no anthologies of learned drama which could have been utilized. A trip to the Continent, especially to Italy, was considered essential to finish a gentleman's education after he had received his degree. Many Cambridge students doubtless saw plays performed while they were abroad, and may have brought back copies to England.

Unfortunately there is no mention in the lives of the university playwrights who chose to translate or adapt Italian works that any

of them had been abroad or studied Italian. William Alabaster visited Italy but only after he had written Roxana. In 1588, nine years after the performance of Victoria, Abraham Fraunce produced The Arcadian Rhetorike; or, the Precepts of Rhetorike made Plaine by Examples Greek, Latin, English, Italian, French and Spanish, which shows that somewhere he must have acquired a knowledge of the language. Similarly Hawkesworth shows his familiarity with the language, as in a letter to Sir Robert Cotton he asks for books "ether Latine, French, spanish, or Italian" for use in some study.[44]

Perhaps the most logical explanation is that one or two men may have been the intermediaries and supplied books for the rest, as most of the writers were contemporaries and belonged to either St John's or Trinity Colleges. This trend towards adaptation at Cambridge may also have partly been caused by the influence of the Court. Of the later plays taken from the Italian a large number were chosen for royal performance. This too may be one of the reasons why Trinity College was so prominent in this area. Trinity was founded by Henry VIII, and as a royal college it almost always acted as host to royalty visiting Cambridge, thus also taking on the responsibility of entertaining its guests. Moreover Trinity had the largest Hall in the University and was therefore particularly suitable for dramatic productions, just as Christ Church, Oxford was in a position to produce the majority of tragedies in which that University excelled.

A feature of the university adaptations was a tendency to expurgation. Nearly all of the authors tried to tone down the air of cheerful immorality which pervaded the Italian sources and which was the basis of the many objections to this type of literature. At the same time the farcical element in the plays was increased by emphasizing certain characters, the pedant, the doctor, the foreigner, by adding new characters of the same type, especially extra comic servants, by substituting slapstick for more sophisticated humour. Both of these tendencies are to be expected in drama, which, although it no longer made any claim to being educational, was meant for the entertainment of students, in their formative years, many of them destined for the Church. The degree of success in this bowdlerizing process may seem negligible but a comparison with the plays of the popular stage of the time shows that the moral standard of dramatic literature elsewhere was far from high. As Jonson commented in the preface to Volpone (1605) "nothing but ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy, all licence of offence to god, and man, is practis'd".[45]

There is little evidence for a connection between the Universities and the popular stage. Public plays and players were discouraged and statutes drawn up prohibiting them in the colleges.[46] Of course this does not preclude a knowledge of what

was happening in the London theatres among Cambridge scholars. University trained men like Nash and Marlowe became popular playwrights. Some academic plays eventually appeared on the popular stage, like Ignoramus. Laelia stems from the same Italian source which Shakespeare probably used for Twelfth Night. Victoria is an adaptation of the same play as Anthony Munday's Two Italian Gentlemen (1584). In No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's Middleton draws on Della Porta's Sorella, as did Brooke in Adelphe. Nevertheless each group remained remarkably separate and there are few cross-currents, but, whether influential or not, the academic stage anticipated the popular drama in all the cases mentioned above.

The taste and perception of the academic writers is to be seen not so much in what they wrote as in what they chose to adapt: mostly comedy, which was the best of Italian drama, then pastoral, a genre which the Italians had made their own, and finally tragedy, which was derivative, unoriginal, and best avoided. From the Italians they derived matter and form which they infused with English vivacity and humour. Although the majority of the italianate plays written at Cambridge may have been amateurish and mediocre, the fusion of the two cultures produced some of the best plays written for the academic stage.

NOTES

1. This entry is quoted by Thomas Warton, History of English Poetry, edited by W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1871), III, 302. In University Drama (p. 2) F. S. Boas casts doubts on the authenticity of the entry but G. C. Moore Smith accepts the reference in his article "Plays Performed in Cambridge Colleges before 1585", in Fasciculus Joanni Willis Clark Dicatus (Cambridge, 1909), p. 266.

2. David Masson, The Life of John Milton Narrated in Connexion with the History of his Time (London, 1859), I, 112.

3. College Plays, p. 18.

4. J. E. B. Mayor, Early Statutes of St John's College Cambridge (Cambridge, 1859), p. 139.

5. College Plays, p. 21.

6. University Drama, pp. 16-17.

7. Danda est tamen omnibus aliqua remissio; non solum quia nulla res est, quae perferre possit continuum laborem, atque ea quoque, quae sensu et anima carent, ut servare vim suam possint, velut quiete alterna retenduntur; sed quod studium discendi voluntate, quae cogi non potest, constat. (I.3.8-9)

8. Joan Simon, Education and Society in Tudor England (Cambridge, 1966), p. 269.

9. Letter dated 31 July 1592, edited by Karl Young, "William Gager's Defence of the Academic Stage", Transactions, Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, 18 (1916), p. 614.

10. centuriae seniorum agitant expertia frugis,
celsi praetereunt austera poemata Ramnes:
omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.
(Ars Poetica, 341-4)

11. Quoted by Aelius Donatus in De comoedia (V.1). The original source in the works of Cicero is unknown.

12. College Plays, p. 50.

13. Annals, II, 193.

14. Fasciculus Joanni Willis Clark Dicatus, p. 273.

15. "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian", PMLA, 10 (1895), p. 251.

16. The Works of Francis Bacon, edited by J. Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath (London, 1859), III, 323.
"amongst so many great foundations of colleges in Europe, I find it strange that they are all dedicated to professions, and none left free to arts and sciences at large."
(Of the Advancement of Learning, Bk.2)

17. Edited by F. J. Furnivall, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 8 (London, 1869), p. 7.

18. Frances A. Yates, John Florio (Cambridge, 1934), p. 53.

19. "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian", PMLA, 14 (1899), p. 466.

20. J. M. Murray The Influence of Italian upon English Literature during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Cambridge, 1886), p.2

21. Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey A.D. 1573-1580, edited by E. J. L. Scott, Camden Society, New Series 33 (London, 1884), pp. 78-9.

22. The dating of Laelia is rather important as a performance of the play in 1546/7 would make it the earliest English play to have an Italian work at its source, predating Jeffery's Buggbears of 1564/5. In College Plays (p. 7) Moore Smith assumes "that a Latin version of the Laelia story was produced in 1546/7". However in his edition of the play (Cambridge, 1910) he comes to the conclusion that it was almost certainly acted on March 1, 1595. Boas in University Drama (p. 289) accepts this dating. In their article on Elizabethan university plays in Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 34 (1898), G. B. Churchill and W. Keller say that Laelia was "1590 aufgefuhrt und 1598 wiederholt" (p. 291).

23. Jahrbuch, pp. 297 and 300.

24. Ibid., p. 213.

25. "Notes on Some English University Plays", MLR, 3 (1907-8), p. 151.

26. See note 25.

27. Jahrbuch, p. 304.

28. University Drama, p. 317.

29. (Urbana, 1960), pp. 207-8.

30. "Sforza d'Oddi's 'Erofilomachia' the Source of Hawkesworth's 'Leander'", MLR, 25 (1930), 338-341.

31. Giambattista Della Porta: Dramatist (Princeton, 1965), p. 279.

32. Elizabethan Stage, III, 475-6.

33. Edward Ravenscroft's abridged version The English Lawyer was acted at Drury Lane in 1677. It was published in London in 1678.

34. Giambattista Della Porta, pp. 281-2.

35. Ibid., pp. 288-9.

36. College Plays, p. 99.

37. Ibid., p. 69.

38. A Dictionary of Old English Plays (London, 1860), p. 42.

39. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage (Oxford, 1956), V, 1298-9.

40. J. Nichols (Progresses, I, 553) quotes an anonymous letter dated 30 August 1605. "There was an English play acted in the same place before the Queen and the young Prince, ... It was penned by Mr. Daniel, and drawn out of Fidus Pastor, which was sometimes acted by King's College men in Cambridge."
The Trinity College MS R.3.37 of Pastor Fidus gives the play with the prologue used in the 1602 version of Hawkesworth's Leander.

41. Plays Confuted in Five Actions (London, 1582), D 42v.

42. (Chapel Hill, 1970), pp. 104-5

43. L'Italia nel dramma inglese (1558-1642) (Milan, 1925), p. 33

44. British Museum, Cotton MS Julius C III 3509.

45. The Works of Ben Jonson, edited by C.H. Herford and P. Simpson (Oxford, 1937), V, 18.

46. On 23 July 1604 the King issued a letter prohibiting all idle games, plays or shows in or within five miles of Cambridge (Annals, III, 6).

2. The Author

Labyrinthus is assigned to Walter Hawkesworth in manuscripts at the University Library, Cambridge (Ee.v.16), Trinity College, Cambridge (R.3.9), the Bodleian (Douce 315), and at Yale University. A rival claim to authorship is put forward by the Newdigate manuscript (CR136/B761) which assigns the play to one T. Goffe of Christ's College. This is probably a reference to Thomas Goffe or Gough who took the degrees of B.A., M.A., and B.D. at Christ Church, Oxford and who wrote several plays including The Careless Shepherdess.[1] However the likelihood of Goffe's having written Labyrinthus is slight as he was an Oxford man (although he was incorporated M.A. at Cambridge in 1617) and moreover was only eleven years old when Labyrinthus is thought to have been first performed. The fact that the note concerning Goffe has been added to the Newdigate manuscript by a different hand from that of the text also casts doubts on the authenticity of the statement.

Walter Hawkesworth,[2] the author, was the second son of Walter Hawkesworth of Hawkesworth, Yorkshire,* by his wife Isabell, daughter and co-heiress of Thomas Colthurst of Edisforth, Yorkshire. The eldest son Richard was eventually knighted and died in 1657. There was also a daughter Isabell about whom nothing is known. Hawkesworth's exact

---

* Not the son of "John, an Officer in the Exchequer" as stated by Joseph Hunter in Familiae minorum gentium, edited by J.W. Clay, Publications of the Harleian Society, 39 (London, 1895), III, 972.

date of birth cannot be ascertained but he matriculated as a Pensioner of Trinity College, Cambridge on March 30, 1588. The average age for matriculation in the sixteenth century was fourteen or fifteen and there is no evidence that Hawkesworth was an exeeption. He was, therefore, probably born in 1573-4. His career at the University was quietly successful and he was elected Scholar in 1589, received his B.A. in 1591/2, was admitted a Minor Fellow in October, 1593, received his M.A. in 1595, and was admitted a Major Fellow in April, 1595.

Little is known about Hawkesworth's early years at Cambridge. His name appears in the history of the University in 1591[3] when on September 15 a Richard Parish of Chesterton assaulted some scholars who were travelling with him in the ferryboat between Chesterton and Sturbridge Fair. A report of the incident was drawn up on the part of the university, probably by the Vicechancellor, Lord Burghley:

> The said Parishe had an action entred against him by one Walter Hawkesworthe a Scholer of Trynity Colledge, for the deadlie woundinge of him, which injury he valued at fyve hundreth poundes ... that sodenlye, withoute anie thinge ether in word or dede offered him, he caughte Hawkesworthe before mentioned by the bosome, and first contendinge with the strengthe of his arme to have put him into the ryver, did after with his dagger thruste him in under the lefte papp, which stabb had suerly proved deadlie unto him, had not the same by God's providence lighte upon a ribb in his side, as is to be justyfied by a chirurgion, who presentlie hadd the same wounde in cure.[4]

Despite his claims against Parish, Hawkesworth seems to have sustained no permanent injury as a result of this incident and

the accounts shed little light on his character, except perhaps a tendency to exaggerate both in his description of the injury and in his claims to compensation.

Of Hawkesworth's academic activities as a Fellow of Trinity we have as evidence a letter to Sir Robert Cotton signed by the author and dated April 15 [1602?][5] In this letter he asks Sir Robert to supply him with books "wherein I might be instructed ether [sic] in the life of Henry the 7; or in the Story of his times, especially that part therof, w^ch reporte the Truthes of State and Church businesse" about which a group of scholars, of whom Hawkesworth was one, intended to write "a Story".

At Michaelmas in 1605 Hawkesworth resigned his fellowship and became secretary to Sir Charles Cornwallis, a Trinity man, who was sent in that year to Spain as James I's ambassador. Hawkesworth is first mentioned as a member of the embassy in November 1605. In letters to the Earl of Salisbury, Cornwallis writes of his intention to send Hawkesworth to England with confidential information for King James about a proposed alliance with Spain for the purpose of "reducing the Low Countries into Obedience".[6] A few days before his departure Hawkesworth fell sick but continued with the mission despite the Ambassador's lack of confidence about his health: "Hawkesworth my Secretarie departing from hence with a Body weak and a Mind not very strong, I am in some doubt his post will override him".[7]

However Hawkesworth returned to Spain in March of the following year and continued at his post dealing with minor diplomatic problems. He died in the autumn of 1606.

In a letter to the Earl of Salisbury dated September 30, 1606, Cornwallis wrote:

> For myne own particular I am yet continuing in my infected House, where sythence my last Letters advertizing the Death of Hawkesworth and four more; and of the Sickness of my Chaplain and two others, there are later fallen downe of the same Disease three more.[8]

As early as the autumn of 1605 Cornwallis mentioned in his letters that Spanish nobles "being sick have been enforced to keep their houses",[9] and it is possible that Hawkesworth's illness before his journey to England was a minor attack of the plague, although the fact that he was allowed to set off at all argues against this diagnosis. By July 1606 Cornwallis was describing affairs thus:

> To conclude, things here are in much Disorder and Confusion: All infected with the malignant Breathe of some Jesuits and other fugitives and ill affected Countrymen of our owne.[10]

Hawkesworth died unmarried at the age of 31-32, one of the many victims of the plague in Madrid that year.

It is interesting to note that Hawkesworth's will is dated at least a week after his death, which we know from Cornwallis' letter took place a short time before September 30, 1606. The will, which was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on November 30, 1606, is dated October 5 of that year. It is obviously on this evidence that Gordon Goodwin, in his article on Hawkesworth in D N B , places Hawkesworth's death "in October 1606". The explanation of this anomaly probably lies in the fact that Spain had adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1582 and was therefore ten days ahead of England, which did not adopt the new system until 1721. Thus the will, dated October 5 New Style in Spain, would have been dated on September 25 Old Style, a date which would fit well with the evidence, as Cornwallis' letters are dated in Winwood's Memorials according to the English system.

Hawkesworth made no mark either as a scholar or as a diplomat. His career under Cornwallis was brief and although he was entrusted with confidential and important matters he elicited no praise or comment from the Ambassador even after his death, when he was speedily replaced by one Cottington. Hawkesworth's only claim to fame is as a writer and actor of comedies for the academic stage. The authorship of Labyrinthus, performed for the first time in 1602, has already been discussed. Leander which was performed at

Trinity in 1598 and again in 1602, the day before Labyrintnus, is probably also by Hawkesworth.

The manuscript at Trinity College, Cambridge (R.3.9.), which contains both plays, names Hawkesworth as the author of Leander and there is further evidence in favour of this claim. Leander and Labyrintnus are always found together in collections of university plays (CYLT), and in one manuscript alone together (J). A connection is often made in general references to academic drama, for example the Prologue of an unknown play warns:

> You must not here expect today
> Leander, Labyrinth, or Loyola.[11]

Further more it was quite common for the authors of college plays to take the leading role in their own compositions (for example, Stub in Fraus Honesta)[12] and Hawkesworth played the title role in both the 1598 and 1602 performances of Leander, as well as the part of Tiberius in Labyrinthus.

In content and style Leander and Labyrinthus are similar, mainly because both are very close adaptations of Italian originals which belong to the same genre. Della Porta, the author of La Cintia on which Labyrinthus is based, and Sforza degli Oddi, who wrote L'Erofilomachia, the source for Leander,[13] wrote comedies which were unusual among their contemporaries in that an element of seriousness was combined with farce, a mixture that

obviously appealed to Hawkesworth. There are, further, certain references in Labyrinthus to Leander which show that the two plays are closely related.[14] The servant Grillus appears in both plays and makes his first appearance in Labyrinthus as if he had just left the scene of Leander:

> Ut illum dii omnes infaelicitent Hypocrassum, miserum senem;
> Qui postquam Flaminia se emunctum viderat, et ab Ardelia
> Mulctatum male, quasi per me id stetisset,
> Infaelix pecus! Famulatu me exclusit suo; (I, 70-3)

There is also a detailed reference to the characters of Leander (V, 352-6), the most significant lines being those spoken by Tiberius (played by Hawkesworth) about Leander (also played by Hawkesworth) which take on a deeper meaning if the same man created both characters:

> Illumne foelicem, miserum, nobilem, servum,
> Amatorem, fatuum, Fabium, Leandrum, Cocalum?
> Iupiter! Quam ego illum
> Sive ridicule quid agit, sive stulte, sive sobrie,
> aeque ac meipsum amo. (V, 354-6)

On the flyleaf of a manuscript of Leander in the Bodleian (Rawlinson MS D341) the name W. Johnson occurs which Halliwell considered to be "perhaps the name of the author".[15] In his [redacted] Chronicle of English Drama Fleay suggests that [redacted] refers to the owner of the manuscript, William Johnson [redacted] College.[16] Johnson was a writer of academic plays and wrote Valetudinarium which was acted in 1638, but the date of Leander makes it too early for this Johnson's authorship

and I have been unable to trace a William Johnson who was at Trinity College at a time suitable for the composition of Leander.

In Athenae Cantabrigienses Pedantius is also assigned to Hawkesworth:

> At the Bachelor's Commencement 1602/3 the Latin Comedy of Leander was acted at Trinity college for the second time, and another comedy which he had himself written, entitled Pedantius, was produced for the first time. He represented the principal characters in both these dramas ...[17]

This statement is repeated by Goodwin in DNB where he speaks of Pedantius as a comedy "which he /Hawkesworth/ is known to have written".[18] In the introduction to his edition of Pedantius Moore Smith discusses this claim:

> It is quite clear that if the Pedantius said to have been played in 1602/3 was the play which we possess both in print and MS, the play, that is, known to Harington and Nash, Walter Hawkesworth was not its author. It is at the same time possible that he adapted it for its new use, perhaps by adding the many (though unimportant) interpolations which distinguish the printed text of 1631 from the Caius MS.[19]

He suggests that Cooper's mistake was based on William Cole's [illegible] of Athenae Cantabrigienses: after a note on Hawkesworth and Labyrinthus Cole adds "Query, Was he the author of Pedantius ..."[20] However the attribution of Pedantius to Hawkesworth may have been

a mere slip on Cooper's part in confusing the names of this play and of Labyrinthus as he states specifically that Hawkesworth acted the principal role and that the play was performed with Leander. Both facts fit the evidence relating to Labyrinthus and are unsubstantiated in the case of Pedantius. If it is assumed that Cooper had some grounds for his statement, it is possible (though unlikely) that this was a new play which is now lost.[21]

Moore Smith's suggestion that Hawkesworth revised Pedantius is unlikely and cannot be proven. The satire on a contemporary which was the object of the play was a far cry from the Italianate romances on which Hawkesworth chose to work. The passages found in the printed text which are not in the manuscripts of Pedantius appear to be afterthoughts intended to introduce fresh humour especially by means of pedantry. An examination of these additional passages show them to consist often of classical and contemporary allusions, which rarely occur in plays known to be by Hawkesworth, and to depend on made-up and long words for some of their humour (e.g. I, 541 Catachrestice), a device not used by our author whose Latin is simple and straightforward. It may be that Hawkesworth adapted his style to the subject matter which he was treating but in the absence of positive evidence it is more likely that Hawkesworth played no part in the composition of Pedantius.

The only other product of Hawkesworth's literary career which is known to exist are some Latin verses in a collection of funeral poems written by various Cambridge scholars Threnodia in Obitum D. Edouardi Lewkenor Equitis.[22] Goodwin attributes to Hawkesworth a set of verses signed G.H.C.T.[23] which presumably he took to represent Gualterius Hawkesworth Collegio Trinitatis. However there are also some verses later in the book signed G.H.T.C.C. (Gualterius Hawkesworth Trinitatis Collegio Cantabrigiae?) and Gu.Hu.T.C. which might as easily be by Hawkesworth. The style of the verses is so different from the comic that no evidence can be drawn from it concerning authorship. However there is no reason why Hawkesworth should not have contributed more than one poem as did Robert Theobald of Trinity in the same book, although the different styles of signature make this unlikely. Goodwin's information probably came from Cooper who in discussing Threnodia in Obitum writes:"amongst the writers who were all members of the University are W. Hawkesworth, Trinity, ... " but does not assign any specific poem to him.[24] I have been unable to trace any connection, personal or professional, between Hawkesworth and Lewkenor who had been a Fellow of St. Johns in 1561-3, was later an M.P. and was knighted by James I. He died September 19, 1605. Hawkesworth must have written his contribution just before he left for Spain and it is likely that this was his last literary effort.

Hawkesworth was a typical academic author of his age, writing, for private audiences at the University only, plays to celebrate minor occasions, or verses in praise of past scholars. Nevertheless he appears a remarkably modern figure, studying recent history, writing lively plays unemcumbered by classical references and allusions, reading French, Spanish, and Italian, as well as Latin. It may be regretted that Hawkesworth died before he had had a chance to consolidate his early success but one suspects that his career would have been that of a conscientious civil servant rather than as a sparkling playwright. Hawkesworth's importance lies in being the first adapter of Della Porta's work in England, and establishing a precedent which led to the composition of such pieces as Ignoramus, and to the use by popular dramatists of the drama of Italy as well as of its novels.

NOTES

1. Goffe left various plays in manuscript of which three were published after his death in 1629:

   The Raging Turk; or, Bajazet the Second (London, 1631),
   The Courageous Turk; or, Amureth the First, a Tragedie (London, 1632),
   The Tragedie of Orestes (London, 1633).

2. Hawkesworth's name is found variously spelt Hauksworth, Haukesworth, Hawkesworthe, and Hawkesworth. I have adopted the last spelling as the author himself used it in the only autograph which is extant, a letter to Sir Robert Cotton which is now in the British Museum, (Cotton MS Julius C III 3059).

3. Annals, II, 496. Compare James Heywood and Thomas Wright, Cambridge University Transactions during the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London, 1854), II, 175.
   The Parish incident is dated 1598 in the latter work but as the specific date of the assault is given as September 30, which was the date of Parish's final arrest, it is probable that Heywood and Wright were wrong in their estimation of the year also, and that Cooper has the correct date.

4. British Museum Lansdowne MS lxxvii, art. 19. Quoted from Annals, II, 496.

5. See note 2 above.

6. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I. Collected (chiefly) from the original papers of the Right Honourable Sir Ralph Winwood K.T. (London, 1725), II, 164.

7. Winwood, II, 173.

8. Winwood, II, 261.

9. Winwood, II, 173.

10. Winwood, II, 244.

11. John Hacket, A Century of Sermons, published by T. Plume (London, 1675), p. vi.

12. Bodleian Douce MS 234.

13. Compare University Drama, p. 317 which gives the source as Della Porta's La Fantesca.

14. For a complete description of the relationship between the two plays see pp. 43-4.

15. J.O. Halliwell, A Dictionary of Old English Plays (London, 1860), p. 142.

16. (London, 1891), II, 363.

17. II, 441-2

18. s.v. Hawkesworth, p. 205.

19. (Louvain, 1905), pp. xix-xx.

20. Notes and Queries, second series, 11 (1855), p. 147.

21. Goodwin makes this point. "His alleged 'Pedantius' must be distinguished from the Latin comedy of the name produced at Trinity in February 1580-1, and possibly penned by Edward Forsett". (DNB, IX, 205)

22. (London, 1606). STC 15561.

23. See note 18 above.

24. Athenae Cantabrigienses, II, 411.

3. The Dating of Performances of Labyrinthus

The first performance of Labyrinthus probably took place at the Bachelor's Commencement at Trinity College, Cambridge in March 1602/3. Although none of the manuscripts which preserve the play give any information regarding the date of performances some evidence might be expected from the cast lists, the names and academic titles of the actors limiting the period in which the play could have been produced.

Unfortunately the information given in the cast lists is conflicting and no firm conclusions can be drawn. The manuscripts of Labyrinthus which have cast lists (CDYLT) agree except in the degrees of five of the actors:

Taverner — He is styled M.A. in CYT, B.A. in D, and an undergraduate in L. John Taverner matriculated c. 1597, received his B.A. 1601/2, and M.A. 1605.[1] Therefore according to CYT the performance must date after 1605, according to D, between 1602 and 1605, and according to L, between 1597 and 1602.

Thwaites — He is styled B.A. in CYLT and an undergraduate in D. There is no record of Mark Thwaites' matriculation, but he received his B.A. in 1603/4 and his M.A. in 1607. Therefore the majority of the manuscripts suggest a date after 1603/4.

Blaxton — He is styled B.A. in CLT and an undergraduate in DY. Joshua Blaxton received his B.A. in 1603/4 and his M.A. in 1607. Again a date after 1603/4 is supported by the majority.

North — He is styled M.A. in CDLT and B.A. in Y. A John North matriculated in 1602, received his B.A. in 1602/3, and his M.A. in 1606 as did one Thomas North. The majority of the manuscripts support a date after 1606.

Simpson — He is styled B.A. in CDYT and an undergraduate in L. Edward Simpson received his B.A. in 1600/1 and his M.A. in 1604. L is probably in error here.

F. S. Boas inspected the cast lists of three of these manuscripts and came to the conclusion that there must be some inaccuracy in the texts. However he saw only CLT, of which CT belong to the same genetic group. He therefore dismissed the variants of L as blunders because they were minority readings.[2] When the cast lists of all the manuscripts are taken into account the anomalies within the readings cannot be so easily dismissed. In the cases where the manuscripts disagree CYT seem to suggest a later date for performance, usually after 1603/4, while D puts the date between 1600 and 1603. Nevertheless these readings are not necessarily correct as both groups of manuscripts have discrepancies within themselves. CYT give evidence for a date after 1605, styling Taverner as M.A., and for a date before 1604, styling Simpson B.A. Similarly D gives evidence for a date before 1603/4, describing Blaxton and Thwaites as undergraduates, and a date after 1606, styling North as M.A.

From details where the manuscripts agree the date of performance can be narrowed down to a period between 1595, when

Hawkesworth received his M.A., and 1605-6 when Goldingham and Wilkinson, both described as undergraduates, received the degree of B.A. Obviously the cast lists cannot refer to a performance after 1605 when Hawkesworth, who took the role of Tiberius, left England. However information about one of the actors, Nid, who is described as an undergraduate in all the manuscripts, supports a firm date some time between 1602, when Nid matriculated, and 1603/4, when he received his B.A.

In view of the inconsistencies in the manuscripts it is fortunate that there is some internal evidence in Labyrinthus which supports the date 1602/3. That Hawkesworth's earlier composition Leander was revived with additions on the occasion of the Bachelor's Commencement in 1602/3 is noted in several of the manuscripts which preserve the play.[3] Labyrinthus provides a kind of sequel to Leander. The action of the two plays is continuous and Grillus, who appears in the earlier play, makes his first entrance in Labyrinthus coming away from the house of Hippocrassus as if he had just extricated himself from the events described in Leander (I, 70-72). Later in Labyrinthus Tiberius makes another reference to Leander when he expresses his intention to invite to his son's wedding

> et Alphonsum aulicum,
> Quique heri etiam in filiae suae nos nuptias vocavit, Gerastum imprimis,
> Et Leandrum generum suum. (V, 351-3.)

These allusions to the characters and events of the earlier play make it probable that both of Hawkesworth's compositions were performed within a short time of one another, while the audience were still familiar enough with the earlier play to appreciate these references. Furthermore Tiberius' mention of the wedding of Gerastus' daughter 'heri' has led scholars to suggest that Labyrinthus was performed the day after Leander.[4] It was not unusual for several plays to be performed on the occasion of a Commencement. At the Bachelor's Commencement at Cambridge in 1594/5, for example, two comedies and a tragedy were presented at Trinity College and there was a comedy at Queen's.[5]

Conveniently there are cast lists for performances of Leander in both 1598 and 1602. With only four exceptions all the actors whose names appear in the cast lists of the 1602 production of Leander are also found in the cast lists of Labyrinthus. On the other hand, while seven of the actors in the 1598 production of Leander appear in the Labyrinthus cast lists, there are seven who do not. If, therefore, Labyrinthus is connected with any performance of Leander it is the later one, and it is safe to say that Hawkesworth's later play was first performed in March 1602/3.

The dating of the second performance advertised in the printed edition of 1636 as "Habita coram Serenissimo Rege

Iacobo in Academia Cantabrigiensi" proves ~~even~~ more uncertain. There is no date of performance on the title page of the printed book and no cast list survives which might shed light on the exact date of the royal performance. One must, therefore, have recourse to the accounts of James I's visits to Cambridge and attempt to fit Labyrinthus into one of the series of dramatic productions which were features of these occasions.

King James paid his first visit to Cambridge in March 1614/15.[6] Nichols remarks

> that though this is repeatedly called the King's first Visit to Cambridge, it is not likely but that he had paid the T own several private Visits ... particularly when the contiguity of his hunting-seat at Newmarket is considered. To such a Visit an item in the expences of St. John's College "sub anno 1613, Jac. 11," seems to allude: "For wood at the King's coming, £4."[7]

Nevertheless the King, accompanied by Prince Charles, formally entered the city of Cambridge for the first time on March 7 1614/15 and was lodged at Trinity College. We learn from a letter dated March 16 1614/15, sent by John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton, that during the visit four plays were performed before the King in the Hall of Trinity College.[8] The play presented by the men of St. John's on the first night is not named but from the summary of the plot given it can be recognized as Thomas Cecil's play Aemilia which has since been lost.[9] On the second night of the visit Ignoramus was performed

by Clare Hall, and on the third and fourth nights Trinity College presented Albumazar by Thomas Tomkis and Melanthe by Samuel Brooke. A fifth play, Fletcher's Sicelides, was prepared for performance in case James stayed for another night. As James departed on March 12 this piscatory was performed after his departure at King's College.[10] Thus, we are informed, on each hight of the royal visit to Cambridge a play, which in each case is named, was presented. There was no time which could have been allotted to a sixth play, Labyrinthus, and the extant accounts have no such record.

The King was so impressed by what he had seen at Cambridge that he decided "to go again privatly to Cambridge to see two of the playes."[11] At first April 27 1615 was set as the date of this second visit but the King did not in fact arrive in Cambridge until May 13.[12] Notice had been given three weeks before this that the King wished to hear Ignoramus again, and it was performed with certain additions on the first evening of his visit. The second day, Sunday, was spent listening to sermons and prayers. On the third day the King attended a Degree Congregation, heard an Act and then departed. It is interesting [redacted] Chamberlain wrote that the King wished to see two [redacted] although in fact he attended only one and that was [redacted]

The third royal visit to Cambridge took place in 1622/3.[13] Scholars have usually assigned the second performance of

Labyrinthus to this year,[14] and Bentley points out that "this play has several times been erroneously dated 1622 because of a confusion of a revival with a first performance".[15] Chamberlain wrote to Carleton on February 22 1622/3 that the King meant to be in Cambridge "this Shrovetide to see certain playes".[16] This reference to more than one play is vital to the dating of the revival of Labyrinthus. In a note concerning this letter Cooper names these "playes" as "Loiola, by John Hacket afterwards Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry (first acted 28th of February, 1622-3), and perhaps Labyrinthus by Mr. Hawkesworth".[17] But in his account of the visit Nichols states that Chamberlain's use of the plural was a mistake: "Not Playes, but one Play, viz. Loiala".[18] Both writers quote another contemporary letter from Joseph Meade, Fellow of Christ's College, to Sir Martin Stuteville, also dated February 22, which states that "on Ash Wednesday there is a Comodie at Trinity College", and goes on to discuss Loiola, mentioning no other plays.[19] However corroboration for Chamberlain's reference to more than one play is found in a letter from William Beale, Fellow of Jesus College, to William Boswell, Secretary to the Lord Keeper, endorsed January 24 1622/3:

> Comoedia habenda est novissime a nostratibus Jesuanis, ... Gemina Comoedia in fieri est; mae [sic] quidem est in Agere, apud Trinitarios.[20]