Civil Conversation,
Religious Controversy,
and *The New Inn*

GLENN J. CLARK

Jonson présente dans sa pièce The New Inn (1629) le parallèle éthique s'établissant entre l'hôtel et l'église en tant qu'espaces où le discours et la conduite laïcs, qui, infléchis par la bonne foi, rendent possible une revitalisation des échanges sociaux. L'éthique présentée dans la pièce est suffisamment générale pour permettre aux discours sociaux et religieux, incluant le discours puritain, de gagner en force et en crédibilité. Jonson allie la liberté traditionnelle propre à l'hôtel au concept de la Renaissance de salubrité et de pragmatisme de la conversation laïque. Il y ajoute aussi l'idéal typiquement Jacobain de communion œcuménique inclusive dans le but de mettre encore davantage en relief la puissance comique de la pièce dans son traitement de la socialisation et de la fantaisie romantique de l'amour renouvelé.

Ben Jonson's late comedy *The New Inn* constructs an ethic of civility in which inn and church become commensurate as places of joyful behavior and conversational inclusiveness. My reading of this rarely performed and infrequently taught drama not only requires us to adjust Jeffrey Knapp's recent articulation of the older Jonson's anti-puritan accommodationism, but also helps us to understand the play's affective force. Knapp's argument echoes that of David Norbrook, who makes the case that Jonson's late drama envisions an "idea of Britain in which political dissension has been banished," largely through the rehabilitation of rural sports despite puritan opposition.¹ But Jonson's Caroline "idea of Britain" is more thoroughly inclusive than Knapp or Norbrook imagine, for despite the younger Jonson's famed satirization of puritans, *The New Inn*'s accommodative ethics are not anti-puritan.

The New Inn is a play in which a variety of characters imagine that the purpose and ethos of the inn are sufficiently flexible that it can be experienced as a theatre, a private household, and even as a church. Near the beginning

of the play, the jovial Host Goodstock grounds his duties as innkeeper of the The Light Heart Inn in a startlingly broad and playful ecumenicalism:

Gi' me good wine, or catholic or christian,
Wine is the word that glads the heart of man,
And mine's the house of wine. 'Sack', says my bush;
'Be merry and drink sherry': that's my posy!
For I shall never joy i' my Light Heart
So long as I conceive a sullen guest,
Or anything that's earthy!²

I will have more to say about the provenance and context of this memorable sequence of accumulating personifications. For now I simply want to note that the passage generates a profoundly affective ethos. Goodstock links joy with a talkatively self-promoting inn-sign, as well as with wine that is conceptually equivalent to an ecumenical—catholic or christian—scripturalism which knowingly serves to prevent sullen silence. Vivacity, we feel, can be found in this hospitable and compassionate place of unexpectedly-promoted wordiness. This is an inn, and a play, that insists on joyful, inclusive, good faith conversation.

In 1610 Jonson had mocked Tribulation and Ananias for using unethical means “For the restoring of the silenc’d Saints,” ministers who left the Established Church after the Hampton Court Conference.³ The younger Jonson seems to have worried little about the silencing of the Saints. But in 1629 *The New Inn* gains dramatic and political urgency by imagining that comfort and release from anxiety accompany open and civil conversation, and that such civil conversation can be extended to include controversial issues and figures in religion. Jonson was most likely on a spiritual journey back to Catholicism by 1629, but this did not prevent him from using the remarkable character Pru, a chambermaid visiting the Light Heart with her mistress, as a representative of the value of socially efficacious puritan speech.⁴ The complex and underexplored Renaissance concept of civility provides one answer to the question of how the re-Catholicizing Jonson could justify, for himself and for his audience, the toleration of subordinated and officially distrusted religious discourse.

The play’s contrarian politics have been historicized in somewhat different terms by Martin Butler. Adapting Anne Barton’s emphasis on individual self-realization through performance in Jonson’s late drama, Butler argues that *The New Inn* tentatively affirms the possibility and value of aristocratic revivification and solidarity in the wake of Buckingham’s death in August 1628 and in hopes of a successful 1629 Parliament. Butler’s argument is

perhaps most daring in his suggestion that Pru comes to represent Jonson's hope for the promotion of new merit within the court circle.⁵ Building on the work of Barton and Butler, I will argue that the play's surprisingly broad inclusivism is rooted in the social licence found in establishments of commercial hospitality, in a humanist and meritocratic conceptualization of civil conversation, and in a conviction that honest dialogue uttered in fellowship has spiritual and psychological value.

Jonson concentrates the significance of the inn as a social setting in an exchange near the end of *The New Inn*. Lord Beaufort has married Host Goodstock's son, whom he believes to be Lady Frampul's cousin Laetitia. Though the impersonation and assignation were conceived as a joke by Lady Frampul's chambermaid Pru, and are known to the key characters in the play, Beaufort believes that the marriage was a secret. When he announces the marriage, Lady Frampul plays along:

BEAUFORT. Madam, my cousin, you look discomposed,
I have been bold with a salad after supper,
O' your own Laetice here.

LADY FRAMPUL. You have, my lord.
But laws of hospitality and fair rites
Would have made me acquainted.

BEAUFORT. I' your own house,
I do acknowledge; else I much had trespassed.
But in an inn, and public, where there is licence
Of all community, a pardon o' course
May be sued out.

LADY FRAMPUL. It will, my lord, and carry it. 5.4.2–10

The dialogue suggests a contrast between the politics of the household and the politics of the inn, implying a distinction between “laws of hospitality” and “licence/Of all community.” Even at an inn, Lady Frampul thinks of herself as host—a presumption facilitated by her high social status—but she is immediately disabused of this belief by Beaufort. The “law” of hospitality would require a guest to tell a host that he is marrying a member of her household, and would also require the host to be involved in such arrangements. This is among what Felicity Heal calls the “reciprocal pressures” of traditional hospitality.⁶ Such laws or pressures, as Heal notes and Jonson realized, do not have the same force within commercial hospitality. A commercial host is unlikely to have the social status to enforce the traditional ethical obligations of his guests, while even a guest of high status cannot acquire full hosting authority because he or she is not in his or her “own house.” Peter Clark, similarly, holds that the commercial establishment is a site of loosened

decorum. He argues that part of the reason for a shift of cultural activity from private households to drinking houses was that drinking houses provided a more permissive climate. He suggests that drinking houses may have become particularly popular because of increased household discipline, so that alehouses and taverns were “a natural alternative centre for young unmarried people.”⁷ Thus, Jonson’s inn allows a relaxation or easing of pressure which may be described as a shift from law to licence. But exactly what kind of pressure is eased? What kind of “licence” is granted at this inn?

When Beaufort says that in a public inn, there is “licence/Of all community” he presumes something like the opportunity to socialize freely, without too much concern about standard rules of social decorum. The enjambment as well as the opaque and elliptical syntax are significant. In line 8, “licence” sounds like a synonym for licentiousness as well as a reference to the fact that inns were centrally regulated and licensed: “in an inn... there is licence.” For Jonson, the word is fascinatingly ambiguous. “Licence” implies both regulation and liberty, and this ambiguity resonates with the legally ambiguous status of inn-licensing during the early seventeenth century. During the sixteenth century, regulation had focussed on alehouses, but a sequence of Jacobean and early Caroline statutes diminished the legal distinction between alehouses and inns.⁸ Early seventeenth-century inns could thus be understood, paradoxically, as places maintaining an ethos of traditional freedom within a sphere of centralized regulation. In the 1620s, though, the force of Beaufort’s line might be heard as reflecting a further paradox in the disturbing relationship between unambiguously excessive licentiousness and regulation itself. The result, if not the original intent, of the transfer of inns into the regulatable realm of alehouses was to open a new opportunity for profit. As the Mompesson scandal had shown less than ten years prior to the composition of the play, the licensing of inns could itself be perceived as an example of illicit or licentious behavior. Giles Mompesson’s patent to sell inn licences, granted in 1617 but hotly debated in Parliament in 1621, had generated great hostility and brought into the open “disputes between central and local government, [and] between a Court apparently preferring private gain against public good.”⁹ What Jonson may have thought about the licensing of inns, or of Mompesson and his patent, we cannot know. But Jonson’s resonant allusion to the licensing of inns at least draws attention to the likelihood that during the 1620s the dramatization of an inn could capture the predictable resistance to law and regulation made by a court out of touch with public concerns and long-standing desires for liberty from regulation.

The ambiguity in Beaufort’s claim for “licence” does not disappear in line 9, but the terms in play, and the nature of Beaufort’s disagreement with

Lady Frampul, do become more clear. The prepositional phrase “Of all community” is ambiguous, as Jonson surely wants it to be. It allows metrical and interpretive weight to fall on both “all” and “community,” suggesting that Beaufort means to say that he has allowance to commune with—approach, converse with, consult, even share—any and all members of the inn’s community. We should also remember that community and commune are related to “common,” which implies that Beaufort is making specific allowance for his “communing” with a character of lower social status.¹⁰ In making this allowance for himself, Beaufort argues for a generally wide scope of “licensed” social interaction at the inn.

The New Inn does indeed give licence to a wide scope of conversation. The play dramatizes a relatively loose and easy social decorum which links civility not with ascribed nobility, but with joyous and charitable behavior. Joy is not limited to the elite, upstairs characters. It belongs as well to those “tapsters, ostlers, chamberlains” whom the Inn’s Host Goodstock calls “Reduced vessels of civility” (5.4.128–29). At the end of the play, Jonson allows a few base characters upstairs to celebrate the marriages and reunions with the gentlefolk. This detail is rarely noted because in his Epilogue Jonson explains that “He could have haled in/The drunkards and the noises of the inn/In his last act, if he had thought it fit” (13–15). These lines have certainly misled critics. Theodore Leinwand, for example, quotes them as evidence for his contention that in *The New Inn* “social status irrevocably alienates those above stairs from those below.”¹¹ Goodstock’s bar-room and bedroom servants Pierce, Jordan, and Jug are, however, upstairs during the fifth act. These men are neither “drunkards” nor “noises.” As a drawer, a chamberlain, and a tapster they are especially representative of the commercial and public nature of the inn. Each of them delivers or prepares the things—drink and lodging—that are sold in the inn. When Beaufort announces that he has married Laetitia, thanks to the opportunity afforded by the inn’s “license/Of all community,” the three servants let out a cheer of celebration and fellowship:

PIERCE. Joy!
 JORDAN. Joy!
 JUG. All Joy!
 HOST. Ay, the house full of joy. 5.4.21–22

Beaufort’s claim for the licence of socialization in the inn is manifested in the servants’ cheer, in which full participation in sociability is emphasized by the repetition of “joy” and by their shared metrical line. Their behavior retrospectively critiques Lovel’s association of low-status joviality with sordidness. Goodstock’s confirmation of their cheer suggests that the appropriateness of

celebratory participation should be based not on social station but on whether the conduct of participants is becoming to the event. It is unequivocally good when, as Jonson wrote in the “Ode. To Sir William Sidney on his Birthday,” “all do strive to advance/The gladness higher.”¹²

The inn’s servants are “reduced”—in Goodstock’s phrase “Reduced vessels of civility”—only in the sense that their ascribed status defines them as base. Their recognition of the joyfulness of the occasion, as well as their natural and unaffected expression of that joy, prove that they are “vessels of civility” nonetheless. Plain speech, uttered in good faith, and properly accommodated to the occasion, here appears to be the definitive characteristic of civility. Such plain speech might remind us of what Daniel Javitch, in reference to Stephano Guazzo’s *Civile Conversation*, calls “courtly anti-courtliness.” This identifies Guazzo’s “growing insistence on avoiding any discrepancy between the inner and outer self” and condemnation of “all deliberate attempts to disguise natural expression.”¹³ But it is very important that Guazzo writes of civility, not courtliness. His conduct book is a guide to an implicitly meritocratic behavior with practical effects. These include the opportunity for householders to “mende their estate” and “to come to dignitie, riches, and worldly promotions” but also to transform melancholy into a state of “being well pleased and joyful.” Civil conversation, as George Pettie puts it in his 1581 translation of Guazzo, “agreeth to all sortes of persons” and is “practised out of the house, haunting many and divers persons.” Guazzo even marks the philosophical pedigree of open, inter-status communication by alluding to Diogenes’ reputation for drinking in the tavern. To be civil, Guazzo requires behavior to exhibit sincerity, signs of careful listening, decorous respect for status, good manners, and moderate ceremoniousness.¹⁴ It is not solely, or even primarily, a guide to success in aristocratic social or political competition. This is the public and joyous civility Jonson dramatizes in *The New Inn*. The servants’ participation in the upstairs celebration reflects a humanist and meritocratic ethic in which internal virtues outweigh ascribed status.¹⁵ The Nurse, really Goodstock’s long-disguised wife, speaks for this humanist civility when she chides Lord Beaufort for threatening to divorce her daughter Laetitia, having learned of her apparent poverty. To Beaufort’s “Let beggars match with beggars” the Nurse responds “You may object / Our beggary to us as an accident,/But never deeper, no inherent baseness” (5.4.45, 60–62). For Jonson, the imaginative social licence of the inn enables what may well have been a personally satisfying fusion of aristocratic romance with a humanist and civil ideology of social reform and meritocratic inclusiveness.

The distinction between Jonson's Guazzian civility and courtliness helps explain Jonson's use of the inn as a setting for the play. At the inn, ethical principles can be refashioned more easily than in an aristocratic household. Mervyn James has argued that civility accompanies the breakdown of the ancient traditions of the elite, and the movement of culture and political discourse from the aristocratic home to public spaces.¹⁶ The decay of ancient domestic traditions is explicitly thematized in the play.¹⁷ While Goodstock does figure both his inn and himself in domestic terms, he also emphasizes the contrast between the inn and what he thinks of as the typical aristocratic household. Lovel has asked the host if he can take young Frank as a page, to which the host adamantly replies in the negative. Lovel responds with a defense of the aristocratic household as "the noblest way/Of breeding up our youth..." (1.3.43–44). Goodstock's reply is swift and to the point: "Ay, that was when the nursery's self was noble,/And only virtue made it, not the market" (1.3.52–53). Once, Goodstock says, the great household was noble because it was virtuous, but now it is noble because its owner has bought a title.¹⁸ The exercises of true honour are no longer taught in the degraded aristocratic household produced by "the market." The ethics of his inn contrast, Goodstock believes, with those of the arrivistes. The host goes on to say that in the households of newly minted aristocrats youth learn lustfulness, cheating, thievery, and in general the "seven liberal deadly sciences/Of pagery, or rather paganism" (1.3.82–83). The inn, by contrast, is a refuge for virtue and an appropriate venue for the reformation of public space and social ethics.

At least once before Jonson had implied that virtue could be found in an establishment of commercial hospitality. The "Leges Convivales" (1619–24), translated from Jonson's Latin by Alexander Brome, imagines civility within the drinking house. It turns the members of Jonson's club in the Apollo room of The Devil and St. Dunstan's Tavern into equal companions based on their wit and virtue. Brome's translation (1636) begins by insisting that "Guests or Clubbers" be "learned, civil, merry men" and "choise Ladies," all of whom must be "modest".¹⁹ Such qualities do not exclude aristocrats, but importantly, they can include commoners. Brome's use of "civil" (which accommodates Jonson's "*urbani*" and "*honesti*") supports Mervyn James's contention that civility accompanies the movement of political or social discourse out of the traditional estate or court. In the process, the discourse becomes more inclusive. Ascribed status is irrelevant in the "Leges." Rather, the "clubbers" will prove themselves worthy of entry by "emulation" of "Not drinking much, but talking wittily" (ll. 13–14). Wit is central to the public, humanist association imagined by Jonson. It effectively constructs an ethos of civility that is

consistent with celebration and in which status is determined not by social rank or even gender, but by the ability to celebrate decorously. The “Leges” is intended to ensure that nobody who adheres to its humanist ethics will feel uncomfortable or excluded. Such a reformation of status determinants is best accomplished in a public space like the Devil tavern or the Light Heart Inn, in which, as Beaufort tells us, conversation is most widely licensed.

Jonson’s Light Heart Inn is a place of civil conversation not only because participation in sociability is not determined by status, but also because conversation allows guests to become “well pleased and joyful” as Guazzo had imagined. Like Jonson in the “Leges Convivales,” Host Goodstock wants an inn filled with “civil, merry men.” From Lovel, the Host wants the sound of “a cheerful chirping charm” (1.1.42); he wants him to “Be jovial first and drink” (1.2.14); “My guest, my guest, be jovial, I beseech thee” he implores (1.5.1). Goodstock expects all his guests, including Lovel, to be joyful and to enhance, or at least not to hinder, joy in others. He will not allow Lovel to “rest up here... Unless you can be jovial. Brain o’man,/Be jovial first and drink, and dance, and drink!” (1.2.11–14). And the play opens with the Host insisting on the importance of the name of his inn—the “Light Heart”—and his obligation to “maintain the rebus” of his inn’s sign, which would itself “speak” if it could (1.1.9, 2). Goodstock emphasizes the necessity of joy—and links that joy to speech and fellowship—over and over again. He knows, for example, that Lovel’s deepest source of melancholy is his silence. When Lovel complains that he must not speak his love for Lady Frampul because of an obligation to the father of her current suitor, Lord Beaufort, he says “I ha’ made a self-decree,/Ne’er to express my person, though my passion/Burn me to cinders” (1.6.157–59). Goodstock accepts the metaphor of passionate burning but insists that Lovel allow his flame to burn more openly: “Take some advice: be still that rag of love/You are; burn on till you tinder” (1.6.163–64). Earlier, Goodstock had been even clearer, responding to Lovel’s complaint that he went “unregarded” by Lady Frampul by asking how he could blame her “When you were silent and not said a word?” (1.6.114). And indeed, Lady Frampul eventually says that she is “changed” by Lovel’s speech: “By what alchemy/Of love or language am I thus translated” (3.2.170–71). While Lady Frampul’s extended metaphor is developed from alchemy, the near equivalence of “love” and “language” and the momentary figuring of deep personal change as a kind of “translation” is surely significant. In *The New Inn*, honest language facilitates love and profound internal transformation. As Goodstock talks with Lovel, the young lord begins to feel a spiritual weight lift from his shoulders. The host’s eloquence eventually makes Lovel “taste and love” Goodstock (1.5.22), whose “expressions/ Both

take and hold” him (1.5.41–2). At the very least, the Host brings Lovel out of his room and makes him engage in conversation, in its full sense of public speech and behaviour, by talking to him. Lovel begins to come to terms with his psychologically debilitating “debt” or obligation to the old Lord Beaufort when he tells Ferret to “Chalk, and renew the rondels; I am now resolved to stay” (1.6.4–5). “Rondels”—chalked scores that make visible patrons’ drinking debts—were part of any drinking house environment. Commercialized sociability helps Lovel overcome his melancholy by providing easy access to an environment in which conversation is very nearly unavoidable.

The play emphasizes the social and political value of the personal confidence generated within environments that allow civil conversation. It does so largely by presenting one of the most startling but understudied characters in Jonson’s canon. Prudence, Lady Frampul’s chambermaid, dramatizes that aspect of Jonson’s ethic of civility in the “Leges Convivales” which admits articulate women to his club: “*Nec lectae fomeinae repudiantor*”(4). Equally significant is the fact that Pru is merely a chambermaid. This low-status woman contributes to Jonson’s socially reformist ethic by displaying polite speech and persuasive wit. She is less a comic messenger than an ambassador from Lady Frampul to Lovel. Her periodic, Latinate sentences create an elegant tone suggesting that she is more “secretary,” as Ferret calls her, than chambermaid (1.6.25). Immediately after she has first spoken, the Host rightly says she comes “in state” (1.6.31). Pru’s civil wit is manifest in her ability to understand Lovel and give him a plausible reason to attend the “day’s sports devised in th’inn” (1.6.44). When Lovel declines to attend because Lady Frampul “professeth still/To love no soul or body but for her ends/Which are her sports,” Prudence calculates a response to overcome Lovel’s belief that Lady Frampul is merely shallow, cold, and cynical:

O, Master Lovel, you must not give credit
To all that Ladies publicly profess,
Or talk o’ th’ volley unto their servants:
Their tongues and thoughts oft-times lie far asunder.
Yet, when they please, they have their cabinet-counsels
And reserved thoughts, and can retire themselves
As well as others. 1.6.60–66

Pru is well aware of the difference between acting and unexpressed psychological truth, and is able to use this knowledge with great sophistication, reminding Lovel of the difference between self-presentation and interior truth, of “public profess[ion]” and “cabinet-counsels.” Pru’s language is pragmatic and even humanist in the sense that it is associated with the language of of-

fice and state. Beaufort calls her “Good politic Pru” (5.4.26). Thus, the play provides an opportunity for one of those base persons who “have civilitie in their behaviour, and wit in their talke,” as Pettie puts it in his translation of Guazzo, to be admitted to the company of the elite.²⁰ By play’s end, no one can doubt that Pru is, as Lord Latimer calls her, “all-sufficient in her virtue and manners” (5.4.144).

Pru’s self-confident authority, like that of Host Goodstock, allows her to correct boldly the errors of her social superiors. She takes upon herself the task of convincing Lady Frampul that she has been untrue to herself as well as to Lovel. Pru vows to Lovel that she will “be bold ... /To show her ladyship where she hath erred,/And how to tender satisfaction” if he will attend Lady Frampul’s games (1.6.77–79). Pru’s boldness leads her into forceful disagreement with her mistress. Her doubts about Lady Frampul’s intentions toward Lovel offend her mistress, who rashly accuses Pru of being a “Dull, stupid, wench,” an “idiot chambermaid” in a “state of ignorance” (4.4.312–18). But within moments, Lady Frampul is penitent, and acknowledges Pru’s real value to her: “I yet must ha’ thy counsel” (4.4.339). Such dialogue indicates that the ethics of inclusive socialization being imagined in the inn are political. That is, the play imagines that civil discourse allows subordinates to make valuable conciliar contributions.

Pru’s most significant conciliar contribution is as a critic of pretense. Lady Frampul claims to believe that “all are players and but serve the scene” (2.1.39). Pru is not sympathetic to the theatrical metaphor, and expresses her anxiety about her mistress’s ability to protect her integrity in a public inn if she has so little sense of true self. In turn, this forces Lady Frampul to assert herself and to express what she genuinely believes to be true: “As if I lived/To any other scale than what’s my own,/Or sought myself, without myself, from home?” (2.1.59–61). Lady Frampul, echoing the female persona of Jonson’s “To the World,” insists that her values and integrity are solid, and cannot be compromised simply by being away from home. Pru might see this as contradicting her claim, made only moments earlier, that she merely “serve[s] the scene.” Nevertheless, Pru immediately drops the issue and asks that her mistress “pardon” her. But Lady Frampul does not mind criticism as long as it is offered in good faith: “I know ‘tis love in thee,/And so I do interpret it” (2.1.61, 64–65). In fact, Lady Frampul’s response to Pru is a political model for the acceptance of criticism and alternative views. In the humanist fantasy of *The New Inn*, licence is given to criticism and counsel offered by anyone, as long as it is offered in good faith and love.²¹

Remarkably, Pru’s distaste for pretense accumulates puritan overtones. When the Stuffs are discovered to have stolen Lady Frampul’s gown, the reac-

tions of Lady Frampul and Pru are suggestively different. Lady Frampul cries “Pluck the polluted robes over her ears;/Or cut them all to pieces, make a fire o’ them.” Pru then says: “To rags and cinders, burn the idolatrous vestures” (4.3.91–93). The difference lies in the distinction between “polluted” and “idolatrous.” Lady Frampul believes the gown has been polluted, suggesting that nothing was wrong with it prior to the polluting act. By contrast, Pru’s claim that the gown is “idolatrous” is a comment on its essence. Pru’s hostility to “idolatrous vestures” evokes memories of the Elizabethan vestiarian controversy, in which puritans objected to the wearing of priestly vestments, particularly cope and surplice, in the Established Church. Puritans did, at times, burn ecclesiastical garments which they believed to be evil remnants of “popish ceremony.”²²

Pru’s characterization evokes neither political rebelliousness nor theological radicalism. Rather, the play makes of Pru “a kind of puritan” marked by boldness and wit, and in so doing presents puritanism as socially-conscious and internalized self-discipline. In act five, Pru enters wearing Lady Frampul’s “new gown.” According to Lady Frampul, “Thy putting ’em on hath purged and hallowed ’em/From all pollution meant by the mechanics” (5.2.7–8). Lady Frampul becomes so moved by the power of the cleansed gown that she believes it can now be used to recreate the love that Lovel once felt for her. She tells Pru to go to his door and “Name but thy gown,/ And he will rise to that!” (5.2.22–23). Ignoring the double entendre, Pru immediately rejects this scenario: “I had rather die in a ditch... Than owe my wit to clothes, or ha’ it beholden” (5.2.25–26). If the gown is meant to suggest a priestly vestment, Lady Frampul clearly believes that it has power in itself. This pushes her beyond Arminianism toward Roman Catholicism, perhaps consistent with her half-joking comment that she does “express [her] love to idolatry” (4.4.309). Pru, by contrast, believes that her own inner virtue, her “wit” as she herself calls it, cleanses and reorders the outer world. She will “owe” nothing to something as superficial as a vestment. This self-confidence is itself suggestive of a puritan mindset, but Goodstock’s response to Pru’s rejection of the gown’s power adds even more resonance. He immediately says “Still spirit of Pru!” (5.2.27). The connotations of Goodstock’s “spirit” may include the “Holy Spirit” to which puritans frequently gave credit for their understanding of the world.²³ More certainly, we see that Pru’s bold self-confidence is fully compatible with the civil conversation for which Goodstock always speaks.

Thus, when *The New Inn* was first staged in 1629, an audience might hear even more than a call for secular civil inclusiveness in Beaufort’s fifth act dispute with Lady Frampul over the degree of licence at the inn. Beaufort

opposes “licence” and “community” not only to Lady Frampul’s “laws of hospitality” but also to her “fair rites.” The marriage rite would have been “fair,” Lady Frampul says, if she had been made “acquainted” with it. As presumed host, she expects a degree of control over rituals and their participants. Lady Frampul’s “fair rites” generates a moment of conflict in which ecclesiastical politics are put in question. Are rites necessarily “fair” when understood within a metaphorical framework of traditional, hierarchical grand hospitality? As Beaufort replies, Lady Frampul is not in her “own house” but at a public inn. His assertion of “licence/Of all community” resists the restrictions and limitations of traditional great household ethics by making a claim to free and wide ranging communication. His assertion thus responds to the religious force of Lady Frampul’s “fair rites” by advocating the delimitation of religious communications in a broad sense. To participate in community, to commune and communicate, could (and can) mean both to administer and to receive Holy Communion and to discuss devotional issues.²⁴ Through the connotation of community as Communion, Jonson releases the idea of ecclesiastical inclusiveness. Adding Beaufort’s “licence” to the religious sense of “community,” it appears that Beaufort claims that the permissiveness in the inn extends in meaning to include a rejection of hierarchical restriction over religious participation and discussion. All members of the inn are licensed to communicate regardless of devotional orientation. As I will show, licence of devotional communication and communion was especially controversial in 1629.

Jeffrey Knapp has persuasively argued for the significance of inclusive, Erasmian Reformism as a powerful condition of possibility for the drama of Shakespeare and Jonson. Knapp has characterized Jonson’s accommodationist drama as gaining cultural and dramatic significance by its direct opposition to the puritan culture of preaching and theological severity.²⁵ But while the younger Jonson’s great comedies are famed for their satires of puritans, Caroline drama—even Jonson’s drama—is engaged with social and political conditions that are different from those of the early to mid-Jacobean theater. In the late 1620s, a time of intense pressure on theological argument and pastoral speech, the kind of anti-sermonizing theological minimalism Knapp finds in theater, and assigns to both Laud and Jonson, could no longer be seen in every quarter as inclusive and accommodationist. It was certainly not seen by puritans as productive of spiritual comfort. *The New Inn* generates a tolerant accommodationism broader and more tolerant than Knapp imagines, and is engaged with the religious controversy of its time more directly than critics have realized.

The period between the accession of King Charles in 1625 and the final Parliament before the personal rule of the 1630s was a time of increasing religious antagonism between Arminians and Calvinists. It was, in general and with the support of the King himself, a period of increasing power and prestige for the Arminians, and of declining fortunes for the previously dominant Calvinists.²⁶ A key ideological shift during the 1620s was the successful identification by Arminian polemicists of Calvinism with puritanism, a shift that recast the image of Calvinism from that of the orthodox theology of the Established Church to the heterodox ecclesiastical and political rebelliousness that King James had defined as puritanism. Partly as a result of this redefinition, King Charles frequently appointed Arminian bishops to replace Calvinist ones. In the 1628 Parliament, several members made clear their belief that the increasing dominance of Arminianism in the highest ranks of the Church was a threat to English liberty because it threatened the beliefs and consciences of orthodox Calvinists.²⁷

The continuing controversies about religion both in Parliament and in the pulpits appears to have concerned the King, who in November 1628 issued a Declaration, prefixed to a reissue of the Thirty-nine Articles, banning preaching and university disputation about contentious issues in religion:²⁸

That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences... we will, that all further curious speech be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

That if any public Reader in either of our Universities, or any Head or Master of a College... or if any divine in the Universities shall preach or print any thing either way, other than is already established in Convocation with our royal assent; he, or they the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure in our commission ecclesiastical, as well as any other; and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.²⁹

The Declaration further asserts that clergy have in the past had no trouble understanding and agreeing to “the true, usual, literal meaning of the said articles; and that even in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the articles of the Church of England to be for them...” The contentious issues, or “curious points,” included predestination and free-will, the key doctrines separating Arminians and Calvinists. In his posthumous *Table-Talk*, Jonson's friend John Selden, for one, perceives the

dispute between Calvinists and Arminians as paradoxical and irresolvable and its participants as trapped in extremes. Selden writes:

The Puritans who will allow no free-will at all, but God does all, yet will allow the subject his liberty to do or not to do, notwithstanding the King, the God upon earth. The Arminians, who hold we have Free-will, yet say, when we come to the King, there must be all obedience, and no liberty to be stood for.³⁰

Despite the 1628 Declaration's assertion of widespread popular consent to the Articles, Selden makes clear for us that "curious points" did separate the Calvinists from Arminians and from "obedience" to King and Church hierarchy. In defending the status quo the Declaration privileges the Arminians, already on the ascendant.³¹

Though the Parliament of 1628 was not able to agree that the court was suppressing liberties in its support of Arminianism, the Declaration against contentious preaching created a much more public sense of oppression. A petition, circulated among London clergy in 1629, complained that the Declaration was

pressed upon us, as we are not a little discouraged and deterred from preaching those saving doctrines of God's free grace in election and predestination, which greatly confirme our faith of eternal salvation and fervently kindle our love to God... So as we are brought into a great strait either of incurring God's heavy displeasure, if we do not faithfully discharge our embassage in declaring the whole councill of God, or the danger of being censured for violators of your Majestie's said acts, if we preach these constant doctrines of our Church and confute the opposite Pelagian and Arminian heresies [which are] both preached and printed boldly without feare of censure. As if the saving doctrines of Christ were prohibited and these impious heresies priviledged.³²

The petition clearly finds the November 1628 Declaration oppressive and disheartening. It has been "pressed" upon preachers, forcing them to abandon pastoral discussion and preaching of predestination as a source of comfort.³³ The preachers are thus in "a great strait" or dilemma of having to choose between God and the King. What is unfair, according to the petition, is that Arminianism is expounded "boldly and without feare of censure" while Calvinism—"these constant doctrines of our Church"—is silenced. In essence, according to the petition, the Declaration takes away from puritans the satisfaction of free expression and the comforts of predestinarian belief.

The New Inn's thematization of comforting civil conversation, which through Pru comes to include boldly-stated religious opinion, certainly appears more polemical and significant against this background of heightened anxiety about religious speech. Indeed, the play makes explicit reference to

such discomfort. Anxiety about puritanism and forms of puritan expression, for example—not new in the late 1620s but certainly heightened by the increasing institutional power of Arminianism—is explicitly resisted in *The New Inn*. During his second hour of assigned speech to Lady Frampul, on the topic of true valour, Lovel’s discourse turns to the Senecan stoicism towards which Jonson himself was especially affectionate. Lovel imagines “I am kept out a masque, sometime thrust out,/ Made wait a day, two, three, for a great word/ Which (when it comes forth) is all frown and forehead” and then asserts the value of being able nonetheless “To feel with contemplation mine own quiet!” (4.4.184–89). In the midst of this compelling and deeply Jonsonian fantasy of indifference to court scorn, Lovel imagines another way of describing valiant stoic self-control:

So he is valiant
That yields not unto wrongs, not he that scapes ‘em.
They that do pull down churches and deface
The holiest altars, cannot hurt the godhead. (4.4.206–09)

Iconoclasts “cannot hurt” God, and so they need not concern the valiant and virtuous. This is by no means advocacy for early-modern Protestant iconoclasm, but it is a rejection of the kind of intense anxiety about puritanism fostered by the Arminianism popular in Charles’ court. Moments after Lovel finishes, Pru congratulates him on his brilliant and moving discourse: “The whole court runs into your sentence, sir” (4.4.225). Religious controversy here provides Jonson with the opportunity to dramatize a fantasy in which tolerant moral authority is unambiguously respected in court. In fact, because Lovel’s discourses cause Lady Frampul to acknowledge her deep affection for Lovel, the play can be seen as imagining tolerance for puritanism as emotionally powerful proof of great-heartedness and virtue. The religious context of the late 1620s in which sectarian tolerance was diminishing thus helps us locate and understand at least part of the affective power of the play.

The loquacious and ever-optimistic Host Goodstock marks the value of tolerant religious thought through language that is at once more generalized than Lovel’s, but nonetheless politically resonant in 1629. From the beginning of the play, Goodstock figures his Light Heart Inn as a place of spiritual ease and joyful conversation. In much of his language, we can hear the Reformist minimalism located elsewhere in Jonson and Shakespeare by Knapp. A deep cultural relationship between wine and joy facilitates Goodstock’s construction of the inn as a site of spiritual rehabilitation. In his attempt to persuade the melancholy and solitary Lord Lovel to be merry, Goodstock happily shares the innkeeper’s philosophy I have already quoted:

Gi' me good wine, or catholic or christian,
 Wine is the word that glads the heart of man,
 And mine's the house of wine. 'Sack', says my bush;
 'Be merry and drink sherry': that's my posy!
 For I shall never joy i' my Light Heart
 So long as I conceive a sullen guest,
 Or anything that's earthy! (1.2.26–32)

For Goodstock, guests who are “sullen” and “earthy” diminish the heavenly and spiritual ethos enabled by wine and joy. The host tries to bring Lovel into the “merry” civil community of the inn by reminding Lovel of the Christian commitment to joy. “Wine is the word that glads the heart of man” alludes to Psalm 104, which praises God for making “wine that maketh glad the heart of man.”³⁴ Moments earlier, the host had called wine his “cor leatificat,” a reference to the Vulgate version of the same psalm.³⁵ The heart-gladdening “word” can be seen as a reference to the Word or Scripture, which gives joy whether in its old Latin and Catholic or newer “christian” or Protestant version. If wine is the Word, and the Light Heart is the “house of wine,” the metaphor suggests that the inn is the house of the Word, or a surprisingly inclusive Reformed Church. Knowledge of the Scripture is, in the conversational terms of the play, comparable to and as enjoyable as drinking good wine or engaging in “merry” civil conversation. All three sources of joy are deeply authorized by Psalm 104.

The fact that Jonson allows Goodstock to describe the pleasure-giving wine cum Word as either “catholic or christian” is especially telling of a tolerant inclusiveness meant to allay anxiety. Jonson here remembers a particularly Jacobean ecclesiastical ideal in which the English Church would be catholic in the sense of being acceptable to all Protestants and Roman Catholics, and Christian in the sense of being reformed of superstition. King James had considered such inclusiveness essential for the long-term stability of Christendom.³⁶ Recent work on the distinctions between Jacobean and Caroline ecclesiastical policies has emphasized the wide scope of inclusion in the Established Church under James, whose theology was Calvinist, but whose ecclesiology was surprisingly ecumenical and whose politics were unionist and irenic. King James envisioned a reformed and universal or catholic Church in which agreement with only “a small number of key doctrines” was essential to membership.³⁷ In *A Premonition to all most Mighty Monarchs, Kings, Free Princes and States of Christendom* (1609), James defined himself as a “Catholic Christian, as believeth the three creeds, that of the Apostles, that of the Council of Nicea, and that of Athanasius.”³⁸ James

wished to exclude from the Church only those whom he considered to be politically subversive, puritans and Jesuits in particular.³⁹ James defined “puritan” politically, not theologically, believing puritans to be those who were unwilling to “express their case for further reformation in the language of expediency, while accepting that the issues themselves were indifferent.”⁴⁰ Thus, James imagined a Reformed Church established by basic doctrines which he thought could be confirmed in Scripture. It is to this broad, ecumenical Christianity that Jonson has Goodstock refer as he tries to ease Lovel’s melancholy. By endowing the ethically credible Goodstock with the language of sectarian inclusiveness favoured by King Charles’s father, the play offers a subtle critique of the religious strains generated by Charles’s apparent sectarian and theological favouritism.

Goodstock’s metaphor likening the Inn to an inclusive Church is part of a larger pattern of imaginative convertability enabled by the inn’s role as a place of hospitality and charity. In the first scene, Goodstock compares his inn to a great manor house, insisting that only “jovial guests” can bring his “harvest home” (1.1.22–23). Elsewhere, Goodstock jokes that if his guests abandon him, he might “Convert mine inn to an almshouse or a spital” (1.5.35). In act five, the inn’s stable becomes, in effect, a church when Beaufort and Laetitia are married in it. Goodstock says, with mock horror and a further anxiety-allaying joke about the puritan conviction that the Church as an institution ought to be humbled: “I ha’ known many a church been made a stable,/But not a stable made a church till now” (5.1.14–15). The fact that Goodstock does not organize the marriage, and is entirely unaware that it will prove genuine and lasting, suggests that the play itself is sympathetic to Goodstock’s tendency to imagine his inn as a place of spiritual comfort. In *The New Inn*, an inn’s stable does become a church. The imaginative convertability of church and inn allows Jonson to emphasize the role of both as places of humble comfort and inclusive, civil fellowship.

The politics of *The New Inn* are remarkable, especially for a play by Jonson. Its romantic, Shakespearean conclusion, emphasizing reunification, is made to depend on honest speech, fellowship, and tolerance for sociability among people of mixed status, and even of tolerance for bold puritan speech. The fifth act is not as thematically disconnected from the earlier part of the play as is sometimes suggested, though it certainly offers a surprising generic shift.⁴¹ Jonson surely hoped his audience would be surprised by the scope of his play’s inclusiveness. But the play does more than generate surprise. It reflects and enhances a reformist civility which allows both dispute and joyful harmony, and promises greater vitality in both the Church and the secular world. Civil conversation, which appears to Jonson particularly

appropriate in a place of commercial hospitality, is extended to include religious controversy. It makes inn and Church ethically commensurate and mutually affirming as public places of reformatory civility and release from anxiety. The dramatization of such surprising inclusiveness must owe much to the 1628 Declaration restricting pastoral speech, but it also owes much to Jonson's own spirited attachment to the ideal of civil conversation in the inn or tavern.

University of Manitoba

Notes

I thank David Bevington, Bradin Cormack, Judith Owens, Richard Strier, and the anonymous readers for *Renaissance and Reformation* for many helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

1. Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation and Theater in Renaissance England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); on Jonson, see especially pp. 43–53. See also David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1984), pp. 246–47. Neither Knapp nor Norbrook discusses *The New Inn*.
2. Ben Jonson, *The New Inn, or The Light Heart*, ed. Michael Hattaway (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 1.2.26–32. This edition will be cited throughout.
3. *The Alchemist*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 3.1.38. Consider also the “silenc’d brethren” of *Epicoene*, 2.2.80 and the “silent Minister” of *Bartholomew Fair*, 5.2.64.
4. On Jonson's gradual reconversion to Catholicism, see David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 339–42.
5. Butler, “Late Jonson,” in *The Politics of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare and After*, ed. Gordon McMullan and Jonathan Hope (London: Routledge, 1992). Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson: Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). See also Barton's “*The New Inn* and the Problem of Jonson's Late Style,” *English Literary Renaissance* 9 (1979), pp. 395–418.
6. F. Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 202–03.
7. Peter Alan Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200–1830* (London: Longman, 1983), p.115, quote p. 127.
8. S.K Roberts, “Alehouses, brewing, and government under the early Stuarts,” *Southern History* 2 (1980), p. 46.
9. Roberts, p. 49. Robert Ashton notes that it was the “defective operation under local governments” of the system of inn and alehouse licensing that led to the Stuarts' attempt at centralized regulation through patents. Mompesson's patent, however, was administered in the interests of personal profit rather than public good. On one London street, he licensed six inns where none had previously existed, obviously compromising the spirit of regulation and limitation that had motivated the grant of the patent in the first place. See Ashton's “Popular Entertainment and Social Control in Later Elizabethan and Early Stuart London,” *London Journal* 9 (1983), p. 11. For a concise history of the licensing

of drinking houses in this period, see C.M. Isles, "Early Stages of English Public House Regulation," *Economic Journal* 13 (1903), pp. 251–62.

10. Among the relevant *Oxford English Dictionary* definitions of community are: 1a) "The quality of appertaining to or being held by all in common; joint or common ownership, tenure, liability, etc."; 3) "Social intercourse; fellowship, communion"; 5) "Commonness, ordinary occurrence"; 6) "The body of those having common or equal rights or rank, as distinguished from the privileged classes; the body of commons; the commonalty."
11. Theodore B. Leinwand, "Spongy plebs, mighty lords, and the dynamics of the alehouse," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 19 (1989), p. 168.
12. Lines 5–6, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. Ian Donaldson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 304.
13. Daniel Javitch, "Rival Arts of Conduct in Elizabethan England: Guazzo's *Civile Conversation* and Castiglione's *Courtier*," *Yearbook of Italian Studies* 1 (1971), pp. 188–95.
14. *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo*, Books 1–3, trans. George Pettie (London: Constable, 1925), pp. 117, 46, 22, 167, 113, 193. Book 4, trans. Bartholmew Young, (orig. pub. London, 1581). "Conversation" continued to include both talk and behaviour well into the seventeenth century.
15. On humanist distaste for aristocracy of birth and the concomitant ideology of the Great Chain of Being, a distaste which results from the belief that virtues and good behaviour can be inculcated in anyone, see Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 176–205.
16. Mervyn James argues that the humanist environment of the school helped displace the culture and religious traditions of the grand household or lineage society. In the resulting civil society, "generalized discourse" entailed a meritocratic and self-determining ethic. See James's *Family, Lineage, and Civil Society: A Study of Society, Politics, and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 194.
17. Both Butler, "Late Jonson," and Julie Sanders, "'The Day's Sports Devised in the Inn,'" *Modern Language Review* 91 (1996), pp. 545–60, assert that the play reflects the increasing use of inns as social alternatives to decaying aristocratic domestic culture. Steven Earnshaw argues that Jonson's inn exhibits the problems of England's traditional estates, but in itself brings nothing positive to Jonson's fantasy of social rehabilitation. See Earnshaw's *The Pub in Literature: England's Altered State* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 82–87.
18. For the causes, consequences, and criticism of the Stuarts' sale of titles, see Lawrence Stone, *Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558–1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 65–128.
19. Lines 1, 3–4, in "Ben. Johnsons Sociable rules for the Apollo" *Alexander Brome: Poems*, vol. 1, ed. Roman Dubinsky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982). The "Leges Convivales" can be found in *Ben Jonson*, vol. 8, ed. C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson.
20. *Civile Conversation*, book 2, p. 193.
21. Laurie Shannon demonstrates that in classical and Elizabethan philosophy and literature "the harsh corrective speech of the counselor gains power from its proximity to friendship." See *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts* (Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press, 2002), p. 52. I would suggest that counsel also gains credibility by its proximity to both love and boldness.
22. Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 31.
 23. For the importance of the spirit in puritanism, see Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946).
 24. The *Oxford English Dictionary* entry for “commune” includes: 8a) “To administer the Holy Communion to”; and b) “To receive the Holy Communion, to communicate.” The entry also includes 7) “To hold intimate (chiefly mental or spiritual) intercourse (*with*).” In the sixteenth century, this use is predominantly Biblical. All uses predate Jonson’s era.
 25. Knapp. See especially Chapter 4, “Preachers and Players.”
 26. For a general review of the increasing dominance of Arminianism in the Caroline Church, see Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 1–8, 125–247; see also Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, “The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I,” *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1993), pp. 23–49.
 27. Peter White has argued, in “The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered,” *Past and Present* 101 (1983), pp. 34–54, that the apparent dispute between Calvinism and Arminianism was in fact a less serious dispute between varieties of Calvinism. As Margo Todd replies, however, in *Christian Humanism*, p. 10, “The contention clearly existed... [and] puritans did see themselves as defenders of predestinarian orthodoxy...”
 28. For the place of religious contention in the 1628 Parliament, see Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics 1621–1629* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 343–45.
 29. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660*, ed. Samuel R. Gardiner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), pp. 75–6. King Charles had issued a similar Declaration in June 1626, in which he had ordered that his subjects “neither by Writing, Preaching, Printing, Conferences, or otherwise. . . raise any doubts, or publish or maintaine any new inventions, or opinions concerning Religion, then such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England... and if any person. . . adventure to break this Rule of sobrietie, and due obedience to his Majestie, and his Lawes. . . His Majestie dothe hereby straitly charge, and command all his reverend Archbishops and Bishops in their severall Diocesses, speedily to reclaime and repress all such spirits. . .”. See *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, vol. 2, ed. James F. Larkin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), p. 92. Similar points were made in the Declaration issued in January 1629 suppressing the controversial book *Appello Caesarem*.
 30. *The Table-Talk of John Selden*, ed. S.W. Singer, (orig. publ. 1689, London: Routledge, 1900), pp. 133–34.
 31. For more on the background to the Declaration, see Fincham and Lake, p. 39; also Tyacke, pp. 76–78.
 32. Quoted in Tyacke, p. 182.
 33. For the comforting intent of Reformation theology, see Richard Strier, *Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert’s Poetry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 104–5, 114–42. Debora Shuger argues, *contra* Strier, that Calvinism is

“hopelessly contradictory” about inner assurance of salvation, and that the “experiential difference” between Calvinism and Arminianism “seems negligible.” See Shuger’s *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (reprint, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), pp. 7–8. With Margo Todd, I would continue to emphasize that Calvinists did perceive themselves to be in conflict with anti-predestinarian forces, and that Calvinists believed their spiritual comfort to be at stake in the conflict.

34. *Authorized Version*, Psalm 104:15.
35. In his annotation to these lines in the Manchester edition, Michael Hattaway explains “cor laetificat” as an allusion to the psalm, but does not comment on the significance of the allusion, or on the fact that Goodstock ultimately alludes to both Vulgate and Protestant texts. Hattaway suggests “catholic” signifies the “realm of anti-Christ” for the host, without explanation. I find no evidence for this.
36. Evidence suggests that Queen Elizabeth also wanted the Church under her leadership to be inclusive. However, W.B. Patterson argues that a key difference between her position and that of James was that the King was willing to engage in an ecumenical Christian council involving the Pope or a papal legate in order to effect a “generall Christian union.” Elizabeth had been unwilling to converse with the Pope or his officers as long as there was a chance that the papacy might appear to have authority over her. Despite setbacks such as the Gunpowder Plot and resulting Oath of Allegiance, James “was a persistent proponent of a general council to promote a lasting religious settlement in Europe. He did not see the Church of England as a competitor to international Calvinism or an implacable foe to Roman Catholicism.” See his *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 31–74, 154.
37. Fincham and Lake, p. 24.
38. Quoted in Lori Anne Ferrell, *Government by Polemic: James I, the King’s Preachers, and the Rhetoric of Conformity, 1603–1625* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), p. 135. Fincham and Lake, p. 28, write that “The king did not share the view of many protestants that papists erred over beliefs central to the faith. Instead he distinguished between core Catholic doctrines to be held *de fide* and other issues on which debate and disagreement were acceptable among Christian brethren. This allowed James to argue that the Church of Rome, though vitiated with serious errors of belief and practice, still remained a true Church since it professed the crucial doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Such a view underpinned his plans to reunite Christendom, based on the authority of scripture and the practice of the primitive Church and effected through a general council of princes.” Knapp, p. 52, quotes Sir John Harrington’s earlier *Tract on the Succession to the Crown* (1602) to the same effect: “*Christian* is my name, *Catholic* my surname.”
39. Patterson, pp. 40, 46–47.
40. Fincham and Lake, p. 25.
41. David Riggs, pp. 302–07, emphasizes the distinction between the comedy of manners in acts one through four, and the Hellenistic romance of act five.