A Piece of Farce

The Jubilee was not really ended at four o'clock on a wet September morning. Transferred to more convenient and comfortable quarters of the London entertainment world, it dominated the stage for a year and a half. The multitudes in Stratford could not all arrange for immediate transportation home, and Francis Gentleman was one of the less fortunate ones. Gentleman was an actor, a lecturer on rhetoric, a very interesting critic of the theater. To entertain the captive audience left reluctantly stranded there, he quickly wrote and staged The Stratford Jubilee, a two-act comedy with a rhymed prologue, “Scrub’s Trip to the Jubilee.” He offered it to Drury Lane, but it was refused, and his wavering loyalties transferred themselves for a while to Samuel Foote, to whom the published play was dedicated. Like Garrick, Foote had his own ideas about what should be done dramatically with the Jubilee, and he did not use the play at the Haymarket, but he did put “Scrub’s Trip to the Jubilee” on stage, Weston speaking the lines.

In the play there is little attempt to individualize any character and the dialogue is basically stock London patter. One scene shows people in Jackson’s costume shop choosing dresses for the masquerade ball; the witticisms could have been transferred to any setting, but the faults and failings of Stratford are present at least in the background, and Stratford inconveniences give pretext for some of the lines. So London’s post-Jubilee satire of
Stratford began on the banks of the swollen Avon.

Foote managed to get back to London in time to close his summer season at the Haymarket with a performance London had been waiting for. He closed on September 15 with a gala performance of *The Devil upon Two Sticks*. His pre-Jubilee deviltry had promised much for his eyewitness accounts, and the Great Comet had played into his hands. He did not disappoint his clamorous audience. At this time he spoke "The Devil's Definition of a Jubilee." The gibes at Stratford and at Garrick's Stewardship and the praise of Shakespeare may be taken as a pattern for much of the satire that followed.

In 1755 Garrick had rung up a real failure with *The Chinese Festival*. The only other great failure of his career was the Jubilee at Stratford, and of the two, this was the more personal and the more embarrassing. He approached the matter cautiously at Drury Lane. On September 21 he staged the old favorite popular for ten years, *Harlequin's Invasion*. It was close enough to the Jubilee message to form a test case, but it had no reference to Stratford. He augmented the final scene of the triumph of the statue over Harlequin with some of the glorification planned for Stratford, and all went well. He took heart. He was not ruined, but he was cautious.

Before he went to Stratford he had submitted a play named *The Jubilee* to the licensing authorities. There is no record of the nature of the play—only of its licensing. The overflow of visitors and of the Avon made it passé almost as soon as it was on paper. He was by no means sure that London audiences were in a mood for eulogies of Stratford, but the ode had been a triumph even amidst the very flood, and he risked its eulogies. He staged it September 30 as it had been performed in Stratford, and it had eight very successful performances that season. People came from rural sections of England to see it. The striking use
of spoken recitative delighted the public. Walpole missed it, and Garrick went to Strawberry Hill and read it for him. Thomas Sheridan and others lambasted the ode in the press, but Garrick's reading of it drew unfailing applause. The poem as it lies flat on a page in black and white may not seem to deserve the praise given it when colored by Garrick's voice, but given that color, critics said it explored areas left untouched by English poetry for years, energy of language and beauty of sound. Despite requests from the public that Tom King's stunt of the macaroni who disliked Shakespeare and Garrick's oration be staged also, Garrick did not repeat that part of the show.

It is a mistake to think of the ode as driven from the boards by satire. It was absorbed by *The Jubilee*, but it was highly successful in its own right. Garrick mentioned Sheridan's critique and parried it with the proof of box office receipts: Sheridan as Longinus was "a blockhead," and for the ode "More triumph." Samuel Foote kept up his threat to stage his own ode; announcements appeared in October and again in November. The idle threat only served to call attention to the Drury Lane performance. But Garrick had promised Lacy a new play that would "indemnify us," and the one he had written would not do.

Then George Colman took action. At Covent Garden on October 7, he opened his own play *Man and Wife: or the Stratford Jubilee*, no afterpiece, but a lavish full-length production. Instead of the usual rhymed prologue, Colman wrote a little skit, as Foote sometimes did when he wanted to clarify his position with regard to a current issue. I think that Garrick himself at this point would not have dared be as beneficient. The character Dapperwit (played by Dyer) represented Colman himself, author of the play and manager of the theater. He had two foils, Jenkins (played by Hill) and Townley (played by Wroughton). Jenkins had been out of town and could ask all
the necessary naïve questions. The sophisticated Townley could quote all the current criticisms of the event for Dapperwit to refute.

**TOWNLEY [quoting Foote]:** Ay, Sir—but an ode without poetry—
**DAPPERWIT:** As to the Ode—it has one capital fault, I must confess.

**TOWNLEY AND JENKINS:** Well—and what was it?
**DAPPERWIT:** Why, Gentlemen, I understood every word of it. —Now, an ode, they say—an ode—to be very good, should be wholly unintelligible.

**JENKINS:** Well—but you intend to give it here, I suppose?
**DAPPERWIT:** No—the Ode can nowhere be heard to so much advantage as from the mouth of the author—and indeed it was so happily calculated for the time and place, for which it was originally intended, and the speaker so truly felt a noble enthusiasm on the occasion, that you have lost a very exquisite pleasure (never to be retrieved) by not hearing it at Stratford-upon-Avon.⁹

Dapperwit attempted to bring Foote over to the side of the angels. The satire of “my friend Pasquin” is not like ordinary mudslinging, but like fuller’s earth, which left his adversary cleaner than before. Theater critics ridiculed this “exquisite scene to sweeten Mr. Garrick for anticipating his pageant,” and had much to say about the fuller’s-earth simile,¹⁰ and Foote’s “kindly intention,” but Colman’s play must have seemed to Garrick heaven-sent, for it put the ground back under his feet.

Colman’s lively three-act comedy opens on a scene of confusion in the White Lion. Orders are shouted for the rooms with their Shakespearean names: madeira for As You Like It, punch for Measure for Measure. The problems and discomforts are treated with light good nature. The army of waiters imported for the occasion are creating more servant problems than they are solving, but they are jolly creatures, ready to sing the praise of the Bard at the drop of a salver. Boot boys lose the guests’
shoes. There is no stable room for the visitors' horses, but they are assured that Jack Pratt's Whirligig is receiving the best of care. A visitor tipsy from bumpers to Shakespeare and the Steward sings "The Mulberry Tree." The long scenes of local color frame the slight plot and the bickerings of the Man and Wife who give the play its title. Mr. Cross favors one suitor for the hand of his daughter, a man named Kitchen (played by Dunstall) whose "mind was a great pantry," and all his talk of eating and drinking. Mrs. Cross (played by Mrs. Green) favors Marcourt. Charlotte herself (played by Mrs. Bulkeley) favors Colonel Frankly.

Act II is dominated by Mr. Cross (Ned Shuter) until the scene shifts to a street and the Shakespearean characters march through the town to music by Arnold. Act III takes place in the Rotunda at the masquerade. Charlotte's young sister (played anonymously and very successfully by the eleven-year-old daughter of the composer Linley) and the gorgeous Mrs. Baddeley (the maid) worked the classic maneuver of shifting masquerade costumes, Charlotte elopes with Colonel Frankly and is reconciled with her parents.

Colman elaborated on Garrick's use of Tom King at Stratford. His character Marcourt is essentially the same (brilliantly played by Henry Woodward). Marcourt's French affectations are seen in his dress, mannerisms, and his French hairdresser, La Fleur, but chiefly in his voicing of his opinion that love of Shakespeare is evidence of low taste. Colman extended the idea to apply to all the characters, the assumption being: What you think of Shakespeare and the Jubilee betrays what you are. Crabbed age in the father is revealed by his disgust with Jubilee joy. Mrs. Cross, a social climber, has attended the Jubilee as she attends Shakespeare's plays, only because it is fashionable to do so. Those who scheme to unite the lovers are idolators. Gradations in social class in minor characters are emphasized by degrees of
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ignorance about Shakespeare. These ideas enter into all the scenes of confrontation, intrigue, and reformation. Even this excellent cast did not prevent public interest from centering in the Jubilee songs (some cribbed from Garrick), the especially skilful movement of crowds in the Stratford streets, the very fine backdrops of Stratford scenes, and the procession that attended the idolized statue.

Colman tried to keep his plan from Garrick's ears, but word got to him at Hampton of the whole project, and he wrote a new play, The Jubilee, in a day and a half and put it on stage a week after Man and Wife opened, October 14. The pageantry was "the marvel of the age," and the play was considered a mere pretext for the pageant by both Garrick and the public. He never published the script. For once Garrick underestimated the value of his work; the play contains some of the best scenes he ever wrote.

The mockery of Stratford folk is more trenchant than Colman's and more carefully detailed. He paid off the villagers who smashed his stage lights and built that soluble Rotunda. Ignorance, avarice, and lackadaisical ways are dramatized by means of local history and names indigenous to the town. In 1605 Stratford had been a hide-out for papists accused of complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, the very name suggests Romish activities, and Angelo with his "mortal deal o' gunpowder" bodes another Plot with "the Pope at the bottom on't all." With the fine illogic of the elderly rustic, the villagers think both antipapist and anti-Semitic sentiments demand a protest, for the name also suggests the current legislation termed the "Jew Bill." The cannon terrify them, the flood proves it is all the work of the devil, yet they see no reason why they should not make a profit out of it even so.

The central character is one of the Irishmen who came to the Jubilee. The role was written for John Moody, famous for such
parts. His stage-Irish brogue was foil for the Warwickshire accents of the natives, his stage-Irish stupidity foil for their native guile. Whereas Colman spoke of discomfort, Garrick's Irishman is seen arising weary and disheveled from trying to sleep in a post chaise, the only bed available to him. Whereas Colman glamorized the dawn serenade, Garrick used it as a means of waking and annoying his hero. Whereas Colman discounted Foote's satire, Garrick endorsed it and rhymed it into a song, "What's a jubilee?"

This is Sir a Jubilee
Crouded without Company
Riot without jollity
That's a Jubilee
Odes Sir without Poetry
Music without Melody
Singing without Harmony
That's a Jubilee

Within the play proper, Colman used the Jubilee as setting for Love's Young Dream. Garrick showed it as an expensive disappointment to the major character and pretext for graft in the minor roles. Tom King played a role with lines which, like his lines as the fop in the performance in the Rotunda, cite the satirists' criticism, but the background of the play gives more force to the gibes in this version. Colman's play is nearer comedy, Garrick's is nearer satirical farce. Thus far in the season there can be seen a steady progress in the increasing satire of Stratford, and there was more to come.

Yet any reading of the two plays, the lines alone, results in a false impression. All accounts by those involved in the plays, those who saw them, those who reviewed them for the periodicals show that plot and dialogue played relatively small parts in the total effect of the productions. The lasting impression was made by the processions and the pageantry. During this era
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Covent Garden excelled Drury Lane in the presentation of spectacle, but for once Garrick surpassed his rival. The Drury Lane spectacle was unanimously declared the greatest stage spectacle of the age. Colman erred in using too many of the "leading" characters, for at the time it was difficult to differentiate them clearly by their dress. Newspapers complained of not knowing who was who in the Covent Garden procession. Garrick left no room for doubt. He marked his groups by large banners bearing the titles of the plays. He identified his characters by action; the element of pantomime increased as time went on. They carried identifying stage properties. Even in Stratford he gave many of the characters historically correct costumes, and in the course of the entire run this use of historical costumes increased until it was said that the entire procession was so clothed. Colman used four divisions, Garrick only the two of comedy and tragedy.

Another difference was the unprecedented demand at Drury Lane for audience participation. The procession came, not from the wings but from the street. It wound through the audience, symbolically drawing the spectators into the idolatry and literally drawing with it the man in the street, for Garrick would thus supplement the procession, to the annoyance of some of the actors. This participation of the spectators was carefully plotted. By the time the final curtain fell, the audience stood on common ground with Falstaff and Lear, singing the familiar songs from the Garland, all men together, all together doing obeisance to the statue. The final stage directions read:

Every Character tragic & comic join in
the Chorus and go back during
which the Guns fire, bells ring, etc. etc.
and the Audience applaud
Bravo Jubilee!
Shakespeare for Ever!
Letters, diaries, periodicals, and drawings supply not only accurate accounts of the production, but also an account of the manner in which it changed. There is a partial picture of the procession as it was meant to appear at Stratford.\textsuperscript{12} There is a remarkably clear drawing of the procession as it was staged in 1770.\textsuperscript{13} Garrick's list for 1769 is given in the copy of the play owned by Huntington Library.\textsuperscript{14} James Messing, stage manager of Drury Lane, left a record of his plans and proposals for the arrangement of the procession in the fall of 1770.\textsuperscript{15} Captain James Saunders made a copy of the play proper which is in the Stratford archives, made about 1813. One of the best accounts of the production was given by Johann Wilhelm von Archenholz (1743-1812), who saw it twenty-eight times with no diminution of pleasure. He visited London in 1769 at the age of twenty-six, veteran of nine years' service in the army of Frederick the Great. His history of the Seven Years' War is a valuable source book. He wrote \textit{England und Italien} in three volumes (1785) and two years later expanded it to five volumes which were translated into many European languages. In the opinion of John Alexander Kelly, the book did more than any other to give the German people a complete picture of England.\textsuperscript{16} The French version of 1788 was translated into English in 1789, reissued in abbreviated form in Dublin on 1791, and in 1797 the German was translated for a new English publication. Young as he was, Archenholz had traveled widely, and he viewed the English stage with a keen and cosmopolitan eye. For his European readers he made \textit{The Jubilee} an important clue to the understanding of the English nature as well as the English stage. The typically English institution of the stage afterpiece, where great events of the day were promptly reflected in the mirror of the stage, seemed to him to have a peculiar function and a great importance, for it was at this point that drama had its most direct connection with contemporary life. Of these
pieces *The Jubilee* was by far the most remarkable and significant. And simply as spectacle it was "probably the most magnificent pantomime ever seen in Europe." By the fall of 1770 the playing time was an hour and a half. Garrick used more and more dumb show, and the characters came more and more alive outside the framework of their own plays. Lady Macbeth and Coriolanus sprang into startling life almost within reach of the spectator's hand.

I am indebted to Mr. Kelly (who had access to the complete work) for many details. I did find a complete German edition, but—perhaps significant of the charm of my subject—the section on *The Jubilee* was missing. I quote from the abbreviated Dublin publication:

> When it is acted, the scenes are painted to represent the marketplace at Stratford. At a certain signal, the stage is filled with a mob of country people, whom they actually take out of the street on purpose; and then begins a procession the like of which has never been seen in any theatre.

> A troop of dancers march first with a solemn step; after them come nymphs, who strew flowers around. The principal characters in each comedy then make their appearance, preceded by a flag, on which the name of the play was inscribed; a triumphal car, in which *Thalia* is drawn by grotesque figures, closes the first part.

> This is succeeded by the Muses, Venus, and the Graces; Cupids, Nymphs, Fawns and Dryads, who carry the statue of Shakespeare, and keep time to the sound of instruments of music.

> Tragedy closes the procession, attended by heralds and standard-bearers, who walk before her: then not only the principal characters in each piece, but also the most striking incidents make their appearance.

> In Macbeth the sorcerers and their cauldron; in Coriolanus the tent of that general adorned with the *fasces*; and in Romeo and Juliet the tomb of the Capulets, forcibly impress the mind with the principal incidents in every play.

> When the persons of the drama arrive on stage, they represent in *dumb-show*, the principal passages of the tragedy.
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King Lear exhibits the madness with which he is supposed to be afflicted; and Richard III that fury with which he is transported in the midst of the battle.

Macbeth appears with a bloody poniard in his hand, and his lady, as described by the poet, pursued by the avenging furies, and wandering about the palace with a lighted torch. Juliet starts from her lethargy, and lifts her head from the bier. The lictors and the eagles precede Julius Caesar; a number of ladies prostrate themselves before Coriolanus, and implore his protection. The procession closes with Melpomene, who is drawn in a chariot, and holds an uplifted dagger in her hand.

The last scene represents a superb temple, the altar of which is adorned with the principal subjects mentioned by the poet, depicted in transparent paintings.

This was a real apotheosis, for it was not literary fanaticism, but a just admiration of everything that is truly great and sublime, which placed the statue of this immortal genius in the temple of immortality.

Garrick and Colman used the same eight comedies, but the order varied. The picture shows Benedick, the character usually taken by Garrick, in the position of climax just before the Comic Muse; Garrick's manuscript puts Falstaff there with Much Ado immediately preceding; Messink spaces the two important groups for better effect. Ten characters from As You Like It formed the first group; Rosalind is omitted from Messink's list but included in Garrick's: "Rosalind in boys' Cloaths with a Crook."

Seven characters from The Tempest are next. Messink omitted Ferdinand, but he is clearly present in the picture, and is mentioned in the London Chronicle review. "A Ship in Distress" is part of this group; it appears to be about twelve feet long and is extremely realistic in its storm-tossed condition. Six characters from The Merchant of Venice, then Much Ado about Nothing, the two gentlemen from Verona with Launce and his dog, Twelfth Night, Midsummer Night's Dream with Oberon and Titania riding in a gorgeous carriage, one season drawn by cupids and adorned with the moon and stars, the next season
shaped like a nutshell. At least twenty-two characters marched with Falstaff.

Messink's orthography is so original that I can make nothing of his first tragic item. "Mr Nelson in his carage & Drums & Trumpets t[wo?] & tow." Benjamin Wilson, who had given artistic counsel at Stratford, assisted in planning the pageantry. Perhaps he also took part, and Nelson is Wilson. Mr. Nelson is granted the dignity of a "Pageant," an honor accorded only to the ship, the fairies, Richard's tent, Juliet's tomb, Cleopatra's boat "with Purpell Sales," and Coriolanus' throne. The Coriolanus group was a late addition and a very popular one.

8 Matrons of Rome
Coriolanus's mother, wife & son
the Pageant to Represent a kind of throne
composed of Tropheys of arms & spears
Tullus Afegius sitting on the Right Hand
of Coriolanus
6 Roman Soldiers at the side where
Coriolanus sits, there helmets, with
horses tails
6 Volchon soldiers—at the other
side where Tullus Afegius sits; with
plumes of feathers in there Helmets.
when the matrons come down front
the kneel, while the Pageant goes
of the folow, it melincoly.

Stage history proves that Messink could stage the "melincoly" better than he could spell it. Archenholz twice mentions this scene as impressive and pathetic.

Messink, with sure sense of pageantry, preferred ghosts and witches to "lovers," whose costumes made them rather nondescript in those days. King Lear was always played in Nahum Tate's version, in which Cordelia was a "lover" and the Fool was omitted as indecorous. Messink wanted the Fool in the procession and Cordelia out. Probably he was only searching...
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for characters that could be vividly portrayed by dress and dumb show, but he gives the impression of defiantly seeking out all the skeletons in the Shakespearean closet—all the scenes that were criticized and altered by neoclassical strictures. He wanted the gravediggers. He wanted the "low" characters next to Juliet. Voltaire used the opening scene of Othello as proof that Shakespeare was a barbarian. Messink wanted Brabantio dressed, without equivocation, in night gown. Messink endorsed the supernatural, the juxtaposition of comedy and tragedy, the mixture of social classes on stage. His artistic principles were not pure, by some standards, but he was doing all he could to change the standards. Swiftly and surely the scenes caught up the audiences in their emotional power.

"The famous festival at Stratford, in honour of our immortal Shakespeare, seems to have cut out a whole winter's work for the theatres in London; and very well hath the public been entertained at both houses," cheerfully observed the Monthly Review early in the season of 1769.20 As months went by the press commented with more acerbity on the theatrical domination of the jubilee plays. Actors (especially those at Covent Garden) felt that it lowered their dignity to be called on night after night "To swell a progress, start a scene or two," when they should be playing leading roles.21 Both good taste and piety were offended. The question of blasphemy involved in the use of the statue in the processions is discussed later in Part II, but the matter of taste was a very important one also. Francis Gentleman in The Dramatic Censor wrote:

... That public appetite should feed so long and greedily upon one dainty, is almost beyond the bounds of credibility; and for managers to run it so enormously, as far beyond the bounds of justification; for admitting there are fools and children enough to answer the end of such unparalleled repetition, what apology can be made for the many sensible, distinguished
friends of the theatre, who must either absent themselves half a season, or have this mummeries imposed upon their taste and feelings...

The idolatry of the creator became the second focus of satire. On January 24, Colman, seeing himself worsted anyway, moved with the pressure of criticism. He cut *Man and Wife* to an afterpiece which omitted both the prologue and the procession. Thereby he deleted both the editorial approval of the Jubilee and the offensive idolatry.

January 27 at Covent Garden *Harlequin's Jubilee* opened with Henry Woodward as author and star. And now we must return to the story of the fight between legitimate drama and pantomime, and look again at the sensitive barometer of public taste to be seen in Professor Harry Pedicord's tabulations and analyses. *Harlequin's Invasion* by Garrick is third on his list of performances during Garrick's regime. First place, second place, and fourth place are taken by pantomimes devised by Woodward. That all four first places are pantomimes gives indication of the popularity of the form of entertainment and the competition it gave legitimate drama. Although pantomimes were staged as afterpieces accompanying other drama, still good pantomime at one house could empty the other house by its attractions. The greatest of the harlequins was John Rich, who mimed at Covent Garden under the stage name of Lun. After Lun's death, Garrick rewrote *Harlequin's Invasion* as a sort of tribute to him, and explained his giving spoken lines to his characters by saying that no one could make action speak as Lun had, and words were now needed. After Lun's death Woodward was supreme as harlequin and as deviser of harlequinade. He was successful also in serious drama, and is said to have been one of the greatest Mercutios of all time. *Harlequin's Invasion*, then, was year in and year out the most popular of the pieces dramatizing the conflict between the two forms of enter-
tainment. Harlequin's Jubilee was a reversal of its theme; in it, the great Lun triumphed over Shakespeare's statue. The piece was not published, but the songs and choruses were, and from these and from accounts of those who saw it, a plot may be reconstructed.

Garrick had associated his harlequin with the rainbow. Taking this cue, Woodward designated Iris, goddess of the rainbow, as "goddess of pageantry and show." Therefore, when Garrick marked his Jubilee crowds with the sign of the rainbow as seen in the ribbon favors worn by all there, he inadvertently aligned the Jubilee with the opposition and delivered it into the power of the goddess of pantomime. Iris guarded her realm jealously. It was she who caused the rain to fall and put a stop to the procession, for such things did not belong properly to Shakespeare at all, but to Lun, her favorite. From time to time Iris appeared in the sky in her rainbow to work her deeds of love or vengeance, in a manner suggestive of that lady as yet in the future, the Queen of the Night. Iris was still the handmaid of Juno, as in classic mythology, and under Juno's orders was promoting the cause of two rather extraneous lovers, performing such feats of magic as transporting them bodily to Stratford when parents threatened the pair. The parents gave their consent, the lovers were united on the banks of the Avon, then Lun appeared, true king of the nonsensical doings that were taking place at the Jubilee. He vanquished Shakespeare at his own Jubilee, and the final apotheosis was given to Lun.

The closing was a masterpiece of jest at Garrick's expense. Gainsborough's Jubilee portrait of Garrick had as background Lord Pembroke's estate at Wilton, Garrick embracing a bust of Shakespeare in the foreground. As Wilton was the perfect formal estate, so Park-place, near Henley, the seat of General Henry Seymour Conway, was perfection of another sort. General Conway, called by landscape gardeners "a true follower of
nature," planned every detail himself, and every detail of rustic bridge, subterranean passage, grotto, ruins, lonely tomb (unoccupied), and romantic cottage was known to the many visitors to the show place and to readers of magazine verse written in its praise. General Conway, one of the most popular public figures of the time, had attended the Jubilee. Richards and Dahl, scene painters at Covent Garden, also had attended. Colman probably had Conway's consent for such a prank. Woodward, who was given a second benefit that year for *Harlequin's Jubilee*, in his introduction to the songs acknowledged how much of the success of the show was due to Richards and Dahl. Against a background of the romantic, natural beauties of Park-place, Lun was posed in parody of Garrick. I think we may trust the great mime Woodward to get the last atom of effect out of that affectionate embrace. Lun was idolized as creator, and his creatures entered to do him homage. "In the pageant scene several of the characters that walk at Drury Lane are highly ridiculed, particularly Mark Antony and Cleopatra, who dance off with their black retinue to the playing of casquers." This joke was a special joy to *Town and Country Magazine*. After all, Shakespeare had not really "created" Cleopatra; Lun had used the characters, too. Lun in his miming loved to bring to life a sack of flour, a windmill, a pudding, the sun, the Platonic egg from which man had hatched, a skeleton. All these creatures did obeisance to their creator. And—most remarkable of all—he gave life to his own statue. When all the creatures were assembled, the statue moved slowly from its frozen stance and with a great harlequin leap began a mad joyous dance to his own life-giving powers. So Lun outdid Shakespeare, but only because Garrick had foolishly placed the Bard within Lun's rightful territory. It was not Lun who had put the Bard at such a disadvantage, but the very man who professed to be his best friend.
Better than Garrick, Lun knew what praise was due the great Shakespeare, in what area each was king.

Songs grotesque and jocund raise
To Lun, who merited our praise!
Who ransacked Heav’n, Sea, Earth and Den
For Monsters, Deities and Men;
Who, Proteus like, cou’d vary shape,
And change to Spaniel, Dwarf and Ape:—
Whose Fancy, Nature’s self outrun;
Then songs of triumph raise to LUN.

And, once the proper bounds of taste and method were acknowledged, none knew better than Lun where he and Shakespeare and all drama of whatever form met on common ground. The closing chorus is in praise of Shakespeare, “The king o’ the stage.”

Tho’ Pantomime
In Shakespeare’s time
    Was all unknown;
He knew full well
    The pow’r of spell—
THAT POW’R HIS OWN.²⁶

Thirty-one performances in the remaining four months of the season show the public’s delight in the joke. Although all the necessary explanation of eighteenth-century landscape gardening may be tedious, this was an important subject at the time, and the explication makes clear, not only this joke, but also what I mean when I say the Jubilee became involved in all areas of life. Garrick had staged Harlequin’s Invasion on September 21 and October 2, but after the opening of The Jubilee had shelved it. Now, of course, he answered with it, and put it on four
times more that season. Six performances in a season for that piece represents a distinct drop. The opening season (1759) it had twenty-five showings, eighteen the next, thirteen the next. It was dropped during Garrick’s stay in France, but had twenty-four, twenty-two, and sixteen performances during the three preceding seasons, and in the next four seasons was given seven, fifteen, sixteen, and nine times. The seven and nine represent big years of The Jubilee, which topped three seasons in number of performances. Its popularity could depress the ratings of very much beloved favorites. Entrenched by two darlings of the box office, Garrick continued to worship the same statue. The boundary marked by the footlights is always flexible; the distance between actor and audience narrows with soliloquy, widens with violent action. When an audience observes any action along with the actors who are simultaneously observers of a play-within-a-play, actor and audience come closer together. In The Jubilee the boundary-line between art and life was made almost to disappear. So skilful was Garrick’s juggling of play-within-play-within-play that the audience at The Jubilee could not at any given moment measure the exact artistic distance between it and the show. The fluidity of that important line was part of the message. All that stage craft could do was done to preach the doctrine of the human reality of Shakespeare’s creatures, and no satire could undercut the effect on the public.

The stage productions described up to this point were the more dignified of a great number of entertainments that derived from the Jubilee in Stratford. Even these operated on the comedian’s principle of the running gag. Rivalry among Jubilee shows was on the whole less a rivalry than a co-operative venture, as one production cribbed from others and each advertised all. With all their conflicting elements, they showed a curious interlocking relationship, and all accepted as a constant the theme which gave them unity—the perfection of Shakespeare
and the terms in which it was now conceived. So much did the productions depend on one another that it was necessary to know the entire Jubilee canon in order to understand the jokes, as parodies were parodied and burlesques were burlesqued. This element of interdependence was greatly increased when the shows moved to the public gardens and little off-beat show houses, for they were by nature derivative; but even in the major houses this characteristic was striking. The Jubilee was a private joke made public, a closed inner circle open to all. For all were really and truly idolaters, being honest English citizens.

The Two Magpies were an example. On the road from Hounslow to Colnbrook there were two inns known for their long quarrel about which had the prior right to the name "The Magpie." Garrick in the prologue for The Jubilee had Tom King, in the character of one of the waiters imported to Stratford to serve Jubilee crowds, compare Drury Lane and Covent Garden to the two inns in their contest to claim the first Jubilee play. When Woodward planned Harlequin's Jubilee, he elaborated on this joke, and wrote a duet for the two innkeepers, whose black-and-white waiters' garb was shaped to look like two birds. He also borrowed Garrick's and Dibdin's song "Warwickshire" as his model. King said (every night the play was on, for the public demanded the Magpie prologue) that the Old Magpie had no wish to monopolize.

Each Magpie, your Honours, will peck at his brother;
Their natures were always to peck at each other.
Young landlords and old ones are taught from their calling
To hate all engrossing—but practice forestalling.

Woodward answered in the same goodnatured vein.

Of Magpies we know 'tis the nature,
To peck at each other, and chatter;
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Like wits of the stage they will crib for relief,
And he that cribs most is the first that cries Thief;
First that cries Thief,
Cribs for relief,
And he that cribs most is the first that cries Thief!

To force a good trade is the plan—
Each magpie will do all he can;—
Pro Publico bono will show his best skill,
For the will of all wills is the public's good will;
Public's good will!
Matchless still!
For the will of all wills is the public's good will!

The many allusions within the two prologues are carefully explained by the press, and the many allusions to the poems continue in stage work, in prologues, and in costumes at the London masquerade balls.

Stage sets provided similar jokes, not only the use in Harlequin's Jubilee of the enlarged "Gainsborough" portrait, but jokes which grew out of the long run of the plays and the shift of mood. For example, the sets of Man and Wife, a play in which satire was very gentle, were used as background for the play when it was given in less beatific mood, and again in Harlequin's Jubilee, where the element of ridicule had increased. Thus the very sets became silent satires of the Jubilee, showing the management's change of policy. Yet all the stage sets had the result of endearing Stratford to the public, as the pilgrims testify in their diaries and accounts of the pilgrimages. What united these productions was more important than what divided them. The jokes were ambivalent, and could be made to work both ways. An example is Garrick's metaphor comparing Shakespeare to the turtle in his toast to the Bard at dinner. Colman used it prominently in Man and
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Wife, and it went through many variations both of form and of mood. There is something ludicrous in Garrick's going to so much trouble to make a point that was already made, sending out expeditions to catch the thing, getting Gill to cook it, preempting the town hall for a kitchen, transporting it across the flood, and then not having enough to go around for the unexpected throng, all "to celebrate a poet whose works had made him immortal," to quote the "Devil." And so it was repeatedly said that the whole Jubilee nonsense developed the public's taste for mock turtle in procession and pantomime, to the point where it now was preferred to the genuine meat.

There was a surfeit of mock turtle. Covent Garden, which had been running well ahead of Drury Lane in number of Shakespearean performances (in one season reaching the surprising total of fifty) dropped to thirty performances that season. At Drury Lane, however, there was the richest diet of the true turtle that theater had ever offered the public—forty-six performances, forty-eight if one counts two performances of a revival of The Double Falsehood, which at the time was billed as Shakespeare's. By my tabulation, the combined offering of the two theaters that season was 202 bills. On 41 bills no turtle was available, but on 161 bills for a total of 230 performances, Shakespeare was on stage in some form. Mock turtle accounted for 152 performances, if the two performances of The Double Falsehood be counted as true Shakespeare.

As the season wore on, the satire of local color in Stratford, the satire of bad taste and idolatry in the processions joined with a third object of satire which may be called, in Samuel Foote's phrase, "Lear's old surlout." It was a tenet of neoclassicism that universal ideas should be clothed in modern dress, not as token of their modernity in any narrow sense, but as token of their universality. Augustan translations exemplify the principle. Dryden consciously strove to make Virgil sound like a modern
English gentleman. Isaac Watts, following Dryden's dictum, strove to make the Psalmist sound like a modern English gentleman, and translated allusions to the chosen race into British Christianity. Aversion to archaism was a principle of taste. Archaism was undignified and distracting. What was universal should be presented clearly and directly to the mind, cleansed of all that was peculiar to the past, so the mind might dwell on universal truth. By this standard, historical costumes were undignified, distracting, and as unworthy of classic truth as were archaisms in the vocabulary. It is easy for us to see that firecrackers add little to Lear's dignity, but accustomed as we are to romanticism's doting on historical suggestiveness and to its love of the long ago and far away, it is less easy for us to understand why Lear's dignity was insulted by costuming that suggested the era in which he lived. But so it was. And Lear, grandest of Shakespeare's tragic and royal figures, became a crux. After such a theatrical season as this one, Foote, the British Aristophanes, rallied to his classical standards for a new attack. The Haymarket opened on May 16.

His growing rancor can be seen by comparison with the relatively good natured Definition. Earlier he had been deterred from using Whitehead's lines against Garrick; now he voiced his derision in echoes of a more famous poem, Johnson's prologue for the opening of Drury Lane. Foote placed the blame squarely on Garrick for the dethroning of "Useful Mirth and salutary Woe" (Johnson's phrase). It was the costuming that Foote berated now as the most offensive feature of the whole season. This, he said, was not even mock turtle, but "Pease, beans and potherbs into ballads made, / And cry'd about by folks in masquerade."

Not small the sin t'have sunk the people's taste,
Chill'd their fine fires, their solid sense debas'd;
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Turn'd useful mirth and salutary woe
To idle pageantry and empty show;
Wit, men, and manners, incident and plot,
Passion and pathos totally forgot;
Blasted the bays on ev'ry classic brow,
Taylors are deem'd the only poets now:
Hark! what a roar at Lear's old surtout,
Falstaff's stuffed vest, and Pistol's hat and boot!
To solemn sounds see sordid scenemen stalk,
And the great Shakespeare's vast creation—walk!
Can a lean wardrobe all his pow'rs express?
Can his fine phrenzy creep into a dress?
E'en Roscius blushes at his own success,
And feels some transient touches for his crime,
To have sunk these scenes below a pantomime. 29

The prologue provoked a minor war among the pamphleteers. Foote had announced Drugger's Jubilee again, but again abandoned the plan. 30

Garrick's determination to return to the days of Olde England led him to devise wonderfully amusing and authentic costumes, and he picked for concentration that group where he had a nucleus of history to work from. Falstaff was one of the few characters that had been given conventional costume rather than contemporary costume in continuous tradition from the days of Betterton. Professor G. C. D. Odell is of the opinion that Dame Quickly alone of all female characters suggested conventional costume by wearing an antique peaked hat with her contemporary dress. 31 So clever were Garrick's improvements on this tradition that Colman copied the costumes for the procession of Man and Wife and by his forestalling was the first to put on stage a whole group of characters from a Shakespeare play in conventional costume. Garrick, intending to get his money's worth after the disappointment in Stratford and the cribbing at Covent Garden, not only outdid Colman
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with his procession, where the use of conventional costume increased through the first season and was strongly reinforced for the stagings of the season of 1770-71, but also staged both parts of *Henry IV* in ancient dress that first season and in later seasons, and thus was the first to stage a Shakespeare play in at least an approximation of historically accurate costumes. At the public balls there grew a fad for dressing like the characters associated with the Jubilee, especially the Shakespearean characters. Young men attended the theater clad as Falstaff's minions and there created disturbances in keeping with their dress. This masquerading, on the stage and off, was for some people the most distressing result of Garrick's degradation of Shakespeare. Why should Shakespeare need costuming? To make him dependent on tailors was degradation indeed. Sir Joshua Reynolds' portrait of Garrick between Comedy and Tragedy was parodied to show Garrick jilting both ladies for tailors and carpenters; he tramples beneath his feet torn fragments of the plays and holds instead a tailor's bill in his hand.

Garrick, unabashed, set about to draw the public over to his historical point of view. Three editions of Shakespeare, Rowe's, Pope's, and Theobald's, had been illustrated. Garrick since 1746 had tried to interest artists in illustrating the plays, as George Winchester Stone has said. Now he found a colleague in John Bell, a pioneering spirit in the bookseller’s trade who was to become noted as a pioneer in the publishing of illustrated editions of good literature. Purists have called his edition of Shakespeare the worst in history, but it served his purpose and served many of Garrick's purposes. In 1709 Rowe had done much for Shakespeare when he reduced the size of the volumes; in 1772 Bell put Shakespeare literally in the pockets of the eighteenth century. They were pocketbooks. The plays were bound separately in inexpensive volumes, and, like the pamphlets and libretti that are sold now in theater lobbies, they gave the
reader the play as it was heard on stage. Bell’s printing of these acting versions may have been an error in taste, but he preserved a record of the playing of certain roles which would have been lost but for him. Francis Gentleman did most of the editorial work with Garrick’s “sanction and approval.” Gentleman’s “Essay on Oratory,” which prefaced the edition, gave impetus to another enthusiasm of Garrick’s, the lay reading of Shakespeare; the essay is mainly for the assistance of amateur declaimers. Format, price, acting versions, and theoretical material all were designed to fit handily into London social life, and it was inevitable that such an illustrated edition should be dedicated to Garrick: “The best Illustration and the best living Comment on Shakespeare.”

The illustrations were in such demand that they were sold separately for a guinea, in sets suitable for framing. Each play had two pictures, and the juxtaposition of the two had an immediate pedagogic value. Each play had a portrait of a famous actor in character on plain background. Mrs. Barry as Constance, Mrs. Matlocks as Princess Catherine, Mrs. Yates as Isabelle are indistinguishable as to pose and dress. Mrs. Lessingham as Ophelia faces the other way and has flowers spaced systematically in her hair. Garrick as Macbeth is a bit disheveled, Edgar and Trinculo are not quite in drawing-room attire, but Mr. Dodd could have worn Mercutio’s cocked hat unexceptionably in St. James’s Park.

The other picture in each volume is quite different. Against a naturalistic background, detailed and historically accurate, the character appears in conventional costume. John Hall Mortimer, a painter of historical subjects, a pre-romantic Benjamin Haydon, did the major part of the art work and supervised the group of artists who worked with him (John Hall, Grignion, Liart, Sherwin, Edwards). Miss Yonge as Cleopatra could have drunk tea with Fanny Burney, but Mortimer’s Cleopatra was quite Roman
if not quite Egyptian in dress and setting. Romeo, the grave-diggers, the merry wives were at least Elizabethan. Garrick’s Lear defies the storm in satin knee breeches, but the other Lear, the historical Lear, is vaguely biblical.

The volumes of Bell’s edition began appearing in 1772. In November of that year the Lady’s Magazine took up the argument, printing its own idea of what The Tempest should look like. The setting is naturalistic. Prospero is in tall peaked wizard hat. Miranda is shorn of wig, hoops, and flounces. Why, asked the ladies, can we not have Shakespeare staged thus, “as dictated by Nature, not as absurdly represented at either of the two theatres”?

The next year Charles Macklin played Macbeth in kilts, but the public was not pleased with his half-measures. He wore a flowing wig and Lady Macbeth wore modern dress.

The next season Garrick’s world-famous Lear, now doubly spotlighted because it was to be his last, was as vaguely biblical as Mortimer’s. It was Garrick’s first appearance in costume, but he took no risk of ridicule, for he had established his own tradition from the Jubilee on. Lear in the Jubilee transparency had looked thus. Lear in the Jubilee processions had always worn his “old surtout,” as Foote scornfully called it. French history tells us that Jacques Louis David put Talma in togas. Mortimer had no power in England comparable to David’s in France, but he had Jubilee backing and the support of the Lady’s Magazine.

The summer season of 1770 saw unusually strong Shakespearean companies. At Richmond Theatre were Cautherly, Love, Keasberry, Mrs. Greville, and Mrs. Baker. At the Haymarket, Shakespeare was played by Thomas Sheridan, David Ross, Francis Gentleman, Palmer, Davis, Reddish, Miss Yonge, and Mrs. Burton. The number of Shakespeare plays was about as usual. The number of plays with Jubilee connections was as
overwhelming as during the regular season which preceded. *The Devil upon Two Sticks* continued its Jubilee commentary. *Harlequin's Invasion* and *The Jubilee* were performed frequently at Richmond. Archenholz had enthusiastically called Garrick's spectacle “the most marvellous pantomime ever seen in Europe,” but he did call it pantomime. It was not, by his classification, in the realm of *true* drama. Foote said Garrick placed Shakespeare—even *King Lear*—*below* the pantomime. A step below the pantomime lay the public gardens. The gardens were not *décassé* then, any more than they were when Handel performed there, but they certainly were not what Johnson had in mind when he dedicated Garrick to higher things. Garrick may have regretted his choice of a name for his festival, with its garden connotations. Naturally Ranelagh exploited the vast amount of publicity accorded its transient replica on the Avon, and “jubilee” now meant Garrick’s Jubilee. A jubilee ridotto was announced for September 14 at Ranelagh. As soon as the Jubilites were home, they were assured by the management: “There will be horse patrollers, and an additional number of lights on the road. The footway from Buckingham Gate is lately mended and enlarged so as to make it very safe and easy for chairs.” Fancy dress “with or without masks” was allowed, there was an entertainment, and of course fireworks. Similar announcements appeared in the *Public Advertiser* for October 4, October 12, November 29. Francis Gentleman did not idle away his time while trapped in Stratford, and he was back in London certainly by September 21. On that date the *Advertiser* carried this announcement:

MARYLEBONE GARDENS. A Jubilee in Honour of Shakespeare will be held tomorrow, Friday the 22 instant, at Marylebone Gardens, where will be performed

AN ODE with Chorusses written by Mr. Gentleman. The music entirely new, composed by Mr. Arnold. The Vocal Parts by Master Merryman, Master Brown, Mr. Rennelson, Mrs.
Arnold was composer for Covent Garden. He had attended the Stratford Jubilee with a view of making professional use of it. He wrote the music for *Man and Wife* also. Gentleman did not linger in adopting Garrick's invention of the spoken recitative. The *Gazetteer and Daily Advertiser* from time to time carried word of jubilees at Marylebone, usually featuring music written for Stratford. *Queen Mab*, a cantata composed by Dibdin and printed in the *Garland*, was performed at the gardens and at Richmond. This is quite another piece than Woodward's pantomime by the same name which opened in 1750 at Drury Lane and stands first on Mr. Pedicord's list of attractions at Drury Lane. George Saville Carey's masque *Shakespeare's Jubilee* was staged that summer, loaded with Bardolatry. Barthelemon was in charge of music at Marylebone that summer and used music of Garrick's *Ode* and *Garland* in many concerts, and orchestras at other summer places were under the direction of other Jubilee musicians, who followed the same policy. There was close association between Richmond and the gardens that summer, and there seemed to be co-operation in use of performers and stage sets. Foote at the Haymarket did not stage much of this material. At Sadler's Wells, every night it was open from April 16 to July 24, *Harlequin's Adventures by Night* was performed, a record approaching that of *The Jubilee* itself. These performances were not extensively reviewed, and unlike the other pieces mentioned here, this text has not survived (if there ever was a text). So I cannot tell its precise relation to
the Jubilee; it was elaborately mounted and consisted mostly of
dancing, and seems to have had some relation to the two
Harlequin-Shakespeare plays, and possibly to a non-dramatic
satire of the Jubilee published in the spring of 1770, The
Fairies' Revels: or Puck's Trip through London by Moonlight. 37
Hardly a display of fireworks was touched off all summer that
did not take the shape of a mulberry tree or the swan of Avon
or some such symbol.

When the regular theaters opened again in September, the
craze continued. Only in January, 1771, did the fever abate. 
Man and Wife continued as an afterpiece for several seasons,
but Harlequin's Jubilee lasted only through the height of the
frenzy. 38 Harlequin's Invasion kept its old popularity; as late
as 1820 it had a revival, chiefly interesting because its review
forms part of the brilliant theatrical criticism of William Hazlitt.
Hazlitt loved pantomime, but this one, played at a deadly slow
pace, gave him pretext for theorizing about what a pantomime
should not be. 39 Garrick's ode was done in the provinces but
was not restaged at the time of his retirement from the theater
in 1776. In London and in Stratford it had nineteenth-century
performances as part of Shakespeare anniversary programs.
Stratford in the twentieth century has seen two gala produc-
tions, one as a benefit for the rebuilding of the theater in 1927,
when Lewis Casson took the role of Garrick, Dame Sybil
Thorndike played the Tragic Muse, and Irene Vanbrugh the
Comic Muse. 40 Since the ode was written to dedicate the town
hall to Shakespeare, it was fitting that it be used to rededicate
that building to him after the disastrous fire which in 1947
destroyed the two Jubilee portraits of Shakespeare and Garrick.
During the Festival of Britain in 1951 an audience composed
largely of the descendents of those who had celebrated with
Garrick assembled in the hall. Servitors wigged and powdered
in eighteenth-century high style held golden candelabra to light
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the costumed musicians. Michael Redgrave, dressed in a replica of Garrick's Jubilee suit, in a superb performance proved that the ode from the lips of a fine actor can still achieve great effects of emotion and excitement. The Jubilee by Garrick had a run of ninety-one performances for the season of 1769-70. This was the record run of the century. Next year it set a season record of twenty-seven performances. Even before it went on stage in the summer theaters it had begun its long, triumphant progress through the provincial theaters. It was staged at York Theatre in April, 1770, as a benefit for Tate Wilkinson. From 1770 on it was played in Dublin and taken on tour by the companies that went out from there. The first performance in Wales was given by a troupe from Crow Street Theatre in Dublin on May 5, 1772, at Denbigh. Mr. Cecil Price, who tells of this incident, reports a strange mélange of myths that clustered round the mulberry tree on that occasion, when Shakespeare beneath the tree received from the hands of Apollo the torch of Prometheus, with Cupid as overseer and assistant. The next year the play had its first printing in Waterford, where there was an Irish theater that was a survival of the Jesuit schools of drama. Dr. Peter Kavanaugh says that it was one of twenty provincial theaters operating then in Ireland, visited by many well-known singers and actors, later under the management of Smithson, whose daughter Harriet married Berlioz. This first printed version of the play is expanded, and hardly a speech shows exact agreement with Garrick's manuscript copy. Interpolated blank verse is made up mostly of Shakespeare's lines; one such speech by a character named Fancy introduces Garrick's Ode to Shakespeare, incorporated into the play to make a full evening's entertainment. The tone of Garrick's old women is altered by their interest in the visiting men—an element of satire that Garrick did not use against Stratford, although it was common enough in the news-
papers. The procession has roughly the organization of Colman's, rather than Garrick's. The inaccuracies show how little care was taken to get the text of the play in correct form. The play was available from several sources, London and Bath, where it was performed. There is a much more nearly correct copy in Stratford (as well as a copy of the Waterford publication in the archives). The play was thought of as a pretext for the procession.

Edinburgh did not see The Jubilee in 1770, for Samuel Foote was in charge that season and would not stage it. The next season West Digges opened it, and it became a stock feature in the repertory. Digges added a fillip of interest by a rumor that the cup used on stage was not only from a tree planted by Shakespeare but also was cut and carved by him, that it remained many years in the family and had been given to Digges by a relative of Shakespeare, Mr. John Shakespeare of Dudley.

When Garrick announced his last season on the stage, The Jubilee again set a record with thirty-five performances at the height of the season, attended by many distinguished visitors. The Great Poet and the Great Actor were identified in the periodicals with true Jubilee spirit, and the town was full of visitors for the occasion of its final climactic performance on May 24. The whole round of derivative pieces appeared again, with two new odes, music by Thomas Linley, then a pupil of William Boyce. The provincial theaters followed suit. Boswell and Johnson went to Lichfield during this burst of enthusiasm. That was when they had dinner with Mrs. Gastrell. They were guests of honor at a performance of The Jubilee that night. Boswell, thinking how rich in associations the town was, how the fame of Shakespeare had been linked with the lives and works of two Lichfield boys, longed to write a prologue for the occasion, but Johnson squelched him.

War with England delayed the Jubilee reaction in America,
but promptly in 1781 New York saw a pageant based on Samuel Pratt's memorial tribute to Garrick, also staged with a procession of Shakespearean characters and an apotheosis scene. Dr. Esther Dunn notes this performance as "a hint of the new idolatry" and records performances of *The Jubilee* as early as 1793 (in Charleston) and as late as 1814 (in Philadelphia). 51

For two of the grandchildren of John Ward, who played *Othello* in Stratford in 1746 and gave his gloves to the Steward, the play *The Jubilee* was something of a bête noir. Sarah Kemble, Mrs. Siddons, made her first appearance on a London stage as Venus in the processions of the 1776 revival, her little Cupid being played by Garrick's godson Thomas Dibdin, son of Charles. 52 Established stars, jealous of Garrick's obvious partiality for the newcomer, shoved Venus and Cupid violently to the background, until Garrick himself had to come to their rescue on stage. Mrs. Siddons in her memoirs associates this occasion with the jealousy that caused her lack of success on the London stage that season. 53 When her brother, John Philip Kemble, assumed management of Drury Lane in 1788, he found *The Jubilee* still in the repertory and deplored the low taste of the public that kept the thing alive. Professor Herschel Baker stresses the importance of Kemble's decision to "cast his lot on the side of a formal, classical, tragic repertory in preference to gratifying the poor taste of the town." 54 After his first season he refused to stage the play; but, if the memoirs of Mrs. Crouch can be trusted, even his firmness did not quite uproot the mulberry. When he opened his magnificent new theater April 21, 1794, the curtain installed as fire protection was given a special dedication. It was raised to reveal the mulberry flourishing still above that same old statue. And again, as always, "Never did audience appear more satisfied." 55 At the bicentennial of Shakespeare's death in 1816, for four happy nights at Covent Garden, *The Jubilee* delighted the town in a lavish production and was
hailed with the same joy. During that first run in 1769, Hopkins, prompter at Drury Lane, had written in his stage diary, “It was received with bursts of applause—The Procession of Shakespeare’s characters is the most superb that ever was exhibited, or I believe ever will.—There never was an Entertainment produced that gave so much pleasure to all Degrees, Boxes, Pit, and Gallery.” The complaints were loud, but that applause could drown them out.

As a great myth will come through to a believer in almost any sort of artistic form, so the myth of the Jubilee could survive any treatment. During the 1770 run, Garrick enlivened his processions at Drury Lane with the feats of the Astleys, two famous trick horseback riders. By midseason of its first run the play had attained the accolade that should be given all eventful and spectacular drama—it was made into a puppet show. Notices in the Gazette and Public Advertiser beginning December 10, 1770, list several attractions with it that may or may not have been incorporated into the play. One could never be sure what might next be included under the comprehensive title The Jubilee. Mr. Laurence performing on the slack wire, Mr. Cooke dancing on the tightrope with two children tied to his feet, the climax of the entertainment coming when the little wooden harlequin ate a dish of spaghetti—let us be lenient. The hornpipe, the tossing the straw, the “tumbling ala mode” were good clean fun, perhaps. But “A new dance called the Frenchman and the Miller in Love,” billed on a program for the kiddies, seems to me to have little real Shakespearean background. Surely the complaints about taste in things that were being associated with the great name of Shakespeare did not all come from purists and prudes.

The Jubilee by Garrick was the best and the best loved and the best known of the pieces that derived from the Jubilee or were modeled on it. Beside it we place the worst and the least
known. It will show how durable was the mulberry as theatrical framework and how low the derivations could sink. It was staged at the Patagonian Theatre. The Apotheosis of Punch went on in November, 1779. It was a contemptible piece of writing by a contemptible man. Leonard MacNally was a Dublin lawyer who came to London, edited the Public Ledger for a while, wrote some plays staged at Covent Garden, and returned to Ireland to make his place in world events as a political informer. He consistently betrayed the revolutionary spirits who made his home a rendezvous, sold them to the authorities, defended them in court proceedings, was executor of their estates, comforted them when they were hanged with the thought that they would soon see their sainted mothers in heaven, and turned the papers over to the English—with no suspicion of duplicity to the day of his death in 1820.

The Apotheosis of Punch took the Jubilee as its framework and was, as its author said, “made all of mulberry wood.” It contains the worst parodies of Shakespeare's Garland I have ever seen, and that sweeping superlative covers much. It is an attack on Foote and Garrick, both of whom had recently died, and on Richard Brinsley Sheridan. The author's mouthpiece, Dr. Plunder, says Sheridan hated Garrick while he lived but made money on his Monody to Garrick after his death; so in like manner the author is determined to make money on the memory of Foote, whom he hated while alive but now will eulogize. Foote had failed in early attempts at tragic roles, so the Tragic Muse ironically mourns at his bier. All the Muses mourn until Bacchus gets them drunk and they hiccup and go to sleep. A humorous chorus derides Death as very ugly. The undertaker enters and starts to remove the body, but Apollo brings Foote back to life as the Devil upon Two Sticks, and all the Garrick-Foote squabbles are gone over, giving opportunity for saying unpleasant things about all the living and the dead. It is an
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insult to three men who served their calling well. Yet even this had as its theme the glorification of Shakespeare, and in a certain perverted way is still effective to accomplish that end. Few authors are better equipped than MacNally for turning a reader into a bardolator. Dr. Plunder's name refers to the author's plundering of Shakespeare, and all through the nauseous skit the noble lines are inserted. To read MacNally, with all he implies about the degradation of the human spirit, then turn a page and have the words of Shakespeare flame out, with all they imply about the dignity of man, is an experience calculated to make the reader giddy with an O Altitudo. Some day such a reader may rush from Sterling Library and fire off skyrockets on the Common in gratitude for the Bard.

That there was bad taste cannot be denied. Praise him with fireworks and all manner of loud noises—so ran the litany. Praise him with the juggling of golden balls, with puppet shows and comic duets and trick riders—let his name be praised. And the satirists, as they established their satiric tension between the low point of man's unworthy tribute and the high point of the praise due to Shakespeare, even more than the idolators raised him to the skies above the realm of the rational criticism they professed to serve. Conceding the major Jubilee premise, the absolute perfection of Shakespeare's plays, they opened the way for the Shakespearomanie.

It is not an extravagance to say that a "piece of farce" ushered in romanticism. History was only repeating itself. The same was true of the era of criticism that preceded romanticism. Professor Spingarn gave due consideration to the learned and abstract theories that stood behind the School of Common Sense, but said the school was born in 1671 with The Rehearsal, and it was this work which determined Thomas Rymer's attitude toward poetry. "It is not to be judged merely as a burlesque, but as a critical work, and Shaftesbury considered it from this
point of view when he said that it had furnished England with the best methods and best phrases of criticism."

A hundred years later the Stratford Jubilee and its derivative stage pieces gave other methods of criticism and a new critical vocabulary. Rymer wrote in *Critical Observations upon Tragedy*: "We want a law for acting *The Rehearsal* once a week to keep us in our sense." How like him to want a law. No law constrained London to go to Stratford and to lay down money at the box offices to see the Jubilee played out over and over. If once a week sufficed for common sense, it did not satisfy bardolators in their eagerness for the drama and doctrine of Garrick’s Jubilee.

1. Francis Gentleman, *The Stratford Jubilee. A New Comedy of Two Acts*, as it has been lately exhibited at Stratford upon Avon, with great applause. To which is prefixed *Scrub’s Trip to the Jubilee* (1769). The prologue is printed also in *Universal Magazine*, XLV, 155. Reviews of publication: *Monthly Review*, XLI, 238; *Critical Review*, XXVIII, 237; Gentleman’s Magazine, XXXIX, 454, all of 1769.

2. Stephen Jones (ed.), *Biographia Dramatica* (3 vols.; 1812), III, 303, says that the printer (Lowndes) deleted from the preface harsh criticism of Garrick.


10. *Dramatic Censor*, I, 379. *Town and Country*, I, 524–26, prints a long imaginary dialogue between Foote and Colman, in which Foote insists that his intent was satire, and jeers at Colman’s “failure” as well as at his staging such a thing as *Man and Wife*.

11. Some idea of Arnold’s music (and of the borrowing of music from other composers) can be formed from the reviews of the play in periodicals. He used a “Roman march” for the Roman characters, “soft” music for Antony and Cleopatra, “a kind of Gothic music” for the old English characters, the
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