William Drummond of Hawthornden as Reader of Renaissance Drama

This essay considers one of the most notable and neglected first readers of early modern playbooks: William Drummond of Hawthornden (1585-1649). Drummond’s commonplace books document his extensive interest in English drama; he left marks of use in his quarto editions of plays, and his poetry and prose make allusion to Shakespeare’s works. In part, this material provides further evidence that early modern readers saw popular drama as material for serious and systematic reading. His notebooks also remind us of the important role ‘commonplacing’ played for such readers: the gathering of memorable reflections and sayings. Yet Drummond’s response to English playbooks is expansive and often surprising. His annotations show that he was equally interested in plot and dramatic process, as much as isolated statements, and in sceptical humour rather than didactic instruction. Furthermore, his allusions to Shakespeare’s plays in his own poetry and prose show a sophisticated response to their specific implications. This essay will concentrate on four plays Drummond owned and read: Jonson’s *Volpone*, Dekker (and Middleton’s), *The Honest Whore*, and Shakespeare’s, *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet*. It will propose that Drummond’s eclectic responses invite fresh thought on the range of uses early modern readers could put drama to and the pleasures they took in it.

‘Shakespeare wanted art,’ pronounced Ben Jonson. As is well known, the recipient and recorder of this remark was the distinguished humanist, poet and historian, William Drummond of Hawthornden (1585-1649) with whom Jonson stayed for some weeks over the Christmas period during his visit to Scotland between September 1618 and January 1619. There are grounds for thinking that this comment had only passing interest for Drummond, given that it addresses Shakespeare’s work as a popular dramatist. Jonson had many strictures to share regarding the limitations of other poets, including the work of his host, and he commented on such notable figures as Petrarch, Philip Sidney, Spenser, and Donne. The reputation of contemporary playwrights may have been of less consequence in this elevated
company, despite Jonson’s own career as a dramatist. Yet Drummond’s curiosity about
English theatre, including Shakespeare’s plays, bears further scrutiny. After all, he had
presumably asked the question that had provoked Jonson’s notorious judgement.

Drummond is now best-known for the ‘Informations’ in which he transcribed his
conversations with Jonson. In truth, there is very little dialogue preserved in this text which is
largely dedicated to transcribing his guest’s anecdotes and opinions. However, it is possible
to learn more about Drummond’s response to the theatrical works of Jonson and his peers
from another set of resources. Drummond read many contemporary plays and copied extracts
from these works into his commonplace book; he also left marks of use in the editions he
owned and, as we shall see, traces of this reading, notably of Shakespeare, are also
discernible in his own writing. To be sure, this evidence raises problems of interpretation that
are familiar to historians of reading. Drummond is enigmatic in many respects: a far ‘more
complex and pressured figure than has been realized’, John Kerrigan notes in a fine recent re-
evaluation of his work, ‘and a grossly undervalued writer’. One might well add that
Drummond’s legacy as a reader is equally complex and equally neglected.

This essay will consider four plays Drummond owned, read and annotated: Jonson’s
Volpone, Dekker (and Middleton’s), The Honest Whore, and two Shakespeare quartos, Love’s
Labour’s Lost and Romeo and Juliet. It should be noted that the density of annotation varies
even across this sample: it is extensive in relation to The Honest Whore and Love’s Labour’s
Lost, more fleeting in the other two quartos. This does not necessarily reflect differing levels
of engagement. Drummond recorded extensive material from plays such as Chapman’s All
Fools and John Marston’s Parasitaster in his commonplace book yet his copies of these texts
are unmarked. Similarly, although no quotations from Shakespeare and Jonson appear in his
notebooks, substantive material may be missing from this source. The material we possess is
partial, therefore, and perhaps incomplete, but it offers intriguing and overlooked testimony from one of the period’s most dedicated readers of drama.

How did Drummond respond to this material? We have learnt much about the didactic spirit shared by many of the first readers of playbooks who sought ‘to find in literature the pithy moral that could be applied more widely’. In addition, recent studies have illuminated the related importance of ‘commonplacing’, the systematic gathering of sententious reflections and sayings. As we shall see, these habits of response also play a significant role in Drummond’s approach to dramatic texts. Yet this is only part of the story. Drummond explored English theatrical works in a variety of ways: they fed his curiosity about the expressive use of language and provided a source for citations and allusions that enriched his own writing whilst embedding these sources in new rhetorical contexts that altered their implications. Crucially, Drummond was not only interested in utilisable fragments but in plot and dramatic process as well. He followed the way that plays unfolded and noted moments of transformation and insight, notably within comic drama where the limitations of established perspectives are revealed. There is evidence, therefore, of Drummond’s active role as a reader as he follows the process and play of thought involved in dramatic structures. These reactions are of great interest, in part because of their lack of accord with assumptions concerning early modern readers of playbooks. To be sure, Drummond’s example is undoubtedly a singular one and he may be thought of as eccentric or unrepresentative, but his energetic and independent responses open anew the question of what constitutes a representative reader. At the very least, his interest in playbooks offers further evidence that the first readers of these works could engage with them in a varied and surprising way. His responses invite fresh thought on the range of uses printed drama could be put to and the pleasures taken in it.
A little context will help bring Drummond’s interest in theatre into focus. His family was well-established and well-connected; they owned an estate in Hawthornden, seven miles south of Edinburgh and he was educated at the city’s High School and University. He seems initially to have pursued a legal career and studied in Paris and Bourges. He left a fascinating record of his time in the latter city, written in Scots, of his experience of seeing over twenty plays, principally *commedia dell’arte* and farces, staged by an Italian and then a French troupe in September 1607. On the death of his father in 1610, Drummond became laird of Hawthornden and retired at the age of 24 to dedicate himself to learning. He accumulated an exceptional collection of books in Latin, in several modern European languages and in Greek; he also began to publish his own poetry, most notably the *Poems* (1616), *Forth Feasting* (1617) and *Flowres of Sion* (1623), the latter printed along with a remarkable prose essay, *Cypress Grove*. He had long abandoned Scots as a literary language and all of these works were written in English. In 1633, Drummond composed a series of pageants for the ‘The Entertainment of the High and Mighty Monarch, Prince Charles’ on the latter’s entry into Edinburgh. The years before his death in 1649 were dominated inevitably by the civil war. He was a firm, but not uncritical, royalist and an unrelenting opponent of Presbyterianism. Drummond’s last major work was the *History of Scotland from the Year 1423 until the Year 1542*, usually known as *The History of the Five James* (1655), which was published posthumously; he also engaged in some explicitly political writing, most notably *Irene* (1638), his impassioned plea for religious toleration.

The scope of Drummond’s reading is prodigious. A great part of his library survives as part of his two bequests of over 700 books to the University of Edinburgh, more properly the Tounis College, in 1626 and again between 1628-36. In many respects, the apparently secluded context of Hawthornden Castle invites us to see Drummond as an example of the ‘Montaigne Model’ outlined by William Sherman which stresses the reader’s remoteness.
from civic and domestic life; this image is reinforced by the often melancholy and contemplative tenor of Drummond’s poetry. Yet we would do well to note Sherman’s emphasis on the limitations of this paradigm. Drummond’s donation to the university suggests that the boundary between his private library and civic culture should indeed be regarded as a ‘membrane’ rather than a ‘borderline’. He negotiated with his publisher in Edinburgh—Andro Hart and, subsequently, his son John Hart—concerning books as well as the publication of his own works, he maintained a wide-ranging correspondence with his Scottish literary contemporaries in London and also with Michael Drayton and Ben Jonson, he composed, as has been noted, an important work of civic pageantry, and he showed a lively interest in scientific invention, including practical experiments. More detailed study is needed of the networks through which books and manuscripts were disseminated in Drummond’s circle. For now, I wish only to note the breadth of his intellectual interests and consider his engagement with contemporary plays.

Drummond’s private library demonstrates that he read widely in classical and contemporary theatre but his most concentrated interest in drama centred upon his substantial collection of texts deriving from the public theatres in London. These were purchased in cheap quarto editions presumably during his visit to the English capital in 1606—the year he read by his own account Love’s Labour’s Lost, A Midsummer Night’s Dream and Romeo and Juliet, along with other plays including Marston’s The Malcontent, The Tragedy of Locrine (attributed to Shakespeare), and the anonymous ‘comedie’ Doctor Dodipol—and perhaps added to again during a further visit to London in 1610. At the very least, the breadth of this interest in vernacular drama provides further evidence that plays were not simply regarded as ephemeral or ‘idle’ reading. Sometime after 1621, Drummond made a list of fifty-seven plays in English that he owned or had read and this is by no means comprehensive as it excludes both Shakespeare and Jonson. His commonplace books also document a detailed
reading of seventeen vernacular plays, including Chapman’s, *All Fools* and *Bussy D’Ambois*, Middleton’s, *Your Five Gallants* and *A Mad World, My Masters*, John Day’s, *Law-Tricks* and *The Isle of Gulls*, and Beaumont and Fletcher’s, *The Maid’s Tragedy* and *Cupid’s Revenge*. Nor is he indifferent to the authorship of these works. Drummond often noted the authors of plays, recording, for example, in his list of ‘bookes red anno 1609 be me’ his reading of ‘Sir Ph. Sid arcadia’ followed by ‘Parasitaster by Marston comed’; he also records the names of the relevant dramatists in his lengthy list of plays noted above. In the printed catalogue of his first bequest of books to the University of Edinburgh, many plays are included and attributed, including Marlowe’s *Massacre at Paris*, Jonson’s *Volpone* and Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labour’s Lost*. Furthermore, Drummond’s copy of the second or “good” quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, published anonymously in 1599 but widely known to be Shakespeare’s, has the author’s name added on the title page almost certainly in Drummond’s own hand along with his signature to mark his ownership (see Fig. 1).

Drummond’s expansive interest in popular drama indicates that he saw this material as appropriate for systematic reading. He does not appear to make any hierarchical distinction between contemporary plays and other kinds of literature. Only a few months after his encounter with Jonson, Drummond published an essay, *A Midnight’s Trance* (1619), a work that was later revised and expanded into *Cypress Grove* (1623). This composition is a significant and under-regarded contribution to Renaissance writing on death in ways that exceed the scope of this essay. It draws and elaborates upon numerous sources, including John Donne, Pierre Charron, Montaigne, and Francis Bacon. It begins by reflecting on our fear of death and portrays a mind transfixed by mortality; all ‘the sweet pleasure of Earth’ will be lost to us: ‘Stars neuer rise vnto us, all strength by this tane away, all comlinesse defaced’. The remainder of the text marshals a series of arguments to show how we can accommodate ourselves to death. Our habits of thought often obstruct this possibility and
work against our best interests; needlessly, we ‘plunge our selues in the deepest gulfes of anguish’ and yet this ailment lies in ourselves as does its cure. If we can see death without morbidity this reveals, in turn, the true condition of our lives. After all, in contrast to death, what antagonist in nature is more forbidding, Drummond asks, than other living men? ‘What wrongs, scornes, contumelies, prisons, poysons, torments, receiueh man of man?’ The use of this vocabulary is itself suggestive. However, the source that is shaping his reflection emerges fully as Drummond considers that although the most contented part of our lives is dedicated to sleep, ‘the shadow of Death’, yet we still dread the latter:

The halfe of our Life is spent in sleepe, which (sith it is a release of care, the balme of woe, an indifferent arbiter vnto all) must be the best, and yet is but the shadow of Death: and who would not rather than suffer the Slings, and Arrows of outrageous Fortune, the whips and scorns of time, the oppressors wrongs, the proud mans contumelies, sleepe euer (that is, dye) and end the Heart-ake, and the thousand naturall Shocks, that flesh is heire to?24

Although he appears to have made no note of owning or reading the second quarto of Hamlet, Drummond appears to have known it well enough. Indeed, the concerns of A Midnight’s Trance resonate powerfully with the play although the essay draws on a multitude of sources some of which Shakespeare was also likely aware of, such as Montaigne.25 In his response to Hamlet, Drummond appears to have agreed with his English contemporary, Gabriel Harvey, who in a well-known observation acknowledged the value of the play and Lucrece for the ‘wiser sort’ of reader.26

Drummond’s citation is worth pausing over. It shows that a Shakespearean play was a natural resource to draw upon to elevate his essay’s mode of expression and concentrate its quality of thought. Hamlet’s pervasive and often anguished consciousness of mortality opens
onto the same problem that Drummond explores in terms of how received attitudes towards
death inhibit understanding of it and how this can be overcome. In this respect, Hamlet’s
soliloquy is treated as a kind of essay whose startling formulations help to identify what is at
stake in this issue. Yet Drummond tests rather than simply absorbs Hamlet’s thinking. The
afflictions of life that should incite us to act and to abandon a merely insensate endurance of
injustice are neutralized, in Hamlet’s account, by the overwhelming fear of death and the
afterlife. Drummond absorbs these phrases but proposes that we can rob death of its fearful
and unnatural qualities if we contrast it proportionately with life as we do with sleep; then it
simply becomes another integral aspect of existence. These ideas are built upon and
developed throughout *A Midnight’s Trance*. For our purposes, it is important to note that
Hamlet’s words are a resource for further thinking that is not untypical of the way quotations
are braided into Drummond’s prose but are also unfolded by it and altered in the process.

This example of how Drummond’s knowledge of popular drama surfaced in his own
writing also places him squarely within a familiar tradition of early modern reading: the
practice of ‘commonplacing’ or gathering of *sententiae*.27 Both *A Midnight’s Trance* and
*Cypress Grove* teem with quotations and allusions concerned with death that Drummond
must have gathered in a now lost or discarded section of his commonplace book.28 The
quotation from *Hamlet* suggests that he read plays in the manner fostered by this tradition as
well and there is further and more substantive evidence of this. As is well-known,
commonplacing asked the student to ‘fragment’ the text by identifying key extracts or
passages that were then grouped together under topical headings that made them easy to
retrieve for wider application. As a number of studies have demonstrated, this method was
applied to the reading of early modern drama.29 Indeed from 1600, plays from the
professional theatre not only began to be quarried as a resource for printed commonplace
books but they were increasingly published with their most significant maxims already
highlighted for the reader, either by a comma or inverted comma at the beginning of the relevant line or a change in font from roman to italic.\textsuperscript{30}

Drummond’s collection contained plays printed in this manner--for example, \textit{Doctor Dodipol}--and, furthermore, his commonplace books include a painstaking gathering of quotations from vernacular drama. Admittedly, this miscellaneous body of material is not organised topically or thematically. Perhaps a degree of randomness is to be expected given that the title Drummond appended to the notebook in which these citations appear was ‘EPHEMERIS’.\textsuperscript{31} That said, the majority of these notes are grouped together and, for apparently ephemeral material, they are often extremely detailed. Drummond recorded many brief quotations along with more extensive speeches, such as Rinaldo’s apostrophe to beauty from the first scene of Chapman’s \textit{All Fools} (1605), along with the same character’s equally grandiloquent reflection on Fortune in the final act.\textsuperscript{32}

Many of these citations are perfect examples of commonplace reading: they collect sayings and \textit{sententiae} along with striking passages, phrases and figures of speech analogous to the phrases taken from Hamlet’s soliloquy. For example, Drummond records Bussy’s resonant reflection at the outset of Chapman’s \textit{Bussy D’Ambois} (1607): ‘men that fall low must die, / As well as men cast headlong from the skie.’ (sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}; NLS 2060, fol. 298\textsuperscript{r}). Similarly, he transcribes the couplet that is italicised in the text of Marston’s \textit{Parasitaster or The Fawn} (1606) and given commonplace markers: ‘\textit{Honour auoyds not only iust defame: / But flies all meanes that may ill voice his name}’ (sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}; fol. 344\textsuperscript{r}). There are further correspondences between these texts, or his marking of them, and his commonplace book. In his copy of \textit{The Honest Whore}, for example, he highlights terse and memorable formulations such as the Duke’s opening reflection on mutability: ‘Queens’ bodies are but trunks to put in worms’ and he duly copies this into his notes on the play (sig. A3\textsuperscript{r}; cf fol. 208\textsuperscript{r}). \textit{The Honest Whore} also allows a comparison to be made between Drummond’s response and that of
another contemporary reader, or in this instance theatre-goer, Edward Pudsey, who also recorded notable phrases from the play in his commonplace book, although these derive from his attendance at a performance. Both Drummond and Pudsey note similar details, such as the sardonic response of Hippolito’s servant, ‘He’s not cloven, my lord, that I can see’, to his master’s accusation that the (disguised) and now reformed prostitute Bellafront is a devil (10.129-30; cf. G2r).\textsuperscript{33} Both also note sententious observations such as those made by the pious Friar Anselmo, ‘Wisely to fear is to be free from fear’ (15.11; cf. I2’), and by the corrupt Duke: ‘Lovers watch minutes like astronomers’ (15.100; cf. I3’). Drummond also marks and records Latin citations and tags, those moments where playtexts themselves draw on received authority.\textsuperscript{34} Colloquial speech also interested him. He records in his notebooks exuberant instances of vernacular idiom, such as Fustigo’s phrase, ‘most Herculian Tobacco’ (sig. D1’; fol. 208r) in The Honest Whore, or ‘Speake, thou three legd Tripos’ in The Fawn (sig. B1’; fol. 344r) and Bungler’s colourful expression in Middleton’s Your Five Gallants: ‘tis now about the nauill of the day, vpon the belly of no one’ (sig. G2’; fol. 210r).

This variety of interest is not in itself surprising given that the tastes of privileged readers ‘were inclusive not exclusive’.\textsuperscript{35} A leading humanist, such as Juan Luis Vives, recommended that notebooks need not be always systematic but could be thought of ‘like nests; in one you would note down words of everyday use’, in another rare words, ‘in another sententiae, in another humorous and witty sayings’ and so on.\textsuperscript{36} Yet Drummond does not separate these distinct kinds of examples into ‘nests’ where they could be recovered easily. He does undoubtedly break the text down into fragments but these citations derive from a process of consecutive reading rather than resulting from a sifting of the text for isolable details to be organised according to an externally imposed system of themes and topics. This lack of system can be puzzling.\textsuperscript{37} It testifies to Drummond’s capaciousness as a reader which appears in his response to individual works as much as in his broader reading. He engages
with an array of verbal qualities in dramatic writing: its insights, quirks, witty ripostes, arguments, figures of speech, and its commonplaces too. However, if we examine Drummond’s marks of use within his copies of plays, it is evident that there is no straightforward process of transmission between these and the material recorded in his commonplace books; the plays are not simply being marked up for transcription. This reveals some distinctive patterns in his response to drama beyond his openness to the plenitude of the text.

In his marking of Jonson’s *Volpone* (1607), Drummond appears to have had little concern to ‘harvest’ the play for memorable quotations despite the dubious example of Sir Politic Would-Be within the play who habitually collects ‘notes / Drawne out of Play-bookes’ (sig. M2'). His reading method appears to be both sequential and much more orientated towards the plot. His principal interest centres on the figure of Mosca and he notes this protagonist’s stratagems, statements, disguises and deceptions, marking his exchange with Corbaccio regarding Volpone’s apparently sceptical view of physicians -- ‘He has no faith in Physick . . . He says, they slea a man’ (C1'-C2') -- and his observations to Corvino: ‘The weeping of an heyre should still be laughter’ (C4'); ‘That naught can warme his bloud, Sir, but a *feuer*; / Nor any incantation raise his spirit’ (F2'). He also notes his incitement of the latter to murder Volpone -- ‘’Tis but to pul the pillow, from his head’ (F2') -- and the thrilling soliloquy that begins the play’s third act where Mosca distinguishes his own virtuosity as a parasite and a trickster from those who merely rely on ‘Kitchin-inuention’ and ‘Make their reuene out of legges, and faces’ (F3'). This is a skill that Mosca continues to demonstrate promptly and Drummond marks his subsequent gulling of Bonario as he refutes his accusations of immorality in a scandalised manner: ‘Your sentence may be righteous, yet you are not’, and professes hypocritically the selflessness of his concern: ‘The worke no way ingageth mee. . .’ (F3'; F4').
This interest in plot, sequence and dramatic moments of transition and revelation is also prominent in his more heavily marked copy of *The Honest Whore*.\(^\text{(39)}\) This play elicited a wide range of reactions. He continues to note instances of demotic speech, the slang and argot that pervades Dekker’s vivid portrayal of urban life, but is equally alert to different registers of dialogue. He marks both Hippolito’s overwrought reflection on mutability—‘it cannot be / Such a bright taper should burn out so soon’—as well as Matteo’s competing reflection on those who sit down to dinner and ‘had so much health that they were glad to pledge it, yet before three o’clock have been found dead – drunk’ (1.99-100; A3\(^v\); l. 102-4; A3\(^v\)). In this way, he responds to shifts in tone and register, noting the variety of speakers along with their varying perspectives. Hence, as noted above, he marks in the same scene the Servant’s sarcastic response to Hippolito’s overwrought suspicion that Bellafront is the devil as well the former’s lyrical lament on the portrait of his (seemingly) dead love, Infelice. In this respect, Drummond’s reading of this play is not simply taken up with fragments; he attends throughout to longer sequences of dialogue and argument, especially those moments when perceptions alter. For example, the crucial relationship between Hippolito and Bellafront (the honest whore of the title) drew his attention (see Fig. 2). He marks Hippolito’s long denunciation of prostitution but also its transformative impact upon Bellafront (D4\(^r\)-E2\(^r\)). Later, he marks the increasing misogyny of the former’s discourse but also Bellafront’s powerful response beginning, ‘If woman were thy mother . . . (G2r-v), as well as her earlier and equally compelling refutation of Matteo’s cynical attitude to women that reveals his responsibility for her earlier condition: ‘you brake the Ice, / Which after turnd a puddle’ (F4\(^f\)).

Crucially, he is fascinated by *The Honest Whore’s* construction and notes passages which are memorable not simply for their weight of sentiment or colourful phrasing but because they clinch a moment of change or reversal. He marks instances where a new plot or sub-plot is inaugurated, such as Candido’s wife’s intention to make her husband ‘horne mad’
(B1’), as well as the culmination or exposure of these devices, for example, the comic revelation of Fustigo’s identity (E4’). He follows key moments of development in the narrative, overlining Bellafront’s ringing declaration to her associates from her former life: ‘I am not as I was’ (F3’), the Duke’s shocking turn against his accomplice the Doctor -- ‘Kings may loue treason, but the traitor hate’ (H3’) -- as well as his final moment of repentance and resignation: ‘Since fate hath conquered, I must rest content, / To striue now would but ad new punishment’ (K3’). Similarly, he notes how the play resolves its different narrative strands in its concluding scene. In this way, Drummond is alert not only to the mechanics of *The Honest Whore’s* structure but its emotional and ethical implications as well. Recurrently, he notes passages where insights expand or are modified and assumptions are challenged.

This interest in dramatic process can also be identified in Drummond’s 1598 quarto of *Love’s Labour’s Lost,* the first published work of Shakespeare’s to bear his name on the title page.⁴⁰ In this text, he shows a similarly wide-ranging attention to plot and dialogue but his concern not only stretches beyond the recording of *sententiae,* it engages with the play’s mordant account of reading and writing as means of gaining wisdom about the world. This concern prevails throughout Shakespeare’s comedy, notably so when Nathaniel produces his table-book so as to record a significant commonplace, Holofernes’s absurd use of the word ‘peregrinate’: ‘A most singular and choice epithet’.⁴¹ This preoccupation with language at the expense of reality is noted by Drummond from the outset when his first marginal notation highlights Berowne’s irreverent response to the King of Navarre’s definition of ‘the ende of study’: ‘to know which else we should not know’. He also brackets Berowne’s bracing reply to the king’s inflated aspirations: ‘Com’on, then, I will sweare to study so, / To know the thing I am forbid to know: / As thus, to study where I well may dine . . .’ (sig. A2’/ 1.1.55-6; 59-61). This interest in the bathetic elements of *Love’s Labour’s Lost* predominates in Drummond’s response. He marks the play’s exposure of affected forms of language and
perception, especially its parodies of Sidney’s ‘Arcadianisms’ and Euphuistic formulations, and its interest in failures of self-awareness as well as awareness of others. He notes with a marginal mark Armado’s absurd declension on the word ‘base’, a toying with words in the manner of Arcadia: ‘I do affect the verie ground (which is base) where her shoo (which is baser) guided by her foote (which is basest) doth tread’ (sig. B3\(^\circ\); 1.2.136-8). Equally, he overlines the same character’s later impulse to ‘turn sonnet’ and his ridiculous letter with its effusive formulations: ‘I proffane my lippes on thy foote, my eyes on thy picture, and my hart on thy euerie part’ (sig. D3\(^\circ\); 4.1.76-8). Drummond follows the quick wit of Moth (or ‘Boy’ in his copy of the quarto) bracketing his exchange with Armado: ‘Armado. Boy, What signe is it when a man of great spirite growes melancholy? / Boy. A great signe sir that he will looke sad.’ (B1\(^\circ\); 1.2.1-3). Subsequently, he also notes the moment when Armado acclaims Moth’s bamboozling disquisition on the number three—‘Armado.

A most fine Figure. / Boy. To proue you a Cypher ‘ (sig. B2\(^\circ\); 1.2.46-7)—as well as the latter’s pointed caricature of the affected language and demeanour that attends masculine courtship: ‘with your hat penthouselike ore the shop of your eyes, with your armes crost on your thinebellies doblett like a Rabbet on a spit . . .’ (sig. C3\(^\circ\); 3.1.12-14).\(^{42}\) His continuous interest in Berowne’s role is evident in his attention both to Maria and Boyet’s exchange, ‘Lady Maria. That last is Berowne, the merrie madcap L[ord]. / Not a word with him but a iest. Boy. And every iest but a word.’ (sig. C3\(^\circ\); 2.1.211-12), and in his bracketing of Berowne’s extravagant Petrarchan flattery of Rosaline (sig. F1\(^\circ\).F2\(^\circ\); 4.3.227-9; 249-54). His annotations also follow Berowne’s unravelling of affectation and illusion and his resolution to discard such encumbrances after the exposure of the courtiers’ folly in adopting the personae of visiting Muscovites (see Fig. 3).

In one sense, Drummond’s annotations of Love’s Labour’s Lost and The Honest Whore show that he is indeed engaging with the moral process and concerns of these works.
Yet the terms of this engagement are not dominated by the homiletic reactions often seen as being prevalent among the early readers of drama. This form of response could be satisfied both by observing the narrative outcomes of a work like *Romeo and Juliet* and in the copious evaluation of its action provided especially by the Friar. Indeed, the latter’s comments are excerpted profusely in those late-Elizabethan anthologies which presented quotations from contemporary poetry and drama under a sequence of alphabetical headings in the manner of a commonplace book: Robert Allott’s *Englands Parnassus* (1600) and John Bodenham and Anthony Munday’s *Bel-vêdere, or the Garden of the Muses* (1600).

However, Drummond’s reading of *Romeo and Juliet* appears surprisingly unengaged by its passages of conventional moral evaluation. He seems to have little interest in the Friar’s voice at the conclusion of *Romeo and Juliet* as compared to his overlining of Romeo’s baroque apostrophe to beauty and death in Juliet’s tomb:

\[
\text{Thou art not conquerd, bewties ensigne yet}
\]

\[
\text{Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks,}
\]

\[
\text{And deaths pale flag is not advancd there.}
\]

\[
\text{Ah deare Juliet}
\]

Why art thou yet so faire? I will beleue,

\[
\text{Shall I beleue that vnsubstantiall death is amorous,}
\]

\[
\text{And that the leane abhorred monster keepes}
\]

\[
\text{Thee here in darke to be his parramour?}
\]

45
Similarly, it is notable that his attention is drawn to the bawdy masculine banter of the play’s opening dialogue between Sampson and Gregory, the two servants of the Capulet household (sig. A3r; 1.1.4-5; 16-20), as well as to the Nurse’s recollection of her husband’s indecorous joke when the infant Juliet suffered a fall (sig. B4v; 1.3.40-3). Drummond also notes Mercutio’s colourful use of innuendo: ‘Prick loue for prickling, and you beate loue downe, / Giue me a case to put my visage in ‘; ‘This is the hag, when maides lie on their backs, / That presses them and learnes them first to beare, / Making them women of good carriage ‘ (sigs. C1v, C2v; 1.4.29; 92-4).

Furthermore, this seeming inattention to passages of moralising reflection, and the evident interest in dramatic wit and wordplay, goes deeper than merely alertness to the latter’s often equivocal tenor. In Love’s Labour’s Lost, Drummond follows the twists and turns of the play’s ethical process as well as the intricacies of its plot. This is especially clear in his attention to Berowne’s self-reflection on the limits of his own aspirations and desires as well as those of his fellow courtiers. However, significant moments are also noted within women’s responses and experiences. He notes the Princess’ abrupt response to Boyet’s mannered compliment—‘Good L[ord] Boyet, my beautie though but meane, / Needes not the painted florish of your prayse’ (sig. B4r; 2.1.13-14) and Rosaline’s crushing response to Berowne’s avowal: ‘Ber. O, I am yours and all that I possesse. / Rosa. All the foole mine’ (sig. H3v; 5.2.383-4; see Fig. 3). He also marks the chilling detail concerning the deadly effect of Cupid on Katharine’s sister: ‘He made her melancholie, sad and heavie, / And so she died’ (sig. G1v; 5.2.14-15) and, in one of the play’s most surprising moments, the Princess’s refusal to accept the King of Navarre’s word at the end of the play—‘Your oth I will not trust’—and her demand that he ‘goe with speede / To some forlorne and naked Hermytage’ for a year to test whether the ‘gaudie-blossomes of your Loue’ will endure (sig. I4v; 5.2.768-77). Drummond is also responsive to moments when laughter, however reflexive, falters.
This mode of response may seem surprising, even counter-intuitive, for those familiar with Drummond’s poetry and prose. He is often depicted as a solemn figure: withdrawn and self-absorbed. His verse memorialises his commitment to an often melancholy and elegiac Petrarchanism that is more rarefied than his English counterparts. Yet his manuscripts tell a different story. These demonstrate that Drummond’s indifference to explicit moral instruction could extend beyond drama; his notes show a widespread indifference to the edifying lessons to be gleaned from works such as Lyly’s *Euphues and His England*, Guazzo’s *Civil Conversation*, and Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* whilst recording ‘nothing but jokes and anecdotes’. One of Drummond’s commonplace books is, in effect, a jest-book that records witty sayings, quick-witted responses, and scandalous and humorous anecdotes that bring unworldly aspirations rudely down to earth. The pieties of all confessional persuasions are a favourite target. The jokes celebrate the deflatory riposte: ‘S[ir]. W[alter]. R[aleigh]. complained on day hee had catched a little cold. No wonder replied S[ir]. G[osceline]. P[ercy]. yee did lie on the head of the church all night’. Time and again in these anecdotes, accepted means of performing and sustaining social roles break down exposing the vulnerability of the speaker. In this respect, Drummond’s notebooks share the broader spirit of the period’s jest-books in undermining collections of *sententiae* by ‘exposing the underlying motives for reading such collections—self-advancement and personal pleasure, rather than some altruistic desire to advance the sum of human knowledge.’ This suggests a quality of response that is at the core not only of Drummond’s own collection of jests but that also plays a significant role in his reading of early modern drama.

There is a further clue to the nature of Drummond’s interest in comedy and bathos when we note his decision to dedicate the commonplace book he dedicated to jokes and anecdotes, to Democritus, the laughing philosopher, who satirised the world’s absurdities:
Democritus: A Labyrinth of Delight. /or/ Wo[rke preparative for his apologie of Demokritus.\textsuperscript{52}

Drummond never completed this apologie but his method of reading offered one way of exploring some of the insights intrinsic to such a study. Democritus was crucial to the conception of Folly in Erasmus famous mock-encomium \textit{Praise of Folly} (1511) and in that work Folly reminds the reader that the world is so replete with idiocies that ‘a thousand suche as Democritus was, shulde not suffice to laughe at theim, although yet those verie laughers had nede of an other Democritus to laugh theim also to scorne’.\textsuperscript{53} This resurgence of interest in the philosophy of laughter, especially among Renaissance humanists of a sceptical disposition, found notable expression in Montaigne’s preference for Democritus over Heraclitus in his essay on these two philosophers. Drummond owned a copy of the \textit{Essais} (1595) and \textit{A Midnight’s Feast} and \textit{Cypress Grove} are saturated with allusions to them.\textsuperscript{54}

Montaigne’s essay commends curiosity about all subjects and values the role of laughter in responding to the diversity, as well as the absurdity, of human behaviour: ‘I cannot be perswaded, there can be so much ill lucke in us, as there is apparant vanitie, nor so much malice, as sottishnesse. We are not so full of evill, as of voydnesse and inani[ti]e. We are not so miserable, as base and abject . . . Our owne condition is as ridiculous, as risible’\textsuperscript{55}

Robert Burton’s adoption of the persona of Democritus Junior in his \textit{Anatomy of Melancholy} (1621) was perhaps the most remarkable expression of interest in this philosopher: ‘So thou laughest at me, and I at thee, both at a third . . . For it is a great signe and property of a foole . . . out of pride and selfe-conceit, to insult, vilifie, condemne, censure, and call other men Fooles . . . to taxe that in others, of which wee are most faulty; teach that which wee follow not ourselves’.\textsuperscript{56} This interest in the reflexive potential of laughter was prevalent in Drummond’s marking of plays and, in this respect, he is attuned to their ethical concerns even if this is not exactly expressed in didactic terms. The example of Democritus stressed ‘that the mocker should be mocked’ and drew attention to one ‘who seems to be detached from worldly folly
but is nonetheless implicated in it’. This illuminates Drummond’s curiosity with regard to Mosca, Berowne and Mercutio as examples of satirists implicated in the follies they expose. The subject matter of Democritie concerns episodes that deflate social pretensions and debunk exalted claims to status and reverence. This helps to explain not only a noticeable lack of moral sobriety in Drummond’s response to drama but his attentiveness to the often sceptical treatment of the moralising impulse within these plays.

‘That Shakespeare wanted art’. Drummond’s scepticism towards Jonson’s authority as a critic is made evident at the end of the ‘Informations’ and he responded to Shakespeare and his contemporaries in independent and diverse ways. These works provided him with formulations and insights that sustained his own writing and reflection as well as demonstrating through their ingenuity of construction how established ideas could be questioned and overturned. By way of conclusion, I’d like to return to another instance of how Drummond absorbed an allusion from Shakespeare. In the year before Jonson’s visit, Drummond had published Forth Feasting, a panegyric on James VI and I’s return to Scotland in 1617 which also acknowledges the deleterious consequences of the king’s long absence. The poem explores a sequence of highly sophisticated analogies, parallels and allusions that explore James’s sovereignty. It includes praise of the king’s exemplary commitment to learning and especially his cultivation of his poetic gift. It is in this context that he alludes to A Midsummer Night’s Dream, a work Drummond had first read over ten years before although his copy has not survived. Forth Feasting describes the king’s capacity to retire from ‘those pearcing Cares which Thrones inuest, / As Thornes the Rose’ and to dedicate himself to creative composition; the resulting poetry is compared to that of Orpheus (in itself a volatile analogy). The effects of James’s poetry on its audience is then evoked by drawing upon the enraptured recollection Oberon shares with Puck of the mermaid ‘on a dolphin’s
back’ who sang with ‘such dulcet and harmonious breath’: ‘That the rude sea grew civil at her song / And certain stars shot madly from their spheres / To hear the sea-maid’s music’. Like the mermaid, the ‘celestial Fire’ of King James’s art, according to the poem, ‘charm’d the Dolphines in the Maine’ and its enchanting effect also resonates across the cosmos: ‘Thou sungst away the Houres, till from their Spheare / Starres seem’d to shoote, Thy Melodie to heare’ (ll. 167-74). It is a curious and equivocal allusion. On the one hand, in contrast to Shakespeare, it is only the cosmos, not the king, that is charmed by art and the monarch is portrayed as author rather than audience. On the other, it is notable that Drummond draws on a passage that continues with a renowned panegyric to Elizabeth, the ‘fair vestal’ and ‘imperial votaress’, a sovereign who remains immune to romantic desire and its besetting complications (2.1.155-64). Shakespeare’s Oberon is an example of the inflammatory rivalry and possessiveness that can afflict monarchs who fail to regulate their private desires and fall prey to divided commitments. Indeed, Titania has just described how his jealousy and unruliness has fractured their relationship and this has also led to the calamitous abandonment of the land. Forth Feasting pays lavish tribute to the king’s exceptional qualities as a ‘Man diuine’ wholly dedicated to his office: ‘No stormie Passions doe disturbe thy Mind’ (l. 17; l. 211). Yet whilst testifying to the collective joy felt at the king’s return to his native kingdom the poem also evokes powerfully the dangers of neglect and distraction that can result in the land becoming ‘a Garden of its Beautie spoil’d’ (l. 97). The allusion to Shakespeare does not undermine Drummond’s praise but its implications are mixed in the associations and parallels it evokes.

How contemporaries responded to the experience of reading plays is an issue of increasing interest and Drummond’s playbooks and manuscripts, along with his own compositions, presents us with a fascinating new resource to explore this. Admittedly, Drummond is an instance of those highly-educated male humanists that have dominated, and
perhaps restricted, understanding of earlier reading practices. Yet such readers will remain important in understanding the reception of early modern drama in print and Drummond’s own extraordinary activity as a reader, let alone a writer, has been overlooked by scholarship that is still largely concerned with English sources. His responses suggests that early readers did not necessarily follow the conservative moral teaching to be found within plays or simply fragment these works for reusable extracts. Drummond took a wide-ranging interest and pleasure in the linguistic diversity of drama, in its range of plots and perspectives and, especially, in the play of thought provoked by theatrical comedy. Both his poetry and prose drew upon this reading and he entered into dialogue with the insights he gleaned from it. Drummond’s view of Jonson and his countrymen’s theatre was receptive, curious, and expansive.
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