

Actors, Orators, and the Boundaries of Drama in Elizabethan Universities

DANIEL BLANK, *Princeton University*

This article discusses the debates over drama that took place in the English universities during the late sixteenth century. It reconsiders the career of the Oxford academic and theologian John Rainolds, whose objections to student performance are usually conflated with attacks upon professional drama. This article argues instead that his opposition arose largely from two related institutional concerns: the equation of drama with rhetorical exercises and the increasing use of spectacle in university plays. The controversy over theatrical performance is thus cast in a new light as an inquiry into the place and purpose of drama within university culture.

INTRODUCTION

IN FEBRUARY 1592, three plays by William Gager (1555–1622), the Elizabethan era's chief academic dramatist, were performed during the Shrovetide festival at Christ Church, Oxford. On the first night, Gager's new play *Ulysses Redux* was presented; the second night featured a revival of his comedy *Rivales*, originally staged during the 1583 visit of a Polish official.¹ Thomas Thornton (ca. 1541–1629), Gager's friend and fellow member of Christ Church, had invited the Oxford academic and theologian John Rainolds (1549–1607) to attend the festivities, but Rainolds promptly declined. Upon receiving a second invitation, Rainolds wrote a letter to Thornton enumerating his reasons for finding academic drama inappropriate.² When Gager's version of Seneca's *Hippolytus* was performed on the third night of the festival, it included the added character of Momus, who chided the preceding performance in language notably similar to Rainolds's own. In response to this alleged caricature, Rainolds did not hesitate to assert his opinion in writing, and a lengthy correspondence between Rainolds and Gager on the appropriateness

For helpful advice and comments on earlier drafts, I am grateful to Leonard Barkan, Sarah Case, Bradin Cormack, Jeff Dolven, Mordechai Feingold, Anthony Grafton, Russ Leo, Rhodri Lewis, Kirsten Macfarlane, and Nigel Smith. I would also like to thank the anonymous readers for their insightful suggestions. All italics in quotations are found in the original sources. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

¹For an overview of Gager's life and dramatic output, see Brooke.

²This letter is transcribed in Young, 1916a, 108–11.

of academic drama ensued. Gager's protestations that Momus had not been intended as a reference to any particular person fell on deaf ears, and Rainolds's unrelenting attack, published in 1599 as *Th'overthrow of stage-playes*, cemented his reputation as what Frederick Boas has called "the fiercest and most powerful assailant of the University stage."³

Rainolds's relationship to the theater has long appeared perplexing. He performed in front of Queen Elizabeth (r. 1558–1603) to great acclaim during her first visit to Oxford in 1566: he was, in fact, one of only two student actors to receive Elizabeth's personal commendation.⁴ When Elizabeth returned to Oxford in 1592, however, the tone of their interaction was quite different. Rainolds was embroiled in the most significant debate over theatrical performance ever realized in the university, and the queen, not at all pleased with his apparently disrespectful behavior, publicly scolded him. During an address to an audience of university leaders, she commanded his obedience and, according to the Oxford historian Anthony Wood (1632–95), "schooled [him] for his obstinate preciseness, willing him to follow her laws, and not run before them."⁵ The degree to which these comments resulted directly from Rainolds's publicly acknowledged disapproval of student performance is unclear, as she perceived his insubordination to extend well beyond his condemnation of drama. Nonetheless, she must not have appreciated Rainolds's outspoken censure of an activity that she had actively encouraged—dramatic performances were a prominent feature of her royal visits—and it seems likely that the queen had him in mind when she spoke of the "overly curious and inquisitive intellects" in the oration that followed.⁶ In less than three decades, Rainolds had gone from receiving the queen's compliments to being the primary object of her irritation. He had also developed from the university stage's talented newcomer into its most notorious adversary.

Modern scholars have almost invariably viewed Rainolds as a symbol of staunch Puritan antitheatricalism. In E. K. Chambers's classic study of the Elizabethan stage, Rainolds's religious fervor is taken as a prime example of the

³Boas, 1914, 106.

⁴See Elliott, 1988. Rainolds's participation in the queen's entertainments is confirmed through his own recollection some years later, as will be discussed below, where he recounts having played the part of Hippolyta in a now-lost play called *Palamon and Arcite*. His involvement is also known through the account of Miles Windsor (ca. 1541–1624), one of the occasion's actors, whose list of the "Actors in the Playes" is given at Corpus Christi College, Oxford (hereafter CCC), MS 257, fol. 107^r. For an overview of the queen's first visit to Oxford and discussion of the plays performed, see Boas, 1914, 98–108; Keenan, 2007, 95–101. Contemporary accounts of the visit are available in Goldring et al., 1:466–672.

⁵Wood, 1792–96, 2:251.

⁶Goldring et al., 3:629.

opposition between Puritanism and humanism.⁷ In Jonas Barish's seminal work on antitheatrical prejudice, Rainolds is portrayed as a raving antagonist, who "in the final decade of the [sixteenth] century . . . is found to be fulminating against all theatrical productions, of whatever origin, under whatever auspices, and against all plays, in whatever languages, of whatever apparent harmlessness of subject matter."⁸ Certainly, rigid attitudes received from these and other twentieth-century critics have begun to be questioned: Thomas Postlewait and Mark Bayer have recently called into question Chambers's overly neat division between theater and religion,⁹ while Peter Lake has convincingly asserted that generalized accounts like Barish's would benefit from a more cautious treatment of the "complexities" involved.¹⁰ As yet, however, a nuanced account of Rainolds's views on theatrical performance does not exist, nor has any study undertaken a careful consideration of the factors that occasioned his transformation from renowned performer to steadfast Reformer.

Aside from these general discussions, Rainolds's opposition to drama has most frequently garnered mention in the past several decades within two critical contexts. The first is concerned with English antitheatricalists' anxieties about effeminization and sexual desire, which the early modern stage was seen to promote through the biblically prohibited practice of cross-dressing.¹¹ Scholars cite Rainolds as a prime example of this fear,¹² usually in reference to his claim that "the putting of womens attire on men" might stimulate "sparkles of lust" within both the actors and their audience.¹³ Also relevant are Rainolds's worries about the homosexual impulses that might result from young boys acting while

⁷Chambers, 1:250–53.

⁸Barish, 83.

⁹Bayer, 30–67; Postlewait, esp. 95–109. Both of these authors raise serious objections to the persistent notion that antitheatricalism was, as Bayer, 34, writes, a "prevalent sentiment among Londoners." While the pages below argue that Rainolds should be viewed in a context largely separate from London, the idea that writings about the theater did not necessarily reflect the attitude of their communities is important to bear in mind when considering Renaissance Oxford, where there is little evidence to suggest that Rainolds's views were reflective of a widespread sentiment.

¹⁰Lake and Questier, 570.

¹¹This was predominantly an issue in England, where the restriction of women acting on the public stage was continuous during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, as discussed by Orgel, 1989. The length and intensity of early modern arguments about cross-dressing on the stage seem to have been unmatched elsewhere in Europe. Recent studies, however, have called attention to the instances in which theatrical cross-dressing did occur on the Continent, as well as the debates provoked. On stage transvestism in France and Spain, respectively, see Gray, 144–49; Heise. For an overview of the European situation, see Rennert, 137–45.

¹²See Cressy, 443; Garber, 29; Levine, 96; Orgel, 1996, 27–29; Traub, 119.

¹³Rainolds, 1599, 11.

dressed as women, which, citing Xenophon and Clement of Alexandria, he compares to the sting of a poisonous spider.¹⁴ Rainolds's vivid articulation of the lustfulness encouraged by theatrical performance has led him to receive attention in this area, and his rigid aversion to cross-dressing—which occupies a large portion of his correspondence with both Thornton and Gager—has repeatedly been asserted as the most significant aspect of his attack, often to the exclusion of other factors.¹⁵

The second line of critical inquiry in which Rainolds often appears deals with anti-Catholic polemic, and the antitheatricalists' equation of dramatic performance with idolatrous worship.¹⁶ In this context, a single excerpt from the end of Rainolds's second letter to Gager is usually referenced, in which Rainolds compares theater to the Catholic Mass: "*Popish Priests . . . have transformed the celebrating of the Sacrament of the Lords supper into a Masse-game, and all other partes of Ecclesiasticall service into theatricall sights; so, in steede of preaching the word, they cause it to be played.*"¹⁷ To Protestant Reformers, popery and theater seemed dangerously similar, and even interchangeable in their mode of presentation and visual representation; the Jesuits' regular employment of dramatic performance surely fueled this equation. Rainolds was a strong proponent of the Protestant cause—so much so, in fact, that he was sometimes called upon by prominent figures to publicly display his skills as a controversialist—and he was widely considered one of the fiercest polemicists in sixteenth-century England.¹⁸ These aspects of his career have led to the appealing assumption that his attack upon the theater was rooted in larger societal concerns about the remnants of Catholicism.

Both of the critical perspectives set forth here provide valuable insight into the antitheatrical writings of the period and the motivations that underlay them. The shared tendency of such studies, however, is to overlook the

¹⁴Ibid., 18.

¹⁵Young, 1916b, 594, lists as Rainolds's primary position that "the wearing of woman's apparel by men is condemned by Scripture, by Christian writers, and by Church councils." A more recent example is found in Jardine, who discusses Rainolds as the prime example of the "polemicists who attacked cross-dressing as the fundamental depraving feature" of theatrical performance: Jardine, 14–17 (quotation on 14).

¹⁶See Lake and Questier, 447; O'Connell, 14–15; Rice, 15–16; Shuger, 1994, 163; Williamson, 85–86.

¹⁷Rainolds, 1599, 161.

¹⁸For instance, Rainolds was sent in the early 1580s by Sir Francis Walsingham (ca. 1532–90), principal secretary to Queen Elizabeth, to debate with the English Catholic John Hart, who had been sentenced to death. The series of conferences took place in Oxford and London, resulting in the widely circulated 1584 publication *The summe of the conference betwene Iohn Rainoldes and Iohn Hart: touching the head and the faith of the Church*.

complexity and the specificity of Rainolds's attack. They consistently place his writings against drama alongside those directed toward the professional stage, grouping his concerns together with those of English antitheatricalists—chiefly John Northbrooke (fl. 1567–89), Stephen Gosson (1554–1625), Philip Stubbes (ca. 1555–1610), and William Prynne (1600–69)—whose purposes and objectives, despite substantial overlap, differed significantly from his own. Rainolds's primary concern lay not in professional theatricals but with plays staged by youth in the educational setting—specifically at the University of Oxford, where the nature of academic playing shifted significantly during the second half of the sixteenth century. In conflating his concerns with other contemporary attacks on the stage, analyses of the period's antitheatrical critique tend to overshadow the concerns that were particular to Rainolds's academic environment, thus precluding a complete understanding of his motivations and the theatrical culture that gave rise to them.

This article attempts to recover the institutional concerns that prompted Rainolds to assail the tradition of university drama. Two of these, it argues, shaped his attack most profoundly: first, drama's potential to interfere with the academic curriculum and, in particular, rhetorical training; second, the increasing use of spectacle in university plays, which had begun to resemble an ancient tradition of festival entertainment. By restoring Rainolds's attack to its institutional setting, this article shows that the controversy over theatrical performance in Elizabethan Oxford was not simply a matter of Puritan zeal, as it has so often been judged. It was instead an unparalleled investigation into the evolving role of drama within the university and its potential to either enhance or disturb the academic process.

STUDENT PERFORMERS AND PROFESSIONAL PLAYERS: AN OXFORD DEBATE

The issue of theatrical performance received a great deal of attention at the University of Oxford during the late sixteenth century. In 1584, students taking part in a disputation required for the degree of master of arts were given the following subject: "Should stage-plays be permitted in a well-governed community?"¹⁹ The subject of a 1593 disputation required for the degree of doctor of civil law followed on a similar theme: "Are actors infamous?"²⁰

¹⁹Clark, 2:170: "Utrum ludi scenici in bene instituta civitate probandi sint?" This disputation was part of the ceremonial process through which bachelors received their MA degrees, known as "Inception": see *ibid.*, 2:82–85.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 2:183: "An histriones sint infames?" On Inception in civil law, see *ibid.*, 2:120–22.

Disputations were an integral part of the sixteenth-century Oxford curriculum at all levels, and they were often featured during ceremonial occasions.²¹ That these issues should be selected for such important proceedings, especially across different faculties, indicates the degree to which this was a prevalent question throughout the university sphere. This is further emphasized by the fact that the subjects chosen for disputation are known to have sometimes reflected issues of contemporary concern.²²

While the suitability of drama had long been a matter of question within the university, increasing anxieties about the continued presence of traveling companies in Oxford, likely exacerbated by the opening of the London public playhouses in the 1570s, caused the debate to become more topical in the final decades of the sixteenth century.²³ Oxford authorities felt a pressing need to distinguish professional dramatic performances from those put on by their fellow academics. In July 1584, the university passed a statute under the leadership of Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester (1532/33–1588), in his capacity as chancellor of Oxford, which banned professional players from performing within university precincts.²⁴ In establishing this prohibition, however, Leicester went to great lengths to ensure that academic plays were exempted, declaring them to be “co[m]mendable and greate funderances of learning.”²⁵ Leicester, a friend of Gager’s, officially endorsed academic drama on the grounds that it was an integral component of the educational process, even calling for the frequency of such plays to be increased.

The following year, a friend of both Leicester and Gager, John Case (1540/41?–1600), addressed the question in a similar vein in a section of his commentary on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, entitled *Speculum Moraliū Quæstionum in Universam Ethicē Aristotelis* (Mirror of moral questions on the

²¹While the format of disputations varied, they generally involved a student respondent, who would present a prepared response to a question; he would then receive an answer from one or more opponents, usually holders of senior positions, who pointed out flaws in the student’s reasoning and argumentation. On the structure and importance of disputations at Oxford and Cambridge, see Curtis, 88–90; Fletcher, 168–70; Mack, 58–66; Shuger, 2009.

²²Clark, 2:170.

²³On traveling companies in Oxford, as well as authorities’ attempts to suppress them, see Elliott et al., 2:614–17; Gurr, 164–65; Keenan, 2002, 113–27.

²⁴Elliott et al., 1:194–95. On similar prohibitions in Cambridge in the 1570s and 1580s, see Marlow, 39–40; White, 2009. The statute acknowledged the university’s inability to control municipal authorities, asserting only their ability to prevent students from partaking in the activities of the town. This recognition of the town’s jurisdiction, however, did not stop university officials from sometimes paying traveling players to refrain from playing and leave Oxford: see Boas, 1914, 226–27; Boas, 1923, 19–21; Elliott et al., 2:614; Keenan, 2002, 117.

²⁵Elliott et al., 1:195.

whole of Aristotle's *Ethics*, 1585).²⁶ The work itself was dedicated to Leicester, and Case posed the question of university performance in the manner of academic disputation, echoing the language of those proceedings discussed above: "Should stage-plays be permissible, and should they be placed under the category of virtue?"²⁷ He begins by dividing all plays into two categories—"common and popular" and "academic"—and asserts the permissibility of the latter based on five principles.²⁸ Boas rightly notes that these are all "of a utilitarian or edifying character," and Case goes on to refute possible arguments against university performance.²⁹ The format of the treatise reflects the Oxford curriculum, as each *oppositio* (objection) is met with a *responsio* (response), in the manner of formal academic discourse. In sum, this was an issue that occupied the minds of university members at all levels, from the chancellor to the faculty to students preparing to dispute. By the last two decades of the sixteenth century, then, the question of dramatic propriety occupied a central role in academic life. The surviving documents indicate that the official university position was clear: despite considerable discussion and debate over drama itself, academic drama's educational value made it a clearly permissible activity.

It was against this backdrop that the debate between Rainolds and Gager unfolded. Far from believing that drama had the capacity to edify, Rainolds feared that participating in theatrical performance would "worketh in the actors a marvellous impression of being like the persons whose qualities they expresse and imitate."³⁰ To illustrate this danger, he draws examples not from the wide history of drama, but from Gager's three Shrovetide plays, describing their scenes of drunkenness and lustfulness.³¹ This account of the plays' scandalous moments is quickly followed by a reference to Cyprian, the church father: "S. *Cyprian* writing of a stage-player who made boyes effeminate by instructing then how to play the wemen, and to expresse & counterfeit unhonest wanton gestures, saith, *he was a maister not of teaching but spilling children*."³² Passages like this one have been used to link Rainolds to attackers of the professional stage, focusing upon their shared censure of men playing the parts of women. Equally important, however, is the focus upon instruction, which distinguishes Rainolds's reference to Cyprian from those commonly made

²⁶On Case's Aristotelianism and his career in general, see Schmitt; on the structure of *Speculum Moraliū Quæstionum* and the significance of its publication, see *ibid.*, 86–87.

²⁷Case, 183: "An ludi Scenici sint liciti, & sub hac virtutis materia contenti?"

²⁸*Ibid.*

²⁹Boas, 1914, 228.

³⁰Rainolds, 1599, 19.

³¹*Ibid.*, 20.

³²*Ibid.*, 21.

by English antitheatricalists.³³ Rainolds's extensive discussion of drama's potential power and its effect on both actors and audience is followed immediately by this anecdote about a "spilling" (i.e., spoiling, or corruptive) educational process.³⁴ Rainolds is keenly aware of the danger of bringing drama into the academic setting; as his use of the Cyprian quotation shows, this is for Rainolds a pedagogical issue focused around plays in an educational environment.

Rainolds was not alone in arguing that drama had a potentially corruptive effect upon youth. The fear that children were particularly vulnerable and would readily imitate the vices portrayed onstage was a common refrain among sixteenth-century opponents of the theater. For instance, the clergyman Thomas Beard (ca. 1568–1632) wrote in a 1597 tract that plays "depraue and corrupt good manners . . . the ears of yong folke are there polluted with many filthy & dishonest speeches, their eies are there infected with lasciuious and vnchast gestures and countenances."³⁵ Rainolds, however, is unique in that he was concerned exclusively with the corruption of youth. His aim in *Th'overthrow* is not a generalized condemnation of drama, nor is his primary concern that children will be taken to public playhouses, as it was for Beard and others. Instead, Rainolds's writings represent a condemnation of dramatic performance specifically in the academic setting, lest it corrupt both the impressionable young actors and those watching them.

Gager's main defense of the academic stage, completely in line with the university's position, rested upon its value for his students. In a frequently quoted passage, Gager justifies his endeavor as a pedagogical exercise that allows instructors "to embowlden owre yuthe; to trye their voyces, and confirme their memoryes; to frame their speeche; to conforme them to convenient action."³⁶ These remarks appear, unsurprisingly, in a series of statements concerned with distinguishing his own entertainments from those put on by professional actors.

³³For references to Cyprian asserting his condemnation of drama in a general sense, see Northbrooke, 63, 69, 73; Gosson, 1582, G5^{r-v}. Northbrooke, 75–76, employs the same Cyprian quotation as Rainolds to defend academic drama rather than attack it, arguing that "S. Cyprian speaketh here of him that did teach and practise only . . . vaine pastimes and playes, and did allure children vp therein. . . . I thinke it is lawfull for a Scholemaister to practise his schollers to play Comedies, obseruing these and the like cautions."

³⁴*Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "spill," v. I.3c: "To injure in respect of character; to spoil morally."

³⁵Beard, 374. His tract is partially composed of a translation of a work by the French Protestant Jean Chassanion (1531–98). Similar language is found in Munday, 100; the anonymous author of the 1579 pamphlet *Newes from the North*, quoted in Chambers, 4:202, lists theaters among the disreputable establishments responsible for "the corruption and vtter distruction of youth."

³⁶Young, 1916b, 614. Gager's letter is not included in *Th'overthrow*, and is cited henceforth from Young's transcription of it.

Following Leicester and Case, Gager adamantly denies that student actors who perform at most once a year should “be termed *Scenici, or Histriones*.”³⁷ In drawing this distinction, however, Gager calls attention not only to academic drama’s comparatively high pedagogical value, but also to the comparatively low caliber of their inexpensive, unskillful performances.³⁸ Many have observed Gager’s adherence to the university line, but Gager also goes a step further than any of his colleagues: he defends the enterprise of academic drama by proclaiming its low quality and lack of professionalism.

In fact, Gager’s letter spends significantly more time downplaying the worth and integrity of his theatrical endeavor than asserting its virtues. In defending his crafting of the character of Momus, for instance, he claims that he had little motivation beyond entertainment, having assumed that his audience would become bored with the tragedy.³⁹ He goes on to assert the carelessness of his own composition: “I did not greatly care what I made hym to saye, as thinkinge any suche thinge became *Momus* well inoughe.”⁴⁰ Most strikingly, Gager is willing to belittle the quality of his plays, even conceding that some of Momus’s objections were accurate.⁴¹ To some extent, the weakness of Gager’s reply should not be surprising. “The defenses of the stage that survive from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,” Barish writes, “tend to be feebler than the attacks on it,” as those defending the stage “usually share the assumptions of their opponents.”⁴² Yet Gager takes this one step further: he attempts to defend the academic stage by leveling further insults at it, responding to Rainolds’s invective not with a strong

³⁷Ibid., 613. This is not the first time he highlights their differences. Earlier in the letter, in claiming that he had not seen Rainolds’s letter to Thornton prior to composing the character of Momus, Gager writes that even if he had he “should have taken it as spoken agaynst *Histriones*, and not agaynst Schollares.” Ibid., 605. See also Shenk, 33–36, for a discussion of Gager’s distinction between academic and professional playing in the context of Elizabeth’s 1592 visit.

³⁸Young, 1916b, 614. It is important to note that, in Gager’s view, the skill of professional players, while relevant in contrast to his own theatrical performances, remains insufficient to redeem them from depravity. He maintains a firm moral divide between his own purpose in staging plays and that of his professional counterparts, whose performances he describes as being “of a lewd, vast, dissolute, wicked, impudent, prodigall, monstrous humor, wherof no dowte ensued greate corruption of manners in them selves, to saye nothing heere of the behowlders.”

³⁹Young, 1916b, 606.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Barish, 117.

counterattack or a simple acceptance of his opponent's propositions, but rather with largely unprovoked deprecation.

Gager's apathy is similarly apparent in his defense of his actors' cross-dressing, wherein he states that the actual problem of such a practice lies not in the donning of women's clothing, but in "the lewde ende to deceyve" that can accompany it.⁴³ This, however, is not a problem for his plays, since a student acting on the academic stage is "openly knowne" to be playing a part.⁴⁴ Gager's argument is based in the disillusioning of the entire theatrical enterprise. Cross-dressing is not a threat because his students' poor acting could never lead anyone to take seriously the onstage fiction. He expounds this point several pages later, describing an instance where a student actor playing a female character should have "made a *Conge* like a woman," but instead "made a legg like a man."⁴⁵ Karl Young calls this anecdote a "genial observation," but it in fact serves to undercut Gager's own endeavor.⁴⁶ Gager's defense here rests upon the notion that, because his plays are "base and meane," Rainolds's fears about theatrical performance do not apply in the case of academic drama.⁴⁷ Beneath the dispute between Rainolds and Gager, therefore, lay a shared recognition of drama's capacity to be a persuasive, powerful force. They disagreed about whether that power concerned plays being performed within the university, thus testing the neat division between academic and professional playing that had been established there.

Rainolds remained unsatisfied by Gager's reply. His second letter begins with an accusation, and it is clear that his adversarial tendencies have come out in full force. Rainolds characteristically quotes Gager at length in order to refute him, and even implores Gager to make the dispute public.⁴⁸ This letter is not so much about exposition as it is about clarification, expanding upon the points of his previous letter and laying out the ways in which Gager has misinterpreted them. Rainolds is careful, though, to make clear that his attack is not a broad one, repeatedly emphasizing the specificity of his claims.

⁴³Young, 1916b, 619–20.

⁴⁴Ibid., 620.

⁴⁵Ibid., 626.

⁴⁶Young, 1916a, 115.

⁴⁷Young, 1916b, 625. Gager's remarks call into question his perennial acclaim as a defender of the stage. See, for example, Wood, 1813–20, 2:88, who states that Gager "hath said more for the defence of plays than can be well said again by any man that should succeed or come after him." Young, 1916b, 603–04, likewise calls Gager's only surviving part in the correspondence "both a spirited reply to his opponent and a substantial treatise of defence of academic drama and academic performances."

⁴⁸Rainolds, 1599, 31.

He says that Gager has charged him “with insinuating of [Gager’s] young men” and claiming that they are “*cast away altogether by those exercises.*”⁴⁹ Rainolds goes to great lengths, however, to dispel the notion that the youth involved in Gager’s plays have already been corrupted beyond repair. They are not, as Gager has implied that Rainolds suggested, “dead, dead, past all recoverie.” Referring to his earlier citation of Cyprian, Rainolds writes that “the termes I used imported that they were in spilling, not spilt, much lesse spilt altogether.”⁵⁰

Continuing in a similar vein, Rainolds makes abundantly clear that his attack is centered upon theatrical practice, rather than any of Gager’s students themselves. Writing of the notoriety of stage players, he makes a point of saying that his words had been misconstrued. At once a sharp rebuke and a striking display of compassion, Rainolds asserts that his attack is centered upon the theater itself, not upon its performers. “I enforced it against the partes played by *Histrion*,” he states, “not against the Christchurch parties who played them.”⁵¹ In support of this claim, he reveals that he himself acted the “womans parte” of Hippolyta on the stage twenty-six years earlier.⁵² This moment is sometimes considered an acceptance of guilt, analogous to the “penitence” William Prynne perceived in Stephen Gosson’s admission of having acted on the stage.⁵³ The context, however, reveals it to be a statement of quite a different nature. Rainolds uses the example of his own time on the stage not to suggest any degree of regret, but rather to prove the more significant point that he would be hypocritical to judge the students themselves for partaking in dramatic activity. Rainolds is reluctant to play the part of an antitheatricalist, fearing that he might be deemed an enemy to the students of the very academy he seeks to protect.

Anthony Wood recalls, in reference to pupils who were recipients in Rainolds’s will, that “Students of several Colleges and Halls in Oxon . . . sate at [Rainolds’s] feet and were his admirers.”⁵⁴ This image of Rainolds is a far cry from the austere figure depicted in modern scholarship, and one that is almost entirely ignored in the existing literature concerning the controversy between Rainolds and Gager. It is nonetheless essential for understanding the motivations of his undeniably fierce attack: Rainolds sought to protect the integrity of the

⁴⁹Ibid., 38.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., 43.

⁵²Ibid., 45.

⁵³Prynne, 436, refers to “*Stephen Gosson, a penitent reclaimed Play-poet (whose eyes did shed many teares of sorrow, whose heart sweat many drops of blood, when he remembered Stage-playes, to which he was once addicted).*”

⁵⁴Wood, 1792–96, 2:294.

academic environment, thereby protecting the students themselves from what he perceived to be a dangerously powerful and potentially corruptive activity. While Gager tepidly fell back on the university position, Rainolds interrogated it, challenging the idea that drama could be beneficial to learning and objecting to the notion that the perils of professional playing did not apply to academic plays. At the heart of Rainolds's sustained onslaught lay a central claim: drama's potency was hazardous to the students involved in its performance, rendering it antithetical to the pedagogical purpose proclaimed by its defenders.

RHETORIC, DRAMA, AND THE ART OF REPRESENTATION

Several pages into his first letter to Gager, Rainolds recalls a pair of anecdotes found in the Roman historian Suetonius's account of the emperor Nero. Rainolds cites Suetonius's description of two tragedies staged during Nero's reign, both of which featured Nero playing the title role.⁵⁵ The first, entitled *Hercules insanus* (Hercules mad), focused on the frenzy of Hercules. Rainolds recounts how a soldier in Nero's guard reacted to the onstage depiction of the emperor in chains, describing how "when hee sawe Nero attired and bound with Chaines, as the argument required, hee ranne to him to helpe him; thinking (poore freshwater creature) that his maister had bene chained in earnest."⁵⁶ A second anecdote about the performance of the tragedy *Canace parturiens* (Canace in labor), on Aeolus's mythical daughter Canace, who conceives a child with her brother, follows the first in a similar vein. Rainolds describes how another soldier, when asked "what the *Emperour* was doing," artlessly responded, "Hee is travailing with childe."⁵⁷ These two stories both provide examples of the same phenomenon—onlookers of drama being unable to distinguish between reality and fiction. As their inclusion in *Th'overthrow* suggests, Rainolds feared that drama might transform both actors and audience, causing their inability to properly perceive the boundary between their own world and the world of the play.

Rainolds was not the only writer for whom the stage's power was fundamentally transformative in nature. Concerns about gender confusion, as discussed above, constituted a prominent facet of the antitheatricalists' larger fear about personal character, whereby theatrical performance was seen to pervert an individual's God-given identity.⁵⁸ Prynne articulates the

⁵⁵Suetonius, 2:112–15 (*Lives of the Caesars* 6.21).

⁵⁶Rainolds, 1599, 7.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸See Barish, 92–93.

comprehensive nature of these anxieties: “This counterfeiting of persons, affections, manners, vices, sexes, and the like . . . it transformes the Actors into what they are not.”⁵⁹ Munday confirms that this sense of transformation extends to audience as well as actors: unlike other “euils,” he asserts, “the filthines of plaies, and spectacles” can “pollute . . . the beholders” as well as “the doers.”⁶⁰ Gosson, in his *Playes confuted in fwee actions* (1582), presents the account of this infectious phenomenon most similar to Rainolds’s in a passage citing the Greek historian Xenophon. Following closely the original source, Gosson describes a Syracusan banquet in which the story of Bacchus and Ariadne was played. The members of the audience became so absorbed in the performance that they lost track of their own reality: “when Bacchus rose up, tenderly lifting Ariadne from her seate . . . the beholders rose up, euery man stode on tippe toe.”⁶¹ The audience response escalated, as Xenophon describes how when the characters “departed to bedde; the company presently was set on fire, they that were married posted home to their wiues; they that were single, vowed very solemnly, to be wedded.”⁶² Drama’s power threatened instability: what was happening onstage might at any moment cease to be a fiction, causing humans to forget their own identities.⁶³

In the academic environment, this general threat had specific implications, particularly with regard to oratorical training. The passage mentioned earlier, in which Gager defends academic drama as a useful activity, focuses largely on its benefits for rhetorical delivery.⁶⁴ In listing the specific ways drama might help students, he argues that it allows instructors to “trye [students’] voyces,” “frame their speche,” and “conforme them to convenient action.”⁶⁵ This was a common argument throughout the early modern period. When Thomas

⁵⁹Prynne, 159.

⁶⁰Munday, 3.

⁶¹Gosson, 1582, G5^r.

⁶²Ibid. The similarly humanistic nature of Gosson’s description, in which he, like Rainolds, recounts a specific story from a classical source, is not entirely surprising, as he was Rainolds’s student at Oxford. On their relationship, see Ringler, 1942, 10–17, 100–08, although the author perpetuates the misguided sentiment set forth in Ringler, 1940, 4–7, that “Rainolds’s theological preoccupations in his later years turned him against the humanities,” citing Rainolds’s “savage attack on the drama” as the prime example of this flawed opposition.

⁶³Gosson’s *Schoole of abuse*, his tract written only a few years earlier in 1579, suggests that humans are particularly susceptible creatures, being “so weake, that wee are drawne with euery threade; so light, that wee are blown away with euery blaste; so vnsteady, that we slip in euery ground.” Gosson, 1579, D2^v.

⁶⁴Delivery is the last of the five canons of classical rhetoric, the first four of which are invention, arrangement, style, and memory. Delivery’s key components are voice and gesture, which are crucial to the presentation of an orator’s speech. See Quintilian, 5:84–87 (*Institutio Oratoria* 11.3).

⁶⁵Young, 1916b, 614.

Heywood (ca. 1573–1641) issued a defense of drama two decades later, he used similar language to assert the value of university performances, claiming that academic drama “instructs [the student] to fit his phrases to his action, and his action to his phrase, and his pronuntiation to them both.”⁶⁶ As in England, so too on the Continent, where the German philosopher Rudolph Goclenius (1547–1628), a professor at the University of Marburg, heavily emphasized rhetorical benefits in a printed discussion of whether academic drama belonged in a well-governed society.⁶⁷ Answering in the affirmative, Goclenius argues that drama is extremely useful for learning correct pronunciation and other skills related to delivery, and he aligns drama closely enough with rhetorical instruction to suggest that “it is not by accident that in this part of Rhetoric actors were at one time used as teachers.”⁶⁸ In defending drama on the basis of its rhetorical merit, Gager was in good company, both at home and abroad.

While this moment in Gager’s letter is often quoted, Rainolds’s reply has received little attention. Crucially, he claims that the university’s forerunners have already accounted for such practice by establishing exercises of “writing, pronouncing, declaiming, disputing, of questions in sundry faculties and artes.”⁶⁹ The equation of drama with curricular activities emerges here as a serious concern, as Rainolds deplores Gager’s comparison of “scholasticall exercises with enterludes and playes.”⁷⁰ Gager had apparently argued that, since an unnamed “godly & learned Preacher in the pulpitt” affirmed that “declamations, oppositions, suppositions, and such scholasticall exercises, are no better than vaine things,” such exercises would then be on the same level as the drama Rainolds was also claiming to be “vaine.”⁷¹ A tenuous argument, to be sure, but one that Rainolds perceives as dangerous not simply because of the denigration of formal academic exercises. It is instead Gager’s notion that plays are somehow

⁶⁶Heywood, C4^r.

⁶⁷Goclenius, 402–05. Part of a much longer treatise, Goclenius’s defense of drama was arranged in the form of a classical oration and was published in the same year as the controversy between Rainolds and Gager began. It apparently arose in response to disapproval of lewd elements in the plays of Plautus and Terence, and was not specifically in reference to plays at Goclenius’s own institution: see McConaughy, 55. While there is no evidence to suggest that any sixteenth-century Continental dispute approached the Oxford controversy in depth or scope, Goclenius’s discussion strongly implies that the terms of debate and the grounds for defending academic drama were similar across Europe.

⁶⁸Goclenius, 403: “Non enim temerè est quod in ea Rhetoricae parte olim histrionibus usi sunt praeceptoribus.”

⁶⁹Rainolds, 1599, 124.

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Ibid., 125.

equivalent to disputations and declamations that provokes Rainolds's ire. "The artes . . . of *Rhetorike & Logike* are requisit to preaching of the woord," Rainolds writes, "And the exercises of declaiming, answering, opposing, doe helpe to breede ripenes in those artes."⁷² Drama, however, offers no such developmental training, and certainly should not be equated with those established academic exercises that do.

Rainolds also rejects Gager's defense that scholars who act in plays infrequently are not, by definition, actors. Recall that Gager had written that coming on the stage once a year or less was not grounds for his students to "be termed *Scenici, or Histriones*." Rainolds, however, sees no such distinction, arguing that "so are they stage-players, who play vpon the stage once in a yeare or two."⁷³ This is directly related to Gager's sense of fluidity between different forms of academic presentation in that, for Gager, the kind of performance in which he is involved fosters rhetorical development in the same way that a disputation might, and thus does not fall into the realm that he sees as reserved for *histriones*, or professional actors. For Rainolds, however, the categorical boundaries are different. Academic activities are in one category, and theatrical activities are completely separate in another. Rainolds's reaction is drawn from the singularity of the latter classification: Gager's students are acting, and therefore are engaging in an activity that should be prohibited. The boundary is firm, and there can be no middle ground between theatrical performance (i.e., stage plays) and academic exercise (i.e., disputations, declamations, etc.). In rejecting Gager's position, Rainolds is therefore claiming a contradiction in Gager's argument, in that Gager has openly denounced theatrical performance but defends its permissibility for his own students.

The separation between theater and oratory is most fully developed in a lesser-known chapter of the Oxford controversy, in which Rainolds's opponent was the noted legal scholar Alberico Gentili (1552–1608). Gentili became regius professor of civil law at Oxford in 1580, having been

⁷²Ibid. Rainolds's remarks about the purpose of the arts serve as an important reminder of his views on education, which remained closely tied to religious training. Green, 79, rightly observes: "Theology was the high calling of the university for Rainolds, and, while rhetoric held an important place, it ultimately was in the service of theology." Rainolds's idea of a humanist education was therefore deeply bound up with issues of religion. To assert, as Chambers and Ringer do, that Rainolds's attack upon the stage was in opposition to humanistic learning is to overlook the interdependence of his religious and educational objectives as well as the degree to which his views on drama were aimed at preserving the university's rhetorical training. On Rainolds's expansive and eclectic brand of Christian humanism, see further Green, 9–92; Feingold, 1997, 213; McConica, 1979, 302–06.

⁷³Rainolds, 1599, 73.

exiled from Italy on account of his Protestantism.⁷⁴ His portion of the correspondence followed quickly on the heels of his friend Gager's portion, as Gentili took up the cause after Gager—for reasons about which readers can only speculate—withdraw.⁷⁵ Gentili was a logical successor to Gager, as he had previously advocated the lawfulness of theatrical performance. His *Commentatio ad L[egem] III C[odicis] de prof[essoribus] et med[icis]* (Commentary on the third law of the [Justinian] Code on teachers and doctors), which included a substantial defense of poetry and acting, was published in 1593, shortly before he sent his first letter to Rainolds.⁷⁶ In that letter, he also claims that he has “publicly discussed the question of stageplayers, before [Rainolds and Gager] had this dispute, with another person.”⁷⁷ Surprisingly, however, the correspondence between Rainolds and Gentili, which was carried out in Latin rather than English, has been all but ignored in critical literature concerning the controversy. While their first four letters are printed in *Th'overthrow*, their last four—occupying over ninety folio pages in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 352, the only surviving manuscript witness to the entire correspondence—have never been printed and have only rarely been mentioned in modern scholarship.⁷⁸ Of these last four letters, Boas writes that they “throw very little additional light on academic stage-history”; the entire correspondence with Gentili is mentioned only in a footnote by Young, who says that it constitutes nothing more than a “highly technical continuation” of the controversy between Rainolds and

⁷⁴On Gentili's career and legal writings, see Panizza. Gentili also had a personal history with Rainolds, who had opposed Gentili's Oxford candidacy: see Feingold, 2004a, 333–34.

⁷⁵Gager's withdrawal seems understandable: apparently exasperated, he implored Rainolds to drop the matter at the end of his July 1592 letter. Rainolds, however, did not comply, and instead wrote a letter that occupies 135 pages in *Th'overthrow* to hammer home his points. Gager, unsurprisingly—and, perhaps, forgivably—did not reply.

⁷⁶See Binns, 1972, which reproduces the Latin text of Gentili's treatise (a copy of which Gentili included with his first letter to Rainolds) while also providing an English translation and a useful introduction. Among numerous other points, Gentili's treatise argued that university plays were permissible because students were not acting for money, as well as that cross-dressing as prohibited by Deuteronomy 22:5 was not applicable to theatrical performers. Gentili expanded his defense of the stage in a 1599 publication entitled *De Actoribus et Spectatoribus Fabularum non Notandis* (Against the censure of actors and spectators of plays), which was probably a direct response to the publication of *Th'overthrow* earlier in the same year. On Gentili's protheatrical writings, see di Simone, 388–410.

⁷⁷Markowicz, 16–18: “quaestionem de histrionibus publice ego tractavi antea quam tibi haec quaestio cum altero esset.”

⁷⁸The most notable discussion of these letters is found in Binns, 1974, though this article is predominantly concerned with how Rainolds's correspondence with Gentili might elucidate “stage transvestism, and whether women might appear on the stage” (98).

Gager.⁷⁹ On the contrary, however, this portion of Rainolds's correspondence elucidates with remarkable depth and originality a central issue: the infringement of dramatic performance upon academic life and, in particular, oratorical practice.

A few pages into his first letter to Gentili, Rainolds calls attention to a portion of his opponent's thinking that he finds particularly distasteful. "With the example of Theophrastus," Rainolds writes, "who taught in school and employed every gesture appropriate to the matter which he treated so that the extended tongue licked his lips when he described the glutton, you demonstrate that the dramatic art is necessary for the orator."⁸⁰ The last part of this assertion—that dramatic technique is a necessary component of oratory—is one with which Rainolds takes serious issue. He cites two ancient authors, Quintilian and Macrobius, whose authority refutes this point.⁸¹ The issue to which Rainolds calls attention is hardly novel, and it is one on which Quintilian is indeed firm. According to his *Institutio Oratoria*, the sum of what an orator learns from an actor should be strictly limited to the realm of delivery.⁸² To this point in the correspondence, Rainolds has clearly drawn heavily on Quintilian, who fears that too much exposure to the actor's art will lead students to imitate the vices an actor portrays.⁸³ While Quintilian recognizes the rhetorical skills an orator can learn from an actor, he is adamant in his distinction between the two professions, and clear in his desire to prevent orators from engaging in any sort of theatrical practice. The ultimate fear is that an orator, lacking the appropriate weightiness, should seem to resemble an actor. He makes clear that orators should "keep well clear of staginess and of anything excessive in facial expression."⁸⁴ That "staginess" should be permitted to enter the realm of oratorical delivery is to be avoided at all costs.

⁷⁹Boas, 1914, 246n3; Young, 1916a, 106n. These sentiments are perpetuated by Leon Markowicz, whose translation of the first four Rainolds-Gentili letters (i.e., those printed in *Th'overthrow*) remains the only reproduction of any of the eight letters since *Th'overthrow*. Even he downplays the importance of these letters, asserting that "we may conclude that this correspondence sheds very little new light, in the way of discovery, on the Elizabethan stage controversy. . . . The debate was carried on with much sound and fury, but it signified little on the dramatic art which flourished in the last decades of Elizabeth's reign." Markowicz, 12–13.

⁸⁰Markowicz, 24–25 (the translation has been slightly altered to more accurately reflect the sense of the verb *adhibuit*): "& Theophrasti exemplo, qui in schola docens, ita omnes gestus rei, quam tractabat, congruentes adhibuit, ut exerta lingua labra circumlinxerit quum heluonem describeret, histrioniam oratori concludas esse necessariam."

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Quintilian, 1:236–37 (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.11). The marginal note in *Th'overthrow* cites the nonexistent section 1.19, which Markowicz follows, but this is clearly a misprint.

⁸³Quintilian, 1:236–37 (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.11).

⁸⁴Ibid., 1:236–39 (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.11).

The desire to keep oratory and theater separate derives from Cicero, in whose *De Oratore* the character Crassus makes the distinction extremely clear. Oratorical gesture should be “borrowed not from the stage and the theatrical profession but from the parade ground or even from wrestling”; the gesture he suggests for orators is specifically “not stagy.”⁸⁵ Cicero is careful to limit the extent to which orators should make use of theatrical technique, fearing that, as Catherine Steel writes, “inappropriate use of gestures and language which seemed too actorly could compromise [orators’] dignity and thus their effectiveness.”⁸⁶ While orators dealt in authenticity, actors dealt in counterfeiting; one form of performance was based in truth, the other in fiction. In a recent study, Adrian Streete suggests that resistance to the early modern theater involved fears about “the wiles of the orators”: “An actor was dangerous precisely because he used the tools of rhetoric . . . to persuade the viewer of the veracity of the imitation.”⁸⁷ This is an important observation, as rhetorical proficiency certainly heightened fears about the believability of mimetic representation. In the academic setting, however, the tools of the actor were dangerous for the orator, as Rainolds feared that budding orators would be trained in the likeness of actors, thus diminishing their dignity, effectiveness, and capacity for speaking truth.

This issue is developed further in the first of Gentili’s unpublished letters to Rainolds.⁸⁸ Gentili is perseverant in his desire to defend acting on the grounds of oratorical usefulness, and he states at greater length his point about the similarities between dramatic and oratorical practice: “The very essence of the stage is the representation of persons, and the representation of persons is not vicious. For even the orator represents persons—although not theatrically, as you think that I said, but rhetorically. Likewise the professor represents persons in lectures, not theatrically but scholastically.”⁸⁹ If drama is based in the art of representation—which is, in Gentili’s view, the same art used by academic orators and professors—then it cannot be illicit, given the obvious permissibility of scholarly orations and lectures. But none of this, in his view, has anything to do with theatrical practice:

⁸⁵Cicero, 2:176–77 (*De Oratore* 3.220). See also Graf, 39, who discusses the “strict demarcation” between rhetorical and theatrical gesture.

⁸⁶Steel, 55. On the classical distinction between actor and orator, see also Connolly, 202–08; Edwards, 118–19; Fantham, 371–73; Gunderson, 117–48.

⁸⁷Streete, 130.

⁸⁸This letter is undated, but must have been sent sometime between 5 August 1593 and 25 January 1594, the dates of Rainolds’s prior and subsequent letters.

⁸⁹CCC, MS 352, p. 216: “Essentia scenae ipsa est repraesentatio personaru[m], repraesentatio p[er]sonaru[m] vitiosa non est. nam et orator repraesentat: sed non tamen, ut putas tu me dixisse histrionicè at oratoriè. et professor item repraesentat in scholis, non histrionicè sed scholasticè.”

Gentili, like Gager, is willing to bring dramatic practice into the academic realm because he sees it as distinct from the art of the professional actor. Academic acting is permissible because, for them, it is simply another form of scholarly discourse, alongside lectures, disputations, and any other form of academic performance. It is as acceptable within the university as any of those exercises because it is an activity entirely separate from professional playing.

Rainolds was inflamed by this argument, and he replied forcefully in his letter of January 1594 that Gentili's distinction was unfounded. Citing Ulpian and Cicero, Rainolds argues that it is not required for those entering the stage to perform multiple times before they become *histriones*. Having thus established that academic actors are indeed stage players, Rainolds continues on to what he perceives as Gentili's main point, as quoted above—that “dramatic art is necessary for the orator.” In refuting this notion, Rainolds puts forth a bizarre analogy: “Whereas the essence of the stage, you say, is the representation of persons, but the representation of persons is not immoral, since both the orator and the professor represent. In this you seem to me to prattle just like any of those who as best as they can adorn and clothe apes in the manner of men . . . deceiving those who are unskilled or inattentive, so that the ape is hailed as human.”⁹⁰ Such a deceiver, according to Rainolds, would argue that “the animal is the essence of the ape; but the animal is not devoid of reason; for both the man and the child are animals.”⁹¹ “Do you think by that logic,” Rainolds asks sharply, “that the monkey is proven to be not devoid of reason?”⁹² Rainolds's comparison is peculiar, but essentially understands Gentili to be claiming that theater is not immoral because the essence of theater—that is, the representation of persons—is practiced by those whom all agree to be respectable, such as orators and professors. According to Rainolds, that would be tantamount to saying that apes are not devoid of reason because the essence of the ape—that is, the condition of being an animal—is also practiced by those who obviously have reason, such as humans. The analogy is convoluted, but the message is clear: just as oratorical and theatrical representation must be kept separate, so too must oratorical training be kept separate from dramatic performances within the university.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 249: “Quoniam essentia, inquis, scena ipsa est repraesentatio personarum: repraesentatio autem personarum vitiosa non est: nam & orator repraesentat & professor. In quo videris mihi perinde argutari, acsi quis eorum qui simias quam maxime possunt ad morem hominum ornant ac vestiunt . . . quo parum attentos aut imperitos fallant, proq[ue] homine salutetur simia.”

⁹¹Ibid.: “Essentia simiae est animal: animal autem expers rationis non est: nam & vir animal est, & mulier.”

⁹²Ibid.: “Num ista ratione probatum iri putas simiam rationis expertem non esse?”

Numerous scholars have addressed the regular exchange between oratory and drama, bringing forth the particularly close relationship between these two forms of performance in the Renaissance educational setting.⁹³ Rainolds's argument fervently opposes that relationship, insisting that rhetorical and theatrical presentation remain firmly divided within his university. Antitheatricalists commonly feared drama's ability to blur the boundary between fiction and reality; Rainolds worried that the position propounded by Gager and Gentili threatened to blur the boundary between academic drama and academic oratory. His principal fear was not simply that students would imitate the vices depicted onstage, although this too was a major concern. It was that university students being trained as orators in preparation for careers in service of the church would develop the habits of actors in their manner of rhetorical delivery. The equation of theater with university exercises effectively placed academic oratory and academic drama under the same heading, conflating the categories that Rainolds was laboring to keep distinct. In Rainolds's view, the inclusive university program envisioned by his protheatrical opponents allowed orators to essentially become actors, risking their transformation from persuasive, decorous speakers into dissembling, dishonorable performers. For Rainolds, therefore, unlike so many of his contemporaries, drama was not a suitable aid to rhetorical training, but rather a hindrance, threatening not only the curriculum but also the very foundation of the university itself.

SPECTACLE AND ENTERTAINMENT: THE HYPOCRISY OF GAGER'S PLAYS

In refuting the notion that dramatic art is necessary for the orator, Rainolds cites two ancient sources, Quintilian and Macrobius. His discussion of Quintilian is largely unsurprising, given Quintilian's authority on matters of education and rhetoric, as well as his importance to Rainolds's argument about the separation between oratory and drama. Rainolds's mention of Macrobius, however, is more unusual. The passage he cites from Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, a wide-ranging ancient dialogue, concerns a theatrical-performance competition that took place during Caesar's Victory Games in 46 BCE.⁹⁴ Caesar commanded that Decimus Laberius, an *equus Romanus*, participate in the competition; Laberius was resentful of the request, leading him to lash out onstage by directing a "caustic

⁹³See Enterline; Rhodes, 16–19; Smith, esp. 98–133; Wesley.

⁹⁴There can be no doubt that this is the section of the *Saturnalia* Rainolds intended, as the marginal note in *Th'overthrow* refers specifically to *Saturnalia* 2.7 and quotes several words from the earlier chapter (*Saturnalia* 2.4) where Macrobius's account of the performance competition begins.

remark” toward Caesar.⁹⁵ The whole affair was characterized by disorder and insubordination: Caesar compromised the status of a high-ranking citizen, and Laberius sharply scorned his superior in return. The story captures the undisciplined nature of Roman *ludi*, or games, occasions on which lavish spectacles—horse races, animal hunts, and stage plays (*ludi scaenici*)—were sanctioned for the enjoyment of the vulgar crowd. Like Greek games, they appeared in many different forms and were often, though not always, held in conjunction with state-run religious festivals. As Macrobius’s story implies, however, their primary purpose was entertainment rather than worship. The presence of this highly specific reference in his first letter to Gentili suggests a connection in Rainolds’s mind between these ancient events and the dramatic performances taking place within his university.

Rainolds’s interest in ancient games and festivals was extensive and long-standing, as two scarcely known pieces of archival evidence attest. The first appears in an undated manuscript tract responding to the Catholic polemicist Nicholas Sanders (ca. 1530–81), whose *De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani* (On the origin and progress of the Anglican schism, 1585) had caught Rainolds’s attention. In his response, Rainolds presents a characteristically learned argument against the notion that the English Reformation constituted a heretical act. He compares Sanders’s accusations against the English to those leveled historically against Christians, calling attention to a particular passage written by the Byzantine historian Zosimus, whose aversion to Christianity earned him the rebuke of several Christian writers. Rainolds deplores Zosimus, who condemns the Roman emperor Constantine for his acceptance of Christianity: “Zosimus argued that the Emperor Constantine brought about the subversion and the ruin of the Roman Empire with his impiety, because embracing the Christian faith he neglected to worship the gods with sacred families and secular games.”⁹⁶ Rainolds chastises Zosimus for his criticism of Constantine, and specifically for the

⁹⁵Macrobius, 1:372–73 (*Saturnalia* 2.5). As Robert A. Kaster explains at Macrobius, 1:342n: “By acquiescing in Caesar’s request to appear on the stage, Laberius placed himself in the category of actors —persons of diminished social standing—thereby forfeiting his status as a Roman knight.”

⁹⁶Bodleian Library, MS Cherry 33, fol. 3^r: “Constantinum Imperatorem, quia Christianam fidem amplexus neglexit Deos colere Gentilitiis sacris & ludis secularibus, imperii Romani eversionem ac ruinam impietate sua conciliasse arguit Zosimus.” Rainolds is referencing book 2 of Zosimus’s *Historiae Novae Libri vi* (1576), which describes how the troubles of the Roman Empire, which had been safely in control of nearly the entire world while the secular games were celebrated, began to deteriorate when the games were not observed under the consulship of Constantine and Licinius. See Zosimus, 1982, 28 (*New History* 2.7). The 1576 Latin version was the first printed edition of Zosimus, and thus Rainolds was grappling with a new and largely unknown text: see Mazzarino, 92–106.

faith he places in “secular games.” The specific reference here is to the *ludi saeculares*, a pagan festival held in ancient Rome that featured, among other forms of entertainment, theatrical performances. These were occasions of great celebration and debauchery: as Zosimus records only a few pages away from the anecdote about Constantine, the *ludi saeculares* were advertised to the Roman people as “a spectacle, such as they had never witnessed and never would again.”⁹⁷

The second piece of evidence appears in a manuscript notebook, a portion of which Lawrence Green has identified as Rainolds’s lecture notes on various themes, including the works of Cicero and Pindar.⁹⁸ Green makes no mention, however, of the two folios occupied by what appear to be notes for a lecture on ancient festivals and games.⁹⁹ Here, Rainolds cites discussions of the topic in a variety of ancient texts, including, among numerous others, Strabo’s *Geography* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus’s *Roman Antiquities*.¹⁰⁰ Although these notes, like others in the volume, mainly consist of what Green calls “rough and cryptic jottings,” they confirm an extensive knowledge of the subject as well as the literature surrounding it.¹⁰¹ Rainolds’s preoccupation with these ancient occasions was thus significant enough that he was at some point preparing to deliver an academic lecture on them; although their date of composition is uncertain, the notes probably date from his time as Greek reader at Corpus Christi, Oxford, during the 1570s.¹⁰² Taken alongside Rainolds’s response to Sanders, these notes suggest that pagan entertainment was a topic to which Rainolds devoted significant attention at different stages throughout his career. Rainolds’s abiding interest would have its greatest bearing upon his correspondence with Gager, where he aimed to highlight the similar motivations behind Gager’s plays and the spectacular theatrical festivities of the ancient world.

While arguing in his second letter to Gager that theatrical performers were infamous in classical antiquity,¹⁰³ Rainolds refers to the performance of plays on festival occasions such as the feast of Bacchus. Even though actors were

⁹⁷Zosimus, 1576, 22 (*Historia nova* 2.5): “spectaculum, quod neque vidissent antea, neque visuri posthac essent.” Zosimus discusses the entire occasion in the language of spectacle, repeatedly referring to the events as *spectacula*.

⁹⁸Green, 45, 45n106.

⁹⁹These notes appear on Queen’s College, Oxford (hereafter QC), MS 352, fols. 25^r–26^v. They occur earlier in the volume than those discussed by Green, 45n106, who specifically refers to the notes written on QC, MS 352, fols. 66–113 (fols. 108–163 according to the current foliation).

¹⁰⁰QC, MS 352, fols. 25^r, 26^r.

¹⁰¹Green, 45.

¹⁰²See *ibid.* On this early period in Rainolds’s career, see Feingold, 2004b.

¹⁰³This was a common topic among Renaissance antitheatrical writers, though their discussions seldom extended beyond mere assertions of the impermissibility of the theater and the disreputable status of actors in the ancient world.

condemned in society, Rainolds says, the ancients still allowed theatrical performance amid such occasions. He uses the example of how Aristotle banished “all unseemly speeches and spectacles out of his commo[n]wealth,” but still allowed festival performances “done in the honour of [the heathens’] Gods.”¹⁰⁴ The main reference here is to the end of book 7 of Aristotle’s *Politics*, in which the author’s subject is the rearing of children. Aristotle forbids children from attending dramatic performances, fearing the potential corruption brought by early exposure to the sights and sounds of theatrical performance.¹⁰⁵ Much like Rainolds, Aristotle recognizes the potential harm of the theater, aiming to shield the young from “indecenty of speech” and urging the legislator always to “banish pictures or speeches from the stage which are indecent.”¹⁰⁶ Despite this prohibition, however, Aristotle makes a specific exemption for those spectacular shows that were put on as part of pagan religious celebrations.¹⁰⁷ Children should under no circumstances be permitted to attend these indecent performances, as Aristotle recognizes their “evil influences”; but he still maintains their permissibility for those of mature age during pagan festival occasions.¹⁰⁸

Following in the path of several church fathers, Rainolds detects hypocrisy in Aristotle’s exemption of these spectacular performances. The ancients, Rainolds writes, “thought it a necessarie devotion to sett them out, a statelie magnificence to sett them out bravelie; yet did they repute the plays thereof infamous.”¹⁰⁹ In support of this claim, Rainolds cites Tertullian, the often acerbic writer of Christian antiquity, who argues in his *De Spectaculis* that Christians should avoid games and theatrical shows on account of their immorality, religious perversion, and basis in pagan ritual. The purpose of the section Rainolds cites is quite specific. After reciting a litany of contradictory behaviors, Tertullian declares: “These are the inconsistencies of men; it is thus they confuse and interchange the nature of good and evil, swayed by the fickleness of feeling, the wavering of judgement.”¹¹⁰ In citing this section of Tertullian alongside Aristotle, Rainolds’s purpose is clear: to highlight the hypocrisy of the ancients in recognizing the infamy of plays but still allowing their performance during festivals. Thus this section of *Th’overthrow* calls attention to Rainolds’s specific interest not only in the impermissibility of stage plays, but in stage plays deemed licit because of their participation in

¹⁰⁴Rainolds, 1599, 71.

¹⁰⁵Aristotle, 1988, 184 (*Politics* 7.17).

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 183–84 (*Politics* 7.17).

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 184 (*Politics* 7.17).

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁹Rainolds, 1599, 71.

¹¹⁰Tertullian, 282–85 (*De Spectaculis* 21–22).

a spectacular, festival tradition.¹¹¹ Herein lies the very essence of his argument against Gager's plays: just as Tertullian condemned the ancients for allowing theatrical performances under certain circumstances—that is, during infrequent festival occasions—so too is Rainolds condemning Gager's hypocrisy in recognizing the immorality of stage plays but still allowing them to take place during occasions like the 1592 Shrovetide festival.

Gager's career, in fact, was based around these sorts of festival occasions. The earliest known performance of one of his plays, the neoclassical tragedy *Meleager*, occurred in 1582 during what has been identified as “a co-ordinated festival of drama” that involved at least seven theatrical performances at multiple Oxford colleges.¹¹² Elaborate entertainments staged the following year during the visit of the Polish dignitary Alberto Laski included Gager's tragedy *Dido*, which he was commissioned to write at short notice.¹¹³ *Meleager* was revived in 1585 in front of an audience that included, among other notables, the Earls of Pembroke and Leicester and Sir Philip Sidney. When Elizabeth returned to Oxford in 1592, university authorities turned to Gager, hoping that he would impress her with the kinds of extratextual elaborations that, as will be discussed below, had come to define his body of work—Senecan ghosts, descending deities, and remarkable special effects. Gager's dramatic motivations at Christ Church were not unique: as Marion Turner observes with regards to Magdalen, the occasions for the increasingly secular theatrical performances at that college also “changed from religious festivals to the visits of dignitaries.”¹¹⁴ Gager's plays were therefore emblematic of a larger trend in the purpose of playing throughout the university.

Although Gager's works were ostensibly straightforward adaptations of classical texts, he incorporated tremendous spectacle into their presentation. He added songs and supernatural figures in order to appeal to the aural and visual sensibilities of his audience. *Dido* presents the best example, thanks to the survival of a contemporary account of its 1583 performance in Raphael Holinshed's (1529–80) *Chronicles*. According to Holinshed's report, which allows great insight into how Gager's play functioned onstage, “the queenes

¹¹¹The depth and specificity of Rainolds's claims are emphasized by the fact that both Gosson, 1582, C7^{r-v}, and Stubbes, L7^r, cite book 7 of Aristotle's *Politics*, but only to briefly and straightforwardly reference Aristotle's insistence that children be kept away from theatrical performances.

¹¹²Finnis and Martin, 392. For discussions of the structure and content of Gager's individual plays, see Sutton's thorough introductions to the texts in Gager. See also Boas, 1914, 167–219.

¹¹³On *Dido*'s hasty composition and the circumstances of Laski's visit, see Boas, 1914, 179–80; Gager, 1:241–45. Gager also produced his comedy *Rivales* for this occasion, but it has been lost.

¹¹⁴Turner, 82.

banket (with Eneas narration of the destruction of Troie) was liuelie described in a marchpaine patterne, there was also a goodlie sight of hunters with full crie of a kennell of hounds, Mercurie and Iris descending and ascending from and to an high place, the tempest wherein it hailed small confects, rained rosewater, and snew an artificiall kind of snow, all strange, maruellous, & abundant.”¹¹⁵ This vividly detailed description represents the only surviving contemporary account of the play, likely derived from an audience member who witnessed the performance firsthand. Two of the stage effects mentioned are found in the text of the play—the marzipan (“marchpaine”) dessert visually depicting the fall of Troy, and the tempest, apparently complete with real rain and synthetic snow. According to Holinshed, however, the performance was even more spectacular than the printed text allows: the “full crie of a kennell of hounds” is directly reminiscent of an effect employed during Queen Elizabeth’s visit in 1566, while the descent of the godly figures foreshadows one of the entertainments produced for her visit in 1592.¹¹⁶ Remarkably, Holinshed’s description of *Dido* does not mention the text at all—there is nothing substantial about the play’s Virgilian source, the characters, or the obvious parallels between the titular heroine and the reigning English monarch. Holinshed’s account suggests that the most memorable part of the evening was not the text of the classical adaptation, but rather the spectacular elements employed for Laski’s amusement.

Gager was not alone in his abundant employment of spectacle. As Magdalen (which, along with Christ Church and St. John’s, was one of the leading producers of collegiate drama in sixteenth-century Oxford) continued its long-standing theatrical tradition from the 1560s through the 1580s, the performances listed in the college accounts began to sometimes denote not just comedies or tragedies, as had long been the case, but “spectacles.”¹¹⁷ This was also how Edward Gellibrand, a fellow of the college,

¹¹⁵Holinshed, 1355. This account is found in the revised version of Holinshed’s text, published in 1587, several years after the author’s death.

¹¹⁶The queen was delighted by a moment in the 1566 performance of *Palamon and Arcite* that involved dogs barking in the quadrangle outside the Christ Church dining hall, as recorded by Miles Windsor at CCC, MS 257, fol. 110^v. For Gager’s 1592 entertainment that featured a student addressing Elizabeth in the character of Apollo, see Gager, 1:229–31.

¹¹⁷“Spectacles” are recorded there in 1572–73, 1573–74, and 1581–82; these constitute a significant portion of the known performances at Magdalen during these two decades, since not all of the relevant college account books survive. See Elliott et al., 2:848–49. *Ibid.*, 2:603, point out that the earliest reference to “spectacles” in any surviving college records occurs in 1559–60 at Magdalen. I have argued that the use of this term is indicative of the increased appreciation for the visual capacity of religious drama upon the return of the Marian exiles: see Blank. As will be shown below, those visual inclinations would eventually overwhelm the sacred motivations of the performances.

referred to theatrical entertainments that he found offensive, which were enumerated along with other transgressions in a manuscript dubbed “A list of College abuses laid before the Chancellor.”¹¹⁸ His objections are comprehensive, ranging from the improper election of fellows to the illicit removal of books from the library. He condemns in particular Magdalen’s financial officers for “spending money on plaies, entertainment of great men,” shortly thereafter expressing disapproval for members of the college “resorting to . . . Spectacles.”¹¹⁹

Rainolds’s surviving works from this period, which often express concern about the deteriorating state of university culture in general, likewise reflect a concern about the increasingly spectacular quality of plays. Writing to a student of divinity in the 1580s, for example, Rainolds outlines the path toward a godly life in the church while also chastising him for partaking in unseemly activities, including “sweet inticeme[n]ts of the flesh, seeing of vain spectacles, overmuch eating & drinking, banqueting, freque[n]ting of the town, deliting in vanity, resorting to tavernes, forgetting the word of God.”¹²⁰ The language used to refer to dramatic performance here echoes Rainolds’s earlier *Sex Theses de Sacra Scriptura et Ecclesia* (Six theses concerning holy scripture and the church, 1580), which contains the first example of Rainolds’s aversion to drama in print. Lamenting the degraded state of education, Rainolds urges his readers to “destroy those temptations that lure men away from their studies,” including “theatrical spectacles” in a catalogue of enticements similar to those listed above.¹²¹ Spectacular entertainments had no intellectual or religious value: as Aristotle writes in his *Poetics*, spectacle “is emotionally potent but falls quite outside the art and is not integral to poetry . . . the costumier’s art has more scope than the poet’s for rendering effects of spectacle.”¹²² Despite Gager’s assertions to the contrary, Rainolds maintains his support for poetic recitation, objecting

¹¹⁸Magdalen College Archive, Oxford, MS 655a, p. 319.

¹¹⁹Ibid., pp. 321–22.

¹²⁰Rainolds, 1613, A10^r.

¹²¹Rainolds, 1580, 30: “Extinguite Sirenes a studiis avocantes . . . Theatralia spectacula.” Rainolds was not alone in condemning the alleged intellectual depravity of the university in this period. It is difficult to know to what extent student obedience was actually in decline, but on the frequent complaints about the temptations of Elizabethan Oxford as well as their relationship to the university’s changing social composition, see Curtis, 83–125; Dent, 181–200; McConica, 1986, 658–92. On the relationship between misbehavior and university drama, both deeply linked with issues of masculinity, see Ellinghausen; Marlow.

¹²²Aristotle, 1995, 52–55 (*Poetics* 6). Although Halliwell’s translation has been retained, the term “costumier” does not entirely capture the sense of the Greek word “σχευοποιός”—meaning one who deals in stagecraft as a “maker of masks and other stage-properties”: Liddell and Scott, 1607.

only to the theatrical elaborations that performance entailed.¹²³ Gager's dramatic productions were consistently outweighed by the spectacle accompanying them, bringing his plays into the same category as those spectacles Zosimus mentioned as being advertised for the Roman games. Rainolds felt that his university was becoming increasingly infected by a form of theatrical presentation that was more interested in the entertainment value of stagecraft than in academic edification.

These concerns were eloquently expressed by Rainolds's colleague and fellow Reformer Laurence Humphrey (1527?–1590), who became president of Magdalen in 1561. Humphrey had been a vigorous proponent of academic drama in the early years of his presidency, actively inviting and engaging with its performance—particularly plays with a specific relation to Protestantism, such as those of John Bale and John Foxe.¹²⁴ In his 1582 Ash Wednesday sermon, however, Humphrey's sentiment was quite different. Speaking of the aforementioned play festival in which Gager made his theatrical debut, Humphrey begins his address with an exhortation: "Enough already, enough, listeners, have we amused (our) ears and eyes with theatrical shows; enough have we seen, have we heard of masks . . . and of ghosts; enough have we indulged comic laughter and tragic sorrow."¹²⁵ He urges his audience to move beyond amusement and indulgence toward a thoughtful search for illumination, hoping they will "pass from playful things to serious . . . from the profane to the sacred, from plays to the very search for and training in truth."¹²⁶ A generation earlier, Humphrey had been an instrumental proponent of university drama, yet he is uneasy about allowing performances to proceed in their current state, apparently divorced from religious solemnity and sacred truth. He implores his audience to search for plays' morals and lessons, which had been obscured by the kinds of "ornate" elements that would only grow throughout Gager's decade-long career.¹²⁷ Given

¹²³Rainolds, 1599, 21–22, makes clear that his objection is not to the recitation of dramatic texts, but rather to their performance. Rainolds strongly refutes Gager's suggestion that he dares to "*despise learned Poetrie*," thus helping Rainolds's reader to understand how he can so comfortably quote verses from plays in his attack upon theatrical performance.

¹²⁴See Blank.

¹²⁵Elliott et al., 2:991. The original Latin text is reproduced at *ibid.*, 1:177–78. Humphrey's sermon was printed the same year it was given under the title *Pharisaismus Vetus et Novus: Sive De Fermento Pharisaeorum et Iesuitarum* (Phariseeism old and new: Or, On the leaven of the Pharisees and the Jesuits). It was originally appended, with a separate title page, to a tract entitled *Iesuitismi Pars Prima*. The influence of Humphrey's sermon and its relation to Rainolds's feelings toward academic drama are indicated by the extremely noteworthy presence of this publication on Rainolds's surviving book list, where it is recorded as "Humfredi Jesuitissimi pars prima et 2.^{da} ejusq[ue] concio de fermento vitando": Bodleian Library, MS Wood D. 10, p. 19.

¹²⁶Elliott et al., 2:991.

¹²⁷*Ibid.*

Humphrey's own investment in academic drama earlier in his career, these remarks are emblematic of a major shift in the university's theatrical culture.

Scholars of the English Reformation and its aftermath have argued that the antitheatricalists' severest disapproval in the late sixteenth century was reserved for religious drama.¹²⁸ Although the stage had earlier been a powerful tool for Protestantism, from roughly the late 1570s onward, it was no longer considered appropriate to combine sacred matters with theatrical practice. As Streete summarizes: "Writers attempted to highlight the fundamental incompatibility of human and divine signs in relation to the secular stage."¹²⁹ As Protestant attitudes toward drama shifted sharply, hardline opponents of the theater found the presence of sacred material on the secular stage particularly offensive and aimed for its complete removal. At the University of Oxford, however, the shift that occurred in the same period was precisely the opposite. The concern Humphrey articulated in 1582 was not the presence of sacred material onstage, but rather that the sacred material onstage was not prominent enough. The Christian lessons supposedly motivating the performances were being obscured by theatrical machinery; Humphrey aimed not to eradicate religious themes, but rather to emphasize them, and to shed the excessive material encasing them. This opposition to the newly extravagant, irreligious performances of the academic stage is at the heart of Rainolds's attack against Gager, whose lavish theatrical productions were the leading offenders. For Rainolds, as for Humphrey, profane spectacle obscured truth. Rainolds's aversion to ancient spectacle implies that his objection was not to the mixture of drama with Christianity, but rather to the aspects of pagan entertainment that had overtaken university performances. Gager's plays had been overwhelmed by spectacle; their primary aim was not to teach, but to entertain.

Beneath Rainolds's attack, therefore, lay a massive shift in the purpose and the nature of university theatrical performances between Elizabeth's two Oxford visits. As the university's leading dramatist, Gager was emblematic of this shift: he was repeatedly called upon not to edify audiences of students, but rather to impress audiences of dignitaries. To Rainolds, who had long been interested in

¹²⁸See Collinson, 1986, 12–15; Collinson, 1988, 112–15; Streete, 130–32; White, 1997, 138–42. On Protestant drama and its uses in the earlier part of the sixteenth century, see White, 1993. *Ibid.*, 173, also makes the important observation that resistance to theater was far from uniform: "After an initial period of outrage and resistance, many Protestant leaders in the church and in the civil government came around to accepting playgoing as suitable recreation . . . there was not one, but a number of different attitudes toward the stage among [committed Protestants]."

¹²⁹Streete, 171. Northbrooke, 65, wrote that plays enacting "histories out of the Scriptures" threatened to "mingle scurrilitie with Diuinitie." See also Munday, 103; Stubbes, L5^v–L6^t.

festival occasions, his opponent's plays resembled heathen performances in that they were spectacular, entertaining, and divorced from Christian worship. They also participated in the same sort of hypocrisy as the ancients, in that Rainolds felt they were being falsely defended. Hypocrisy was a major topic for those writing against the stage: the theater was dangerous because it allowed actors, in the words of Prynne, to "seeme that in outward appearance which they are not in truth."¹³⁰ It was in a similar spirit that Rainolds attacked the university stage. In addition to concerns about the pretending and the dissembling that theatrical performance involved, he detected a substantial discrepancy between Gager's plays and the grounds on which they were being outwardly defended. As professional drama came under attack, Gager's plays were allowed to continue under the guise of edification, even as their academic and religious goals had been left behind.

CONCLUSION

The concerns that motivated John Rainolds's attack upon the stage differed from those of his antitheatrical contemporaries. His opposition to the theater arose not simply due to an increase in religious fervor, nor was its prime intention a general condemnation of dramatic performance. It was driven instead, as this essay suggests, by a specific desire to prevent students from engaging in an activity that, especially in its current form, stood in opposition to Rainolds's idea of a university education. His citation of Macrobius alongside Quintilian confirms that his fears about the increasingly spectacular quality of plays were linked with those about how plays might infringe upon oratory, factors which in combination Rainolds perceived as a serious peril to both the university and its young inhabitants. The greatest threat to their disciplined training was not, in Rainolds's view, the professional playing companies banned by university officials. It was allowing students to watch and participate in dramatic performance within university walls.

Rainolds's attack did little to prevent the university stage from flourishing. The frequency of academic performances actually increased during the first two decades of the seventeenth century,¹³¹ and plays remained integral components of royal visits and other important Oxford occasions until the outbreak of civil war. Rainolds's attack was also unsuccessful in changing the terms of debate, in England or elsewhere: nearly a century after the publication of *Th'overthrow*, as the French *querelle du théâtre* was fully underway, academic drama was repeatedly defended by religious moralists as an edifying exercise entirely separate from professional theater.¹³² Despite its inefficacy, however, Rainolds's

¹³⁰Prynne, 159. The word *hypocrisy* has close ties to the art of the actor, as it derives from the Greek word ὑπόκρισις, which means "playing a part." See further Barish, 91–92; Eden, 4–5.

¹³¹Elliott, 1997, 642.

¹³²See Phillips, 199–202.

dispute with Gager and Gentili produced the deepest and most extensive exploration of the question of whether drama belonged in the university. Their exploration is certainly not applicable to every Renaissance academic setting: this essay has shown that Rainolds's attack arose in response to a specific opponent and the theatrical culture he represented. While Rainolds's situation at the University of Oxford is unique, however, the study undertaken here urges greater attention to the particular contexts—institutional, religious, temporal, and otherwise—in which debates about drama emerged in England and across Europe. Careful consideration of these circumstances promises a more complete picture not only of early modern attacks upon the theater, but also of the dramatic cultures that inspired them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival and Manuscript Sources

- Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Cherry 33, fols. 1–33. Rainolds, John. Tract against Nicholas Sanders.
- Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Wood D. 10, pp. 1–111. Book list of John Rainolds.
- Corpus Christi College (CCC), Oxford, MS 257, fols. 104–123. Windsor, Miles. Account of Queen Elizabeth's 1566 visit to Oxford.
- CCC, Oxford, MS 352, pp. 11–307. Correspondence between John Rainolds and William Gager, followed by correspondence between John Rainolds and Alberico Gentili.
- Magdalen College Archive, Oxford, MS 655a, pp. 319–24. "A list of College abuses laid before the Chancellor by Edward Gellibrand."
- Queen's College (QC), Oxford, MS 352, fols. 1–127. Notebook of John Rainolds.

Printed Sources

- Aristotle. *The Politics*. Ed. and trans. Stephen Everson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . *Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Stephen Halliwell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Barish, Jonas A. *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Bayer, Mark. *Theater, Community, and Civic Engagement in Jacobean London*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2011.
- Beard, Thomas. *The theatre of Gods iudgements*. London, 1597.
- Binns, J. W. "Alberico Gentili in Defense of Poetry and Acting." *Studies in the Renaissance* 19 (1972): 224–72.
- . "Women or Transvestites on the Elizabethan Stage?: An Oxford Controversy." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 5.2 (1974): 95–120.
- Blank, Daniel. "Performing Exile: John Foxe's *Christus Triumphans* at Magdalen College, Oxford." *Renaissance Studies* 30.4 (2016): 584–601.
- Boas, Frederick S. *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.
- . *Shakespeare and the Universities, and Other Studies in Elizabethan Drama*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1923.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker. "The Life and Times of William Gager (1555–1622)." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 95.4 (1951): 401–31.
- Case, John. *Speculum Moralium Quaestionum in Universam Ethicam Aristotelis*. Oxford, 1585.
- Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Cicero. *On the Orator*. Trans. H. Rackham. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Clark, Andrew. *Register of the University of Oxford*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1885–89.
- The Collegiate University*. Ed. James McConica. Vol. 3 of *The History of the University of Oxford*. General ed. T. H. Aston. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Collinson, Patrick. *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation*. Reading: University of Reading, 1986.
- . *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

- Connolly, Joy. *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Cressy, David. "Gender Trouble and Cross-Dressing in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 35.4 (1996): 438–65.
- Curtis, Mark H. *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1558–1642*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Dent, C. M. *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- di Simone, Maria Rosa. "Alberico Gentili e la controversia sul teatro nell'Inghilterra elisabettiana." In *Alberico Gentili: Atti dei Convegni, Nel Quarto Centenario Della Morte*, 377–410. Milan: Giuffrè, 2010.
- Eden, Kathy. *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Edwards, Catharine. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Ellinghausen, Laurie. "University of Vice: Drink, Gentility, and Masculinity in Oxford, Cambridge, and London." In *Masculinity and the Metropolis of Vice, 1550–1650*, ed. Amanda Bailey and Roze Hentschell, 45–65. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Elliott, John R., Jr. "Queen Elizabeth at Oxford: New Light on the Royal Plays of 1566." *English Literary Renaissance* 18.2 (1988): 218–29.
- . "Drama." In *Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (1997), 641–58.
- Elliott, John R., Jr., Alan H. Nelson, Alexandra F. Johnston, and Diana Wyatt, eds. *Records of Early English Drama: Oxford*. 2 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Fantham, Elaine. "Orator and/et Actor." In *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, ed. Pat Easterling and Edith Hall, 362–76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Feingold, Mordechai. "The Humanities." In *Seventeenth-Century Oxford* (1997), 211–358.
- . "Giordano Bruno in England, Revisited." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67.3 (2004a): 329–46.
- . "Rainolds, John (1549–1607)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford, 2004b. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/23029.
- Finnis, John, and Patrick H. Martin. "An Oxford Play Festival in February 1582." *Notes and Queries* 50.4 (2003): 391–94.
- Fletcher, J. M. "The Faculty of Arts." In *The Collegiate University* (1986), 157–99.
- Gager, William. *The Complete Works*. Ed. and trans. Dana F. Sutton. 4 vols. New York: Garland Publishing, 1994.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Godenius, Rudolph. *Exercitationes Ethicae, in Usum Studiosorum Philosophiae Academiae Marpurgensis*. Marburg, 1592.
- Goldring, Elizabeth, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke, and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, eds. *John Nichols's "The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I": A New Edition of the Early Modern Sources*. 5 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

- Gosson, Stephen. *The schoole of abuse*. London, 1579.
- . *Playes confuted in fiue actions*. London, 1582.
- Graf, Fritz. "The Gestures of Roman Actors and Orators." In *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, ed. Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg, 36–58. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- Gray, Floyd. *Gender, Rhetoric, and Print Culture in French Renaissance Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Green, Lawrence D. *John Rainolds's Oxford Lectures on Aristotle's "Rhetoric."* Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1986.
- Gunderson, Erik. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Heise, Ursula K. "Transvestism and the Stage Controversy in Spain and England, 1580–1680." *Theatre Journal* 44.3 (1992): 357–74.
- Heywood, Thomas. *An apology for actors*. London, 1612.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The Third volume of Chronicles . . . Now newlie recognised, augmented, and continued . . . to the yeare 1586*. London, 1587.
- Jardine, Lisa. *Still Harping on Daughters*. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1983.
- Keenan, Siobhan. *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- . "Spectator and Spectacle: Royal Entertainments at the Universities in the 1560s." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 86–103. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Lake, Peter, with Michael Questier. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists, and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Levine, Laura. *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579–1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Mack, Peter. *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Macrobius. *Saturnalia*. Ed. and trans. Robert A. Kaster. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Markowicz, Leon, ed. and trans. *Latin Correspondence by Alberico Gentili and John Rainolds on Academic Drama*. Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1977.
- Marlow, Christopher. *Performing Masculinity in English University Drama, 1598–1636*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.
- Mazzarino, Santo. *The End of the Ancient World*. Trans. George Holmes. London: Faber and Faber, 1966.
- McConaughy, James L. *The School Drama, Including Palsgrave's Introduction to Acolastus*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913.
- McConica, James. "Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford." *English Historical Review* 94 (1979): 291–317.
- . "Elizabethan Oxford: The Collegiate Society." In *The Collegiate University* (1986), 645–732.

- Munday, Anthony. *A second and third blast of retrait from plaies and Theaters*. London, 1580.
- Northbrooke, John. *A Treatise wherein Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine playes or Enterluds with other idle pastimes. . . are reprobued*. London, 1577.
- O'Connell, Michael. *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Orgel, Stephen. "Nobody's Perfect: Or, Why Did the English Stage Take Boys for Women?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88.1 (1989): 7–29.
- . *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Panizza, Diego. *Alberico Gentili, Giurista Ideologo Nell'Inghilterra Elisabettiana*. Padua: Giuffrè, 1981.
- Phillips, Henry. *The Theatre and Its Critics in Seventeenth-Century France*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Postlewait, Thomas. "Theatricality and Antitheatricality in Renaissance London." In *Theatricality*, ed. Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait, 90–126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Prynne, William. *Histrion-mastix. The players scourge, or, actors tragedie*. London, 1633.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Ed. and trans. Donald A. Russell. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Rainolds, John. *Sex Theses de Sacra Scriptura et Ecclesia*. London, 1580.
- . *Th'overthrow of stage-playes*. Middleburg, 1599.
- . *A Letter of Dr. Reinolds to his friend, concerning his advice for the studie of Divinitie*. London, 1613.
- Rennert, Hugo Albert. *The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega*. New York: n.p., 1909.
- Rhodes, Neil. *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- Rice, Colin. *Ungodly Delights: Puritan Opposition to the Theatre, 1576–1633*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1997.
- Ringler, William, ed. *Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae [Circa 1572] by John Rainolds*. Trans. Walter Allen Jr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- . *Stephen Gosson: A Biographical and Critical Study*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942.
- Schmitt, Charles B. *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983.
- Seventeenth-Century Oxford*. Ed. Nicholas Tyacke. Vol. 4 of *The History of the University of Oxford*. General ed. T. H. Aston. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Shenk, Linda. "Gown before Crown: Scholarly Abjection and Academic Entertainment under Queen Elizabeth I." In *Early Modern Academic Drama*, ed. Jonathan Walker and Paul D. Streufert, 19–44. Farnham: Ashgate, 2008.
- Shuger, Debora Kuller. *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- . "St. Mary the Virgin and the Birth of the Public Sphere." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72.3 (2009): 313–46.
- Smith, Bruce R. *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500–1700*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

- Steel, Catherine. *Roman Oratory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Streete, Adrian. *Protestantism and Drama in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Stubbes, Philip. *The anatomie of abuses*. London, 1583.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars*. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Tertullian. *De Spectaculis*. Trans. T. R. Glover. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Traub, Valerie. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Turner, Marion. "Drama at Magdalen." *Magdalen College Record* (2003): 82–90.
- Wesley, John. "Rhetorical Delivery for Renaissance English: Voice, Gesture, Emotion, and the Sixteenth-Century Vernacular Turn." *Renaissance Quarterly* 68.4 (2015): 1265–96.
- White, Paul Whitfield. *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Theater and Religious Culture." In *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan, 133–51. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- . "The Queen's Men in Elizabethan Cambridge." In *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583–1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing*, ed. Helen Ostovich, Holger Schott Syme, and Andrew Griffin, 41–49. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Williamson, Elizabeth. *The Materiality of Religion in Early Modern English Drama*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Wood, Anthony. *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford*. Ed. John Gutch. 2 vols. Oxford, 1792–96.
- . *Athenae Oxonienses. An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the University of Oxford*. Ed. Philip Bliss. 5 vols. London, 1813–20.
- Young, Karl. "An Elizabethan Defence of the Stage." In *Shakespeare Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of Wisconsin*, 103–24. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1916a.
- . "William Gager's Defence of the Academic Stage." *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 18 (1916b): 593–638.
- Zosimus. *Historiae Novae Libri vi*. Basil, 1576.
- . *New History*. Trans. Ronald T. Ridley. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1982.