

Relentless Punishments:
Mirrors of Hell from Sackville to Shakespeare

Allyna E Ward
University of Newcastle

A doctoral thesis submitted for examination in November 2005

NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

.....
204 26863 0
.....

Thesis L8237

Abstract

This thesis seeks to establish the literary background to the representation of Hell in Elizabethan tragic drama. It uses historicist techniques to posit a causative relation between religious change introduced by the Elizabethan religious settlement and the form and content of Elizabethan tragedy, both dramatic and non-dramatic.

More particularly I am concerned with the post-Reformation conceptions of the spaces of the afterworld, especially those consequent upon the dissolution of purgatory and the developing emphasis on Hell. I am also interested in the new emphasis on predestination and the effect on theological doctrine concerning the divine or diabolical origin of sin on earth. If sin originates with the Devil then sinful acts on earth are linked with Hell, and the link between Hell and the Devil is articulated in tragedy as a particular discourse of tyranny.

At the start, I cite Shakespeare's Richard III, a familiar Elizabethan text, that demonstrates how the secular and religious anxieties about the endless punishments in Hell generate a fear that the forces of Hell penetrate earth and produce "mirrors" of Hell on the Elizabethan stage. Then I go back to look at less familiar texts leading up to it, starting with the Elizabethan adaptations of the de casibus form in the William Baldwin editions of A Mirror for Magistrates, especially the contributions from Thomas Sackville, and also Richard Robinson's The Rewarde of Wickednesse. In part three I include a discussion of Jasper Heywood's translations of two Senecan tragedies, Troas and Thyestes, and the Reformers' debates on the treatment of tyranny in four early Elizabethan tragedies: Gorboduc, Cambises, Horestes and Jocasta. The final part of this thesis examines Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy and Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine and their engagement with the discussions of Hell and earthly sin.

Acknowledgments

My relatives and friends have always been enthusiastic regarding my long-term life as a student. I am particularly grateful to my parents for furnishing the house with books, for my education and for their support, and to my sister for her inexhaustible encouragement. To Andrew, thanks for your support and confidence in me throughout my studies. I will always value the friends I made during my time as a postgraduate at Newcastle; especially with David, Laura and Bill, for their company and quirky conversations. Thank you to Stefanike and Yasmin for being suitably talkative at all times and for the laughter and joy you carry with you wherever you are, especially when it is most needed. To Leentje, my Libran voice of wisdom, for late-night meetings in the park, for being there, and especially for our friendship. And to Christine, for your enthusiastic support and understanding during the last stages of my thesis, for your questions and your keen interest, for listening to what I have to say about Hell and the Elizabethans, and for your companionship.

While at Newcastle University I have had the privilege to work closely with the department's Renaissance specialists Jennifer Richards and Kate Chedgzoy. I am grateful to you both for sharing your interests and expertise over the years and for encouraging my ambitious research proposals. My greatest debt is to my supervisor, Professor Mike Pincombe, a patient and thorough supervisor without whom this project was unconquerable. His knowledge, expertise and excitement for Elizabethan tragedy was a source of great encouragement and inspiration throughout this project.

List of Abbreviations

<u>De Casibus</u>	<u>De Casibus Virorum Illustrium</u>
<u>DNB</u>	<u>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Online Edition</u>
"Homily"	"A Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion"
<u>Institutes</u>	<u>The Institutes of Christian Religion</u>
LCL	LOEB Classical Library
<u>Mirror</u>	<u>A Mirror for Magistrates</u>
MSR	The Malone Society Reprints
<u>OCD</u>	<u>Oxford Classical Dictionary, Third Edition</u>
<u>OED</u>	<u>Oxford English Dictionary, Online Edition</u>
<u>RW</u>	<u>The Rewarde of Wickednesse</u>

Throughout this thesis I have observed the conventions of the MLA Handbook (Fifth edition, 1999). Where possible I have used old spelling texts but I have silently modernised the conventions concerning i/j and u/v.

Contents

Introduction	1
a) <u>Saint Patrick's Purgatory</u>	7
b) <u>The Castle of Perseverance</u>	12
c) The English <u>de casibus</u> : From Boccaccio to Lydgate	18
Part I:	
"The Slippery Deceits of the Wavering Lady": Fortune and Damnation in Early Elizabethan Poetry	
Chapter One	
Executrix of Wierdes: The role of Fortune in the Baldwin editions of <u>A Mirror for Magistrates</u>	27
I: Fortuna's Literary Heritage	
Campbell to Budra: Ways of Reading the <u>Mirror</u>	30
II. The "Slippery Deceits of the Wavering Lady"	
Classical and Early Christian Fortuna	36
Chaucer's Seneca	43
Lydgate and Bochas: Musings on the Vicissitude of Fortune	47
III: Early Elizabethan Mirrors of Hell:	
<u>A Mirror for Magistrates</u>	
I. Elizabethan Angst: Earthly Fortune and Damnation	56
a) William Baldwin's "Richard Duke of York" and Francis Seagar's "Richard Duke of Gloucester"	57
b) John Dolman: "Lord Hastings"	68
c) Thomas Sackville: "Induction"	76
"The Complaint"	87
Fortune and Hell in the <u>Mirror</u>	89
Chapter Two	
'The Monstrous Abuses of the Wicked and Ungodly': The Relentless Punishments of Hell in Richard Robinson's <u>The Rewarde of Wickednesse</u> (1574)	92
a) Richard Robinson	93
b) The <u>de casibus</u> framework of Robinson's Poem	97

II: <u>The Rewarde of Wickednesse</u>	
a) The Infernal Court	103
b) Tyranny, Pluto and Catholicism	112
c) Pluto's Court and Tyranny	126
Part II:	
Seneca and Elizabethan Infernal Tragedy	
Seneca and the Elizabethan Tragic Mode	133
Chapter Three	
The Elizabethan Senecan Tradition and the Reformation	135
I. Seneca and the Elizabethans	137
a) <u>Thyestes</u> and the Inexorable Curses of Hell	140
b) <u>Troas</u> : Infernal Achilles	151
II. Reformation Resistance Theory: Obedience and Rebellion	158
Chapter Four	
From Among the Grisly Ghosts: Tyranny and Obedience in Four Early Elizabethan Tragedies (<u>Cambises</u> , <u>Gorboduc</u> , <u>Jocasta</u> and <u>Horestes</u>)	168
I: Reformation Resistance Theory in <u>Cambises</u> and <u>Horestes</u>	
a) <u>Cambises</u>	172
b) <u>Horestes</u>	186
II: Civil Disobedience in <u>Gorboduc</u> and <u>Jocasta</u>	
a) <u>Gorboduc</u>	195
b) <u>Jocasta</u>	208
Part III: Mirrors of Hell in Kyd and Marlowe	
Hell on the Elizabethan stage in Kyd and Marlowe	225
Chapter Five	
Hellish Revenge in Thomas Kyd's <u>The Spanish Tragedy</u>	228
I. Obscured Justice; The Cause of Ire	231
a) The <u>Excitatio</u> of the Furies from Hell	243
b) Horatio's Murder	247

II. <u>Tragedie Cothurnata</u>	251
a) Justice or Revenge?	252
b) Hieronimo's Revenge	262
III. <u>Soliman and Perseda</u> and Andrea's Final Judgements	265
 Chapter Six	
"Vile Monster, born of some infernal hag, And sent from Hell to tyrannise on earth"	274
I. Tamburlaine's Command over Evil	276
II. The Horrors of Civil War	
a) Lucan's Lofty Verse	283
b) <u>Furor</u> and False Gods	291
III. "[D]aring God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlan"	296
IV. Reading Lucan as an Analogue for <u>Tamburlaine</u>	
a) Caesar and Tamburlaine	299
b) Loyal Zenocrate	301
c) Tamburlaine's Progeny	309
 Conclusion	318
 Appendix: William Williamson, Printer	320
 Works Consulted	322

Part I

"The Slippery Deceits of the Wavering Lady": Earthly Fortune and Damnation in Early Elizabethan Poetry

Introduction

Oh, then began the tempest of my soul.
I passed, methought, the melancholy flood,
With that sour ferryman which poets write of,
Unto the kingdom of perpetual night.
The first that there did greet my stranger-soul
Was my great father-in-law, renowned Warwick,
Who spake aloud, 'What scourge for perjury
Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?'
And so he vanished. Then came wandering by
A shadow like an angel, with bright hair
Dabbled in blood, and he shrieked out aloud,
'Clarence is come: false, fleeting, perjured Clarence,
That stabbed me in the field by Tewkesbury.
Seize on him, furies, take him unto torment.'
With that, methought, a legion of foul fiends
Environed me, and howlèd in mine ears
Such hideous cries that with the very noise
I trembling waked, and for a season after
Could not believe but that I was in Hell.
Such terrible impression made my dream.

(Shakespeare Richard III I.iv.44-63).

In Clarence's recollection of his terrifying dream we witness the "impression" left by the re-imagining of the space of Hell in Elizabethan tragedy. Shakespeare's articulation of the relationship between Hell and

Clarence's impending fate draws on a tradition of representing the way the forces of Hell penetrate human actions on earth.

Before he is murdered Clarence learns that the order for his assassination came from his wicked brother Richard. The first murderer tells Clarence, "'Tis [Gloucester] that sends us to destroy you here" (I.iv.233). The association between Richard and Hell is repeated throughout the tragedy with others recognising the tyrant as a devil. Queen Anne, for instance, comments that Richard's presence makes earth like Hell when she says, "Foul devil, for God's sake hence, and trouble us not, / For thou hast made the happy earth thy Hell" (I.ii.77).¹ What makes the characters in the play fear Richard is the direct link they perceive between Richard and Hell.

This thesis begins with an examination of the English de casibus tradition in the 1550s in A Mirror for Magistrates, where the idea that people are marked out for sin and damnation dramatically changes the nature of de casibus examples. In turning the de casibus form in the direction of tragedy, Elizabethans moved away from reading the examples as evidence of God's infinite power in human history.

When Shakespeare dramatised the life of Richard III, already an archetypal villain in English history, he applied the constructs for writing about sinners and wickedness that link earthly sin with Hell. His imagining of Richard's tyranny on stage creates a mirror of Hell as a spectacle on earth and exemplifies the way tragedy was bound up with ideas of sin and damnation. The traditions Shakespeare is drawing on for the association between the forces of Hell and human actions and events is bound up with

¹ This accusation is repeated by the Duchess later in the play: "Thou cam'st on earth to make the earthy my Hell" (IV.iv.167).

the shift in thinking about damnation that takes place with the Elizabethan religious settlement.

Stephen Greenblatt, and many others after him, recognise a crucial shift in the early modern period in the way people thought about identity: "there is in the early modern period a change in the intellectual, social, psychological, and aesthetic structures that govern the generation of identities" (Self-Fashioning 1). This shift goes hand-in-hand with the Reformation shift in thinking about God and man's place in the Christian universe. But also, although perhaps less recognised in literary studies, the early modern period saw a shift in the way people thought about the relationships between the sovereign and God, and between misbehaved magistrates and Hell.

In Elizabethan tragedy from the 1550s we can see how the discussions of Hell and damnation altered the role of Hell in tragic drama and poetry. Political treatises on tyranny and obedience, as well as the discussions of fate and predestination permeated the tragic sphere so that tragedy was seen in a frame of chthonic intervention. But this raised problematic questions about God's role as the author of evil.

This study traces the Elizabethan negotiation between good and evil in a world dominated by the threat of damnation in tragic writings from the 1550s to the 1590s. There is evidence for the way pamphlets and prose accounts of witches and demons shaped ways for thinking about the relationship between ordinary citizens and Hell; as in the case of Faustus in Marlowe's Doctor Faustus. But I have restricted my study to tragedies that explore the early modern link between tyrants, or tyrannous magistrates, and Hell and the devil. Consequently I have

decided not to address the Elizabethan problems of witchcraft and demonology in relation to the tragic writings of the period.

Henry Ansgar Kelly's study of evil spirits and the Devil, The Devil at Baptism (1985), examines the initiation rites in Christendom in their conceptual and dramatic aspects. He recognises how the ritual reaction against evil spirits dramatised the anti-demonic aspects of Christian initiation rites such as the defeat of Satan. He also shows how the emphasis on the spirit of evil in Christendom, especially in the dramatisation of the ritual and liturgy in mimetic representations of salvation, emphasised the spirit of evil. The purpose of the emphasis on the influence of evil was actually in celebration of the liberation of the baptismal candidates from Satan (11-12).

James Sharpe's recent book, Witchcraft in Early Modern England (2001), addresses the importance of witchcraft on early modern English history. He focuses on the period when witchcraft was a secular crime (1542-1730) in England and his study reiterates what Alan Macfarlane's earlier study, Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England (1970), identified, as the tendency to use witchery to explain misfortune. This is distinct from the de casibus emphasis on a fall from Fortune and is key to why I have not examined the influence of Elizabethan witchcraft and sorcery in this thesis.

My thesis begins with the premise that in talking about fallen figures from history and myth, Elizabethans altered the role of Fortune. Writers focused on how figures turned to sin before suffering a fall, and therefore linked fallen grace with sin. In these examples the fall is

attributed to Fortune, whose presence seems to indicate an infernal influence, as we shall see in chapter one.

When Sharpe talks about witchcraft being linked to misfortune, he means causing harm to people and animals, illness and other mishaps. Based on his findings from various assize indictments printed in the 1570s and 1580s, Sharpe determines, "what worried people most about witches was maleficium, the doing of concrete harm by witchcraft" (41). The tragedies discussed in this thesis engage with a different Elizabethan concern relating to the threat of Hell infiltrating earth. I explore the application of the de casibus tradition to tyrannous situations on earth to create mirrors of Hell on earth by suggesting that tyrants were agents of the devil.

The relationship between ghosts and Hell is another important area for research into the development of English tragedy; one need only to think of Shakespeare's Hamlet to see the relevance of anxieties in thinking about ghosts and their origin in the early modern period. In Lewes Lavater's Of ghostes and spirites walking by nyght (1572), for example, the author examines pressing questions about spirits and ghosts. In the preface to the reader the English translator, Robert Harrison, is equally suspicious of reports of ghosts:

[the reader] shall see they have ben falsly taught, & that they were not the soules of men whiche appeared, but eyther falsehood of Monkes, or illusions of devyls, franticke imaginations, or some other frivolous & vain perswasions

(Lavater B2r).

John Newton notes how there were various ways for interpreting apparitions in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Lavater's Of Ghostes and Spirites, argues Newton, served as a guide to official Protestant doctrine on the nature of ghosts (66). Alongside other Protestant documents, such as Reginald Scot's Discoverie of Witchcraft, the idea that apparitions might be demonic became common currency. When Faustus rejects the appearance of Mephistopheles and orders him, "return and change thy shape. / Thou art too ugly to attend on me" (I.iii.24-5), Marlowe inverts the instruction found in Scot, "come unto us, in fair form of man [. . .] and not terrible by any manner of way" (qtd. in Bevington Faustus 127 n.24-5).

In this thesis I am particularly interested in the dialectical exchange between religion and tradition that takes place in the late-Tudor period and affected the way Elizabethans understood evil and Hell. By looking at key tragic texts from the 1550s and 1560s, such as A Mirror for Magistrates and Jasper Heywood's translations of Seneca's Thyestes, alongside tragic dramas leading up to the 1590s, we can locate the development of the relationship between the forces of Hell and sin on earth that inform Clarence's dream.

Firstly this introduction establishes the background for the late-Tudor conception of tragedy with a basic examination of three medieval traditions for writing about the consequences of sin and the role of Hell; Saint Patrick's Purgatory, The Castle of Perseverance and The Fall of Princes. One aim of this section is to show that the dissolution of Purgatory following the height of the Protestant Reformation contributed to the complex and terrifying Elizabethan conception of Hell.

a) Saint Patrick's Purgatory: Curative Punishments

The concept of Purgatory was not universally accepted and remained a problematic part of the teaching of the church but the adherents of Purgatory maintained that sins could be repented for after death. The punishments for sin were described at length in various medieval purgatorial accounts despite the volatility of the doctrine of Purgatory. From the twelfth century Catholics in Europe identified a cave in Donegal as the pilgrimage site of Saint Patrick. The legend of Saint Patrick's descent into the cave was one of the most influential sources of writing about Purgatory in European Christianity and the earliest surviving account of Saint Patrick's descent is the Latin text, Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii (c. 1180). The medieval text identifies Purgatory as one of three regions in the other world and thus plays what Jaques Le Goff calls "an important, if not decisive, role [in the history of Purgatory]" (193).

In the account, the narrator, Owein, details the experience of Gilbert, a Cistercian monk, in Purgatory and earthly paradise. Owein's retelling of the story draws on a variety of cultural and religious traditions for imagining Purgatory. The account draws on different legends of Saint Patrick that were popular in Ireland throughout the Middle Ages. The text was translated into English and remained popular in British medieval literature until the late-fifteenth century.² In the latest revision of the Tractatus in English, The Vision of William Stranton, we notice the emphasis on harsh punishments for sinners juxtaposed with the reminder that they are only temporary. When the

² The legend persisted in popular culture though and even Shakespeare recalls the legend of Saint Patrick when Hamlet says to Horatio, "Yes by Saint Patrick but there is [offence], Horatio, / And much offence too. Touching this vision here, / It is an honest ghost, that let me tell you" (Hamlet I.v.142-44).

punishments recur in the space of Hell in Elizabethan texts they are equally severe and threatening but made considerably worse by the fact that they must be endured eternally.³

In Purgatory, the narrator William Stranton witnesses different fires where sinners are punished according to their sins on earth. With the expertise of his two guides St. John and St. Hild, Stranton learns that each fire is reserved for a particular earthly sin and the intensity of the punishments varies: "I saw þer sum wyth colers gylytde abowte þer nekkys [. . .] and other[s] wyth gaye chappelettys on þer heddys of golde and perlle and other precyvse stones" (87). In Purgatory, men are decorated externally according to the way they lived their lives and the stain of sin is a physical one after death. When the sinners have purged their sins in the fires of Purgatory and are ready to enter Heaven then the stains will disappear.

In each instance St. John first identifies the sinners by their crime, rather than by name. Secondly he recommends for the reader the opposite virtuous behaviour that would avoid punishment. And finally he explains how the sinner-type should beg for God's grace:

theis þat þou seeys in þe grett payne ar bothe men and
wemen þat displeyde Gode thorowe þer grett pride þat thay
usyde in þer lyffe [. . .] more forto pleyse þe bode [. . .] then

³ Jean-Michel Picard's edition, Saint Patrick's Purgatory: a twelfth century tale of a journey to the other world, provides the most comprehensive literary and cultural history of the story. But for a scholarly analysis of different extant editions and their relationship to Medieval dream visions see, Saint Patrick's Purgatory, ed. Robert Easting. Easting reprints the Latin Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii (c.1180-1184); three Middle English translations of the Latin text; a thirteenth century and a fifteenth version called Owayne Miles; and the popular fifteenth century prose version discussed here, The Vision of William Stranton. Easting shows that these are the chief Middle English versions of the visions at Saint Patrick's Purgatory (xix).

to plesse God and kepe hys cummandementtys [. . .] bott
space of penancedoyngge theme lakkyde, and perfor schall
they have penance wythouten mercy to þe day of dome
(89).

In each example St. John mentions the length of punishment that is necessary before the soul can move ahead towards heaven. In this account the only sin that is punishable in Purgatory until the day of doom is pride. Sinners guilty of pride must endure the fires the longest; but even they will eventually be allowed to enter Heaven.

The most important part of the Purgatorial tradition was that all sinners are afforded an opportunity to reach Heaven, even if it is not until the day of doom. During the first half Elizabeth's reign the word eternal is particularly crucial to the discussions of damnation and Hell and punishments are never curative. The purpose of the guides in accounts of Hell is restricted from revealing the moral lessons in Hell and the guides serve only to show the safe path and keep the traveller protected from the damned.

At the end of Stranton's journey past the penal fires of Purgatory he catches sight of a threatening structure that prevents the sinners from reaching heaven until their appointed time. The stench near the walls is unbearable and Stranton sees the naked souls of lechers. Behind the structure there is a black pool which seems impassable to Stranton. When he reaffirms his faith and remembers Christ's passion a ladder appears so that he may safely pass to the other side of the pool:

ant then I blyssyd me wyth my prayer; and or I rose up, I lokyd to þe towre, and þer I saw a ledder fro þe toppe of þe tower rechyng to þe grownde þer I kneylde (109).

At the top of the ladder Stranton meets the godly souls who judge the dead when they arrive. This antechamber of Paradise, Earthly Paradise, is as far as Stranton is allowed to go but he is lucky enough to witness a newly arrived soul receive her judgement.

The new soul is a wicked prioress who arrives decorated in gold and ornate jewellery. When she sees the judges she makes false claims about a virtuous life but the judges can see all of her earthly sins detailed in a book open before them.

When she is presented with the evidence the prioress protests and claims that she has repented for those sins, "I hade schryfte and full repentance of my mysdedys and my wykkydnes done before thys tyme [. . .] take me to [God's] mercy" (115). But these are experienced judges and they spot her false claims and condemn her:

And þer þe byschoppe domyd hyr to payne to þe day of dome, and principally for sche wolde nat forsake synne, to syne forsoke hyr, for then sche had no space of penance (117).

The purpose of this part of Stranton's visit to Purgatory and Earthly Paradise is to demonstrate to the reader that sins cannot be disguised, even if your outward appearance suggests a life of virtue. In this Medieval Christian account judgement is not determined until death and so the judges must be adept and weigh the matter seriously. They see that the wicked prioress failed to repent for her sins before death, so

her appeals for mercy are too late and she must endure the torments of Purgatory until the day of doom.

At the black pit that separates Purgatory from Paradise St. John tells Stranton that God allows all souls to be helped out of Purgatorial confinement:

God forbede ellys; for þou schal undyrstande þat thyes salves may be refresshyde and holpyn owt of thyes payns princypally by þe mercy of God, and by the gude dedys þat þer frendys and other pepull lyffynge in þe warlde may doo for them (107).

The theological implications of Stranton's message are two-fold; not only should people try to avoid sin in life so they will not have to endure terrible punishments in Purgatory, but Christians should also remember that God is merciful and allows people to repent for their sins.

Stranton's message that sinners in Purgatory may be aided in their plight towards the heavens by prayers from people still living is distinctly representative of the volatile medieval tradition of the space for purgation after death. Stranton's didactic message emphasises the temporality of punitive punishments so that sinners on earth may be persuaded to live virtuously and offers a hopeful vision of the future. When Purgatory is eliminated from the traditions for writing about sin and punishment, the threat of endless torments in Hell makes this type of advice superfluous.

b. The Castle of Perseverance: Medieval Treatment of Sin and Salvation

The morality plays used personified vices to dramatise the influence of evil in human lives on earth. The Devil's role in the moralities is superfluous because they aimed to show how the different vices affected the human soul: "[the Devil] is too much the composite of undifferentiated evil to be homiletically useful [. . .] The moralities wanted a homiletic showman" (Spivack 132). The morality plays did not require an actual devil but instead they call on the vices as the primary exponents of evil.

The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom and Mankind are the only extant English morality plays written before 1500.⁴ Each of these plays dramatise a struggle between good and evil over man's soul. In Wisdom, Lucifer and Christ battle each other while Wisdom (Christ) gives the three powers guiding man; Soul, Mind and Will, advice on how to defeat wickedness. Mankind is a comical drama in which various devils tempt Mankind, who falls into despair and is saved in the end by Mercy. The Castle of Perseverance includes devils and tempters but also shows the psychomachia of Mankind concerning his eternal fate.

In depicting Mankind's struggle for salvation in the face of active devils on earth, The Castle of Perseverance emphasises the role of free-will, rather than fate, in human lives. This is a distinct point of departure in the Elizabethan narratives that depict the struggle, or as in the case of Tamburlaine the tyrannical acceptance, of sin as the result of destiny, or an inescapable fate. In The Castle of Perseverance the protagonist's

⁴ For a fully detailed analysis of the influence of The Castle of Perseverance on English drama up to and including Nathaniel Woodes' The Conflict of Conscience, see Cox 43-101.

decline into sin corresponds to the de casibus accounts in A Mirror for Magistrates that will be discussed in chapter one.

At the beginning of the drama the devil Belial appears and reveals to the audience that he plans to destroy the soul of Mankind with help from his friends Pride, Wrath and Envy. In the next scene king Caro (Flesh) explains how he and his friends, Gluttony and Lechery, with his son Sloth work to destroy Mankind. Together with Mundus, Belial and Caro work together in the struggle for the souls of men and women. Caro declares that the newly born Mankind is the object of their current intentions:

Behold þe Werld, Þe Devyl, and me [Caro]!

Wyth all oure mythis we kyngys thre

Nyth and day besy we be

For to distroy Mankende

If þat we may (The Castle of Perseverance, 266-270).

The drama follows Mankind from his birth and youth to old age and eventually to his death and final judgment. Throughout his life the three kings Mundus, Belial and Caro present different temptations to Mankind and try to secure his soul in Hell. This type of recruitment is wholly active and requires continual attention from the vices who attend the kings and from Malus Angelus who offers diabolic advice to Mankind.

When he is born, Mankind is presented with both the good and bad angels; one to teach him Christ's teachings (Bonus Angelus), and one to coerce him towards evil (Malus Angelus). Unsure whom to follow because he has no knowledge of good or evil, Mankind calls out to Jesus, "A, Lord Jhesu, wedyr may I goo?" (323).

Mankind's innocence is evidenced in his inability to grasp that what Malus Angelus offers him necessarily includes a life of sin. Even as he agrees to follow Malus Angelus, he tells Bonus Angelus that he will still be true to God: "I vow to God, and so I may / Make mery a ful gret throwe" (420-421).

It is important in this example that Mankind chooses to follow Malus Angelus and that he does so because he is more persuaded by the rewards Malus Angelus offers. At the end of his wicked life, Mankind is granted the opportunity to gain salvation by accepting the sacraments. Since fates are not assigned before birth, and because humans are inclined towards sin because of the Fall, yet God is merciful, repentance before death is essential to salvation in the Medieval Christian tradition.

Each time Mankind is faced with another temptation by the seven deadly sins, he is persuaded by their rhetoric and is convinced to lead a life of sin. Eventually he appears onstage with clothes made of precious fabrics and expensive metals. Like Faustus, Mankind enjoys the luxury that Sin affords. He even goes as far as to appoint Envy as his chief counsellor: "Cum up, Envye, my dere derlynge. / þou hast Mankyndys love" (1142). By choosing Envy as his prime counsellor, Mankind confirms his union with the diabolic coterie that solicit him.⁵

Even though Mankind considers his sins and learns the value of Confession, Penance and Virtue, he still chooses a life of sin at the end of the play. When Death arrives to take Mankind away he cries out to

⁵ When Mankind appoints Envy as his counsellor in The Castle of Perseverance the author subverts Tudor ideas of good counsel discussed below in chapter four. Thomas Betteridge notes the importance of counsel in the Tudor histories of the English Reformations: "the question of counsel and its relation to the reform of the commonwealth is often a central issues to these histories" (28). Similarly John Guy states, "In the humanist-classical tradition, counsel was linked directly to virtue, since it was the dictates of virtue that impelled the king to act according to the common good" (qtd. in Betteridge 29). See also discussion of Cavanagh's recent study below, 142ff.

Mundus, "Goode Syr Werld, have me in mende!" (2852). In reply Mundus reminds him about his sinful life and Mankind starts to despair. Rather than concede that he must be damned, like Faustus, Mankind begs God for Mercy: "God kepe me fro dyspayr! [. . .] God me graunte of hys grace [. . .] I putte me in Goddys mercy" (2990-3007).

God does not offer immediate salvation, but asks the sisters of Heaven, Mercy, Justice, Verity and Peace whether or not Mankind deserves God's mercy. The primary reason for not granting immediate salvation to Mankind is that humans would never avoid the luxury of sin if they could all be saved at the last moment. But Peace reminds her sisters that Jesus died to save humankind from the punishments in Hell: "For hys love þat deyed on tre, / Late save Mankynd from al peryle / And schelde hym from myschaunsse" (3209-11). After listening to the Sisters of Heaven and hearing the evidence from Mankind's life, (Innocence, Temptations, Life-in-Sin, Repentance, Temptation, and Return-to-Sin), God grants mercy. He tells the Sisters of Heaven to collect Mankind from Belial so that he can sit beside God in Heaven.

Without the last scene where God offers mercy to Mankind, the drama would be a tragedy since Mankind would be damned. This is a point of distinction which separates the pre-Reformation dramatic treatment of damnation from Elizabethan tragedies. Even in the sixteenth-century morality dramas, salvation cannot be granted at the last moments so the drama often just ends with death.

In The Castle of Perseverance, the vices and devils must actively vie with the converse virtues for Mankind's soul. In the end God grants Mankind's soul mercy because he offers repentance for his life of sin. Quite distinctly though, in the Elizabethan period, the battle between good and evil is a passive one, sometimes aided by the malicious intentions

of a Vice character. In these dramas, the life of sin can be seen as a sign of damnation in itself.

The role of vices and devils dramatically alters during the Tudor period, as John Cox has recently noted in his comprehensive study, The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama, 1350-1642. Cox indicates how the ideology of the Protestant Reformation regarding history informed the thinking about devils in drama in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. Here, what Cox refers to is the newly conceived reformed church that placed the ruler at the head, rather than the pope. The traditional church and its sacramental system thus became identified with the devil: "In Johan Baptystes Preachynge (1538) Bale [. . .] openly identified the devil with traditional religion itself - a model that countless dramatists, including Shakespeare, would imitate after him" (Cox 84). Cox maintains that the Protestant Reformation in England did not constitute a cultural turning point in terms of thinking about the devil although their role changed in dramatic works. This thesis argues that with the Protestant Reformation, thinking about the origin of sin altered in English cultural memory.

The way that the Vice figure developed in English drama, particularly during the Elizabethan religious settlement, corresponds to the shift in thinking about evil and the devil. In the late 1950s, Bernard Spivack studied the role of the vice in Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. Looking back to the role of the Devil on stage, Spivack highlights how the prominent place of the Devil in the mystery and miracle cyclic dramas becomes estranged in the morality dramas because he represents an allegorical figure from Christian folklore and because he is the source of all vice.

This study recognises the importance of the Vice but does not include the figure for analysis in the way dramatists mirrored Hell on earth. Instead this study examines how the language of tyranny and Hell influences the wicked characters in tragedies. The morality plays are not tragedies because they end with the message about repentance for a sinful life and show God's infinite mercy. In chapter four, my discussion of the Vice in the tragedies Cambises and Horestes focuses on the force of evil that staging the vice indicates.

Spivack's study traces the development of the Vice in English drama, and recognises the importance of the transition to the modern stage from the medieval morality traditions. He shows how the Vice progressed onto the homiletic stage world; a world of real people and history rather than the world of metaphors and abstractions:

as [the Vice] moves onto a new stage filled with human individuals and the diverse events of history or fable - a stage, moreover, rapidly transferring its allegiance from a homiletic to an aesthetic purpose - his original significance is compromised by his new surroundings, and his activity, though his energy is unimpaired, undergoes an important transformation. [. . .] in a dramatic world that is no longer a metaphor he himself ceases to be metaphorical (278-9).

But Cox highlights the flaws in Spivack's theory about the role of the Vice. He shows that the Vice staged after the Reformation was not so different from the vices in pre-Reformation mysteries and miracle plays as Spivack argues:

He slants his account to favour the Vice, because he sees the Vice as a transitional figure between 'other-worldly' and 'this-worldly', or secular concerns in drama [. . .] Spivack's story of incremental secular change follows earlier critical accounts in its failure to recognise continuity between stage devils before and after the Reformation (Cox 102).

Cox's argument looks at a broader spectrum and he traces how the thinking about evil altered, rather than thinking about just one manifestation of evil, and how this was portrayed on stage. One of the main points in this thesis is that the Protestant re-evaluation of the cost of sin marks a shift in the way people thought about the origin of sin.

When the Vice emerged onto the Tudor stage as a single figure who encouraged evil by intrigue, he already had an established homiletic role: "The heart of his role is an act of seduction, and the characteristic stratagem whereby the Vice achieves his purpose is a vivid stage metaphor for the sly insinuation of evil into the human breast" (Spivack 152). Cox shows how the Vice's attributes merge with the characteristic traits of stage devils, such as the ones in The Castle of Perseverance. In the Elizabethan reformed world, God does not grant mercy at death as He does for Mankind. Instead the turn to wickedness in life is a sign of the person's lack of grace and consequent damnation.

This crucial difference transforms the form of religious drama in the direction of tragedy. The differences mark altered attitudes concerning salvation and damnation but they also indicate a shift in thinking about tragedy. Not only does the sinner's life end wretchedly but now the person must also face damnation after an earthly fall from grace.

. Another striking difference between the medieval homiletic tradition and the post-Reformation didactic tradition is that the protagonists in tragedies who are affected by devils and vices do not represent Mankind. Instead the protagonists are an example of one particular man; an individual who is marked for sin or damnation, sometimes even at birth. This shift corresponds to a shift in thinking about history and tragedy in the same morally motivated frame of reference. The de casibus form, originally a form of history writing, was increasingly linked with tragic writings in the Tudor period. The way the de casibus form altered to suit tragedy is discussed at length in the final section of this introduction.

c) English de casibus: From Boccaccio to Lydgate

In the first chapter of this thesis I discuss Lydgate's contributions to the discussions of Fortune in de casibus accounts and how the role of Fortune changed from Boccaccio to Lydgate and then through Chaucer. Here I am only concerned with Lydgate's alterations to the de casibus form and its early English manifestations. The discussion below focuses on the early transition in de casibus writing from a mode of history writing to a mode for writing tragedy.

In Boccaccio's famous pioneer text, De casibus virorum illustrium ["The falls of famous men"], the fourteenth-century Italian provided a teleological history of the falls of famous men from creation to his present. This text was extremely influential on the English literary tradition from the time of its circulation in Latin from 1363/4. The Italian author knew that his readers could not be swayed by what he called, "the eloquence of history", and so he proposed a new method for

approaching history in which he would show, "what God or Fortune can teach [men] about those she raises up" (qtd. in Budra 16).

Boccaccio's unconventional method for writing history was to select figures whose lives and falls symbolised the capricious nature of Fortune, man's volatile position in life and God's infinite power. He explains these purposes in the introduction to De casibus virorum illustrium:

Therefore, from among the mighty I shall select the most famous, so when our princes see these rulers, old and spent, prostrated by the judgement of God, they will recognise God's power, the shiftiness of Fortune, and their own insecurity (cited in Budra 16).

The Italian author understood the value of history in terms of the moral instruction that the examples of men and women whom God punished for hubris provided.⁶ The repetition of such examples in history was, for Boccaccio, evidence of a teleological structure in human events: he Christianised the hubris myths of antiquity to illustrate God's infinite power.

The English translators treated Boccaccio's text differently and added a tragic perspective to the stories of fallen men and women. After Lydgate and Chaucer, the de casibus tradition was intimately bound up with both tragedy and history. Instead of trying to identify a teleology in the examples of fallen figures, the de casibus form was applied to figures who were marked for damnation, and thus by implication fit into a

⁶ Boccaccio supplemented De Casibus virorum illustrium, which discussed both men and women, with a work that only discussed fallen female women, De mulieribus claris / On Notorious Women (1361, revised 1362)

Providential plan for human history. The crucial point of departure for the English imitators though is that for Boccaccio the fallen figures were not uncompromisingly tied to sin and damnation.

Paul Budra's excellent scholarly work on *A Mirror for Magistrates* repositions Boccaccio's text in the frame of history, as it was intended, rather than as tragedy, as it is often approached. In *A Mirror for Magistrates and the de casibus Tradition*, Budra traces the history of the de casibus form in England back to its Boccaccian roots through Geoffrey Chaucer and John Lydgate, who are responsible for the Elizabethan understanding of de casibus primarily as a form of tragedy. He shows how the English authors imported ideas of tragedy into the form set by Boccaccio and how, and why, the import continued to be a part of de casibus writing.⁷

In "The Monk's Tale", Chaucer identified his de casibus narrative as an example of tragic story-telling. This marks the point in English literary history when de casibus became closely, but not exclusively, linked with tragedy. It is even thought that Chaucer intended to write a large work in imitation of Boccaccio but abandoned the project and inserted "The Monk's Tale" within the Canterbury Tales (Budra 42-3, Benson 17-18).

There is a possible reference to Boccaccio at the start of "The Monk's Tale" although it is not certain if the acknowledgement is Chaucer's or an editor's. The title reads, "Heere bigynneth the Monkes Tale / De Casibus Virorum illustrium (Chaucer 240). We cannot be certain who wrote the reference and there is an existing debate about

⁷ See pages 35-6 for a further detail of the scholarly discussions of the de casibus tradition in English literature by Budra.

whether it was Chaucer or if it was the result of early editors mapping Boccaccio onto Chaucer's text.

Chaucerian scholar and editor Larry D. Benson attributes the reference to the medieval poet and not to the corruption of the editing process: "Boccaccio's De Casibus virorum illustrium (Concerning the falls of illustrious men), cited in the subtitle, supplied the basic ideas of the collection and some of the details of the narratives" (17). And Paul Budra is equally convinced the words were Chaucer's own:

Chaucer was consciously working in the tradition set by Boccaccio. The tale follows Boccaccio's original in being a collection of short tales of the falls of great personages, arranged in rough chronological order, beginning with Lucifer (Budra 43).

Despite strong indications that Chaucer wanted to place his text in the Boccaccian frame, there is not enough evidence to say for certain who added the reference. It is also possible that after John Lydgate translated the French version of Boccaccio's work into English in the fifteenth-century the printers wanted to make the connection between Chaucer's work and Boccaccio.

When Lydgate recalls Chaucer at the end of The Fall of Princes he cites "The Monk's Tale" as one model for de casibus writing. He links Chaucer's tale with the stories in his text:

The Fal of Princes gan pitously compleyne,
As Petrark did, and also John Bochas;
Laureat Fraunceys, poetys bothe tweyne,

Toold how Princes for ther greet trespace
 Wer ovirthrowe, rehersyng al the caas,
 As Chauceer did in the Monkys Tale (8: 3422-7).

Here, Lydgate honours the Italian poets Petrarch and Bochas, the French translator of De Casibus Laurent de Premierfait, and his countryman Geoffrey Chaucer. Lydgate's particular mention of "The Monk's Tale" is confirmation that Chaucer's tale was at least regarded in the Boccaccian de casibus frame even if the direct allusion was not original.

More important though is the link between "The Monk's Tale" as a de casibus text and tragedy. The opening lines to Chaucer's narrative offer the first extant definition of tragedy in English:

Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie,
 As olde bookes maken us memorie,
 Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
 And is yfallen out of heigh degree
 Into myserie, and endeth wretchedly (Chaucer 241).

With these lines Chaucer permanently changed the way de casibus literature was conceived in England by launching it into the mode of tragedy.

For Chaucer, tragedy includes a protagonist who is subject to Fortune and whose fate is pitiable. Benson comments,

Tragedy in this view is a universal concomitant of good fortune and prosperity, for all are subject to Fortune save

for those who turn aside from this world, scorn its comforts, and place their faith in a higher power (18).

When Chaucer writes that tragedy ends "wretchedly", he includes empathy with his tragic vision. He reinforces this when the monk states,

I wol biwaille in manere of tragedie
 The harm of hem that stoode in heigh degree,
 And fillen so that ther nas no remedie
 To brynge hem out of hir adversitee (Chaucer 241).

By including references to empathy in words like "bewail", Chaucer associates traditional ideas of tragedy such as pathos with the de casibus form. In Chaucerian terms de casibus is a story which is told in the frame of tragedy and invokes pity.

Lydgate's trueness to Boccaccio is complicated further when he identifies his muse. Instead of Calliope or Melpomene, Lydgate calls on his compatriot Chaucer:

My maistir Chaucer, with his fresh comedies,
 Is ded, alas, cheeff poete off Breteyne,
 That whilom made ful pitous tragedies;
 The fall of pryncis he dede also compleyne,
 As he that was of makyng sovereyne,
 Whom al this land sholde off riht preferre,
 Sithe off oure language he was the lodesterre
 (Lydgate 7: 246-252).

He continues to distance his work from the original in the next section when he mentions Seneca the tragedian: "Senek in Rome, thoruh his hih prudence, / Wrot tragedies of gret moralitie" (8:253-4). Further proof of how far Lydgate was influenced by Chaucer's references to tragedy is made evident when he refers to the nature of the subject matter: "And John Bochas wrot maters lamentable, / The fall of pryncis, where he doth expresse / How fro ther joie thei fill in gret distresse" (269-271. My emphasis). Thus Lydgate, like Chaucer before him, links lamentation with the de casibus formula.

Lydgate devotes most of the last section of the prologue to praise for Chaucer and especially "The Monk's Tale": "In prose [Chaucer] wrot the Tale off Melibe [. . .] And how the Monk off stories newe & olde / Pitious tragedies be the weie tolde" (346-50). He does not make any note that he is departing from the historical aims of his source material or explain why he introduces Chaucer and Seneca. This slant in the direction of tragedy reflects the heightened awareness of the link between history and tragedy that continued in de casibus writing in the sixteenth-century.⁸

The English authors Lydgate and Chaucer adapted the model set forth by Boccaccio in De casibus virorum illustrium by including a tragic perspective. Despite the differences, Boccaccio, Chaucer and Lydgate shared a worldly understanding of de casibus that focused on the earthly fortunes of men and women. In part, this reflects the Medieval Christian

⁸ Lydgate thinks of his source book in terms of its historical didactic potential, but that he is more inclined towards thinking of these examples in terms of tragedy is clear from the way he devotes so many stanzas to Chaucer. In calling on Chaucer's tragic world picture in his translation, Lydgate anglicises the de casibus tradition. For a detailed analysis of the history of the de casibus tradition from Boccaccio to Lydgate and later through to William Baldwin and his collaborators, see Budra Mirror 14-59.

understanding that even at the last moments a sinner can offer repentance and be granted salvation from a forgiving God.

When William Baldwin and his collaborators gathered together in the sixteenth-century (nearly one hundred years after Lydgate's death), to write A Mirror for Magistrates, originally intended to be an expansion of Lydgate's The Fall of Princes, ideas of tragedy permeated de casibus heritage. Budra notes:

The stories are tragedies, but they are treated with the precision of histories. This juggling between tragedy and history goes on throughout the prose envoys of the Baldwin editions of the Mirror. At times empathy for the protagonists will be foregrounded: 'Whan he had ended this so wofull a tragedy, and to all Princes a ryght wurthy instruction, we paused: hauing passed through a miserable time full of piteous tragedyes' (1:119). Sometimes this empathy will even transcend the obvious political didacticism of the biography at hand (Budra 52).

Baldwin and his collaborators may not have been not overtly conscious of how their stories differed from the Boccaccian model. But there is a colossal distinction between the medieval de casibus accounts and the Elizabethan ones: The figures in the Mirror not only suffer an earthly fall, but they are also eternally damned. The most significant difference that separates the texts is that Elizabethan tragedy is bound up with thinking about eternal damnation and Hell, as this thesis will demonstrate.

Chapter One
Executrix of Wierdes: The role of Fortune in the
Baldwin editions of A Mirror for Magistrates

The Elizabethan dramatic tradition for representing Hell on stage was cultivated, in part, from the treatment of Hell and damnation in the early editions of A Mirror for Magistrates (1559 & 1563). The editor, William Baldwin, even locates the bad behaviour of magistrates within a hellish frame of reference in his introduction: "What a fowle shame wer it for any now to take upon them the name and office of God, and in there doinges shew them selves divyls" (Mirror, 65). Baldwin's link between badly behaved magistrates and devils indicates a shift in thinking about the forces of Hell that takes place as a result of developments within magisterial English Protestantism after Elizabeth's succession and the religious settlement of 1559.

The predominant role of Fortune in the Baldwin editions of the Mirror is essential to comprehending how her presence offered evidence of a predetermined fate of damnation. The first half of this chapter is devoted to tracing the English heritage of Fortune and the de casibus form leading up to Troilus' lament to Fortune, "But oh Fortune, executrix of wierdes" (see page 46 below) and the first edition of the Mirror in 1559.

By attributing sin to the earthly presence of Fortune, Elizabethan tragic narratives created a mirror of Hell on earth where Fortune's presence indicated an imminent fall. Initially, Fortune's role in bringing about falls was central to de casibus accounts, as I shall show in the discussion of the medieval de casibus tradition. But as this tradition developed, her role in human affairs faded and the characteristic of evil was enough to indicate damnation. At times, invocations to Fortune

disclose an indication that those who accept her gifts might already be marked out for damnation according to God's predetermined plan. It is one of the aims of this chapter to highlight this underlying meaning in (some of) the invocations to Fortune in the Mirror and recognise its importance for tragedy.

In the second half of this chapter I discuss how the altered role of Fortune redirects the path of the de casibus form. In the first editions of A Mirror for Magistrates, for example, Fortune was linked with tyrants who climbed the heights of her wheel and brought physical suffering to men and women on earth. By imposing earthly tyranny over human subjects, early modern dramatic tyrants could re-enact, or perform, the torments of Hell on earth. The link between the dramatic tradition and the way Baldwin quasi-dramatically stages the de casibus accounts in the Mirror shows that Elizabethans were thinking about how sins on earth could actually derive from Hell: rather than lead to damnation, sinful behaviour could indicate predetermined damnation.

Fortune's appearance in A Mirror for Magistrates is important because her presence signifies an infernal force working within the fates of men on earth. Subtleties of meaning can be detected in the inclusion of Fortune as a sign of damnation when we consider the contemporaneous theological treatises from the key reformers about the link between disobedience and damnation. These discussions presented varying doctrines of salvation and damnation and none could be considered the orthodox line.

Although newly conceived English Church aimed to dissolve inter-parochial disputes, it failed to establish its own set of doctrines in the early stages. Christians in England struggled to understand religious doctrines primarily because there were no universally recognized

guidelines for the English Protestantism taking shape in England during Elizabeth's reign. The theological treatises mentioned in this chapter highlight the link between earthly ways for determining eternal damnation and sin.

Due to the multi-vocal character of *A Mirror for Magistrates*, it is difficult, if not impossible, to trace any consistent ideology for thinking about Fortune, earthly sin or damnation. But evidence that this link was conceived of in early Elizabethan England is indicated by the repetition of the link between Fortune and sin in the accounts.

After looking at Fortune's medieval heritage, this chapter examines a small selection of accounts from the Baldwin editions that link the earthly presence of Fortune to eternal damnation. This will include firstly an investigation of William Baldwin's account of Richard Duke of York and Francis Seagar's account of Richard III. Both these accounts offer insight into Elizabethan conceptions of tyranny and rebellion and illuminate the cultural relevance of Calvin and Luther to the discussions in England.

Following the analysis of Baldwin and Seagar's stories, this chapter progresses into a discussion of John Dolman's account of Lord Hastings, Thomas Sackville's "Induction" and finally, Sackville's account of the Duke of Buckingham. These four excerpts and Sackville's "Induction" engage with literary tropes for writing about Hell and reflect on the philosophy behind the link between the infernal realm and earthly behaviour that dominates the Elizabethan conception of Hell.

Baldwin asks the reader to imagine that the ghosts of the dead are telling their own stories. In this chapter I argue that the quasi-dramatic poems in the *Mirror* establish a mirror of the grave, or Hell, on earth. Dolman and Sackville both engage with the classical underworld by linking

their protagonists' damnation to their flirtations with Fortune and provide solid, erudite examples of Fortune's changing role in the Elizabethan period. The first part of this chapter is concerned with the critical considerations of the role Fortune in the Mirror and her role in key medieval texts that influenced the Mirror.

Campbell to Budra: Ways of Reading the Mirror

In her introduction to A Mirror for Magistrates in 1938, Lily B Campbell argues that the decreased emphasis on Fortune's irrationality should be attributed to the didacticism of the Elizabethan poets. She identifies the cause of such decreased emphasis as the desire to replace the analysis of divine justice with an older philosophising on the uncertainty of fortune (56). The Boccaccian model did not offer moral condemnation for the examples because it was primarily concerned to show evidence of Fortune's capricious nature and God's infinite power.

Baldwin and his collaborators, argues Campbell, heightened the moral value each story could offer when they added prose links and prefaces to connect the accounts. The way the Elizabethan collection differs from the aims of its primary medieval source, Lydgate's The Fall of Princes, was what made the text uniquely Elizabethan.

The importance of the Mirror on the English literary tradition is stated firmly in Campbell's introduction. She emphasises the way the text transgressed boundaries of genre:

The Mirror for Magistrates was an important pioneer work in literature, because it transferred to the poet the accepted task of the historian - a task which, if the defenders of

poetry are to be believed, he could perform more delightfully, more directly, and hence more effectively, than could the historian (Campbell Mirror 51).

Campbell's critical analysis of the Mirror celebrates the diverse nature of the text; praising it for bridging the gap between history writing and tragedy. But not all modern critics read the inconsistencies positively, or even as concrete evidence of the changing shape of Elizabethan theology.

Rather than embrace the interdisciplinary nature of the text that Campbell highlighted in her innovative criticism, critics over the last century problematised this aspect of the Mirror. Since Campbell's innovative work on the Mirror, literary scholars are getting more accustomed to reading the text and engaging with its interdisciplinary quality.

In 1938, Howard Baker reduced the influence of A Mirror for Magistrates to the mere muddling of examples of divine providence with stories that show the ways of Fortune. His study limits the importance of the varying theologies and philosophies concerning Fortune and Providence to early modern culture and to tragedy. Baker considers the inconsistencies in the tragedies problematic because they do not conform to any single coherent tragic schema for writing about examples of sin and punishment. He states:

Almost in spite of itself, The Mirror lets the tradition of fatal sins broaden out into a conception of tragic flaws. It puts necessary limits on the freedom of the will, and it acknowledges that much of the ill which happens to men

cannot be explained by the theory of an ounce of punishment
for an ounce of crime (Baker 205).

Baker's difficulty in trying to trace a single unified tragic schema running through the stories in the Mirror lies primarily in the way he limits his study to just two accounts from the entire work (Thomas Churchyard's account of Jane Shore and Thomas Sackville's account of Buckingham).¹

William Peery also relegates A Mirror for Magistrates to a secondary place in the history of English tragedy by trying to determine a tragic formula to explain the examples. Peery begins by dividing the nineteen stories from the original 1559 Mirror according to the stance each account made about tragic retribution: five are tragedies of external circumstance, twelve are stories where responsibility is divided and two are stories of tragic retribution. This breakdown leads Peery to conclude:

Recognising these concepts [of individual responsibility and tragic justice], we should not forget two other elements in Elizabethan tragedy which help account for its effect: realisation of the vanity of worldly ambitions and acceptance of the imminence of death [. . .] the Mirror helped familiarise the Renaissance with both sets of concepts, chance and causality, irresponsibility and retribution

¹ Similarly, Willard Farnham argues for a reading of A Mirror for Magistrates within the scheme of divine providence: "Fortune is more and more plainly made to surrender the mystery of her ways and to work according to laws which men may analyse and understand" (Farnham 285). Farnham identifies a providential force at work in bringing about men's falls, but crucially recognises that the motivating force is not Fortune as it was for Lydgate and Boccaccio. In the 1559 Mirror, Farnham concludes, "[the] authors return to an attack upon the tragic mystery, with a persistence that Boccaccio and Lydgate do not have and with far stronger conviction that there is a 'salary of sin' paid here upon earth [. . .] Call it Fortune, the stars, or, more properly, God" (190-1).

(Peery 129).

The common problem scholars such as Baker and Peery encounter when trying to identify a tragic formula for the accounts in A Mirror for Magistrates is the tendency to categorise de casibus in strictly tragic terms.

It was not until the 1960s that scholars began to engage with the multi-vocal character of the Mirror positively. The collaborative aspect of the work was now considered a crucial element for identifying a tragic schema within the whole text. In 1965 Irving Ribner, for example, addresses the diverse roles assigned to Fortune in the text. He determines that despite variations, Fortune had a definite role in the work: "Fortune in the Mirror usually served as an agent by which God visited retribution upon evil rulers for their sins" (Ribner Age of Shakespeare, 99).

Frederick Kiefer disagrees with Ribner's reading of Fortune in the Mirror and argues that the individual poems do not define Fortune as an executrix of God's will. Instead, Kiefer argues, the goddess Fortuna retained her ancient identity and resisted absorption into the Christian tradition of Providence (150). Kiefer states that within the collection there are instances when Fortune acts as a partner to Providence, rather than a replacement for Providence, and he loosely agrees with Ribner that the references to tragic deeds carry the implication that Fortune behaves according to God's will (152).

Kiefer concludes that the varying invocations to Fortune in the Mirror point to her role as nothing more than the presiding deity of the poem, or the Muse. He says,

The authors of the Mirror for Magistrates carefully orchestrate the two themes [of Providence and Fortune] in order to avoid any overt clash. Providence and Fortune may share the same stage, but they do so in an artistically controlled manner (164).

Kiefer continues to state that although the authors sometimes mention the incompatibility of Fortune and Providence, they do not take issue with this contention. Furthermore, he notes, the authors rarely mention God's justice and Fortune's power together. Given the diverse authorship of the Mirror, it is difficult to imagine the contributors formally agreed to any specific methodology ("artistically controlled manner") for writing about Fortune and divine Providence in order to assimilate their own theological perspectives, which may have varied.

The different theological and philosophical perspectives offered on Fortune and Providence exemplify the core anxiety that permeates Elizabethan tragedy and participates in the development of Hell on the stage. The primary problem with past criticism is the tendency to separate the issues of history and tragedy from the role of Fortune. But as Paul Budra has recently recognised, and as I have indicated in the Introduction, the two issues are inextricably linked in the sixteenth-century. Critics tended to highlight the role of Fortune in A Mirror for Magistrates as a retributive executrix.² However, this line of criticism was soon questioned and scholarship turned towards reading beyond ideas of tragic retribution in the accounts within the Mirror.

² This is further emphasised by the common association of Fortuna with Nemesis, the goddess of Justice by the Renaissance iconographers (Kiefer 150).

Paul Budra addresses the automatic inclination for critics to read de casibus as a form of tragedy in his illuminating study, A Mirror for Magistrates and the de casibus Tradition (2000). He states in his introduction,

Critics fascinated with Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedy have looked back to the Mirror as a proto-tragedy, a primitive stage in the evolution towards, above all, Shakespearean tragedy (Budra Mirror xi).

By looking back through the genealogy of de casibus literature, Budra realigns the Mirror closer to its Boccaccian de casibus model as a form of history writing.

Budra's study works to correct the critical misjudgements of past scholars who read the Mirror within a tradition for de casibus as a form of tragedy.³ He aims to re-evaluate the significance of de casibus as a literary tradition of its own, rather than as a stage tradition that Lily B Campbell ascribes to it in Shakespeare's "Histories"; Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. Campbell argued for a reading of the Mirror as a step in the evolution of tragedy leading towards the canonical tragedies of Shakespeare (51).

Budra relocates the Baldwin editions of A Mirror for Magistrates within the historical framework of the de casibus tradition to emphasise its importance within the context of Tudor historiography. In his final chapter, Budra highlights the relationship between the de casibus

³ Henry Ansgar Kelly's reading of A Mirror for Magistrates as history is duly noted by Budra as is Kelly's relegation of the collection as a "bad history". See Kelly, Divine Providence 163-82.

tradition and drama; firstly looking at the influence of drama on A Mirror for Magistrates and then addressing the effect of the historical import of de casibus when it is invoked in drama. It is with this realignment in mind that readers should understand the Mirror he argues. This chapter reverses Budra's study by looking at what aspects of the de casibus accounts in the Mirror's invocations to Hell contribute to the late-Elizabethan perception of de casibus and Hell.

II. The "Slippery Deceits of the Wavering Lady"

Classical and Early Christian Fortuna

When William Baldwin rearticulates the purpose of continuing Lydgate's Fall of Princes in the original preface to A Mirror for Magistrates he adds a new dimension to the de casibus form that includes a lesson in morality:

[the Printer] was counsailed [. . .] to procure to have the storye contynued from where Bochas leftte, unto this presente time, chiefly of suche as Fortune had dalyed with here in this ylande: whiche might be as a myrrour for al men as well noble as others, to shewe the slippery deceytes of the waveryng lady, and the due rewarde of all kinde of vice (68).

By including an emphasis on the rewards for vice, Baldwin's preface evidences the changing role of Fortune in de casibus examples. This shift in the reception and appropriation of Fortune in early modern texts is informed by the goddess' classical and medieval heritage from Seneca and

Boethius, and later in Chaucer and Lydgate as we shall see in the following section.

One key element that makes the stories from English history included in A Mirror for Magistrates identifiable with the contemporary interest in Senecan tragedy is their relation to the hubris myths of antiquity. Boethius learned from Seneca that the good man is not affected by Fortune because she can only change worldly matters, not spiritual matters. Seneca maintained that Fortune is unable to remove virtue because she does not distribute it: "Fortune can take away nothing unless she gave it; but she did not give virtue, therefore she cannot take it away" (De Constantis Sapientis, V.4).⁴ Seneca limited Fortune's powers and restricted her role so that she could only affect vice. With courage, wisdom and power Romans believed they could defend their lives against Fortune's influence. Pagan Romans believed that there were alternate deities in the heavens who control and order earthly affairs and humans were not subject to just one God.

In his introduction to Seneca's moral essays, John W. Basore states that in Seneca's philosophical works the ancient Stoic was primarily concerned with ethics:

While ostensibly an adherent of Stoic materialism, he shows the independence of an eclectic and [became] particularly noteworthy in his conception of deity and the kindred doctrine of the brotherhood of man. [. . .] he verges

⁴ Cf. Horace, Ode XXIX, "A Clear Conscience makes us Superior to Fortune". Here Horace discusses the way life changes instantly, sometimes from good to bad and at times from bad to good: "Fortune, exulting in her cruel work, and stubborn to pursue her wanton sport, shifts her fickle favours, kind now to me, now to some other" (III.xxix.51-54).

constantly toward the representation of God as a moral and spiritual being, a beneficent Providence (Basore x).

Two things stand out in Seneca's philosophical writings for Basore: the identification of a moral order controlled by Providence, and a bitter condemnation of any type of cruelty inflicted on mankind by fellow men. Since worldly affairs must be governed by a beneficent Providence and all human actions are maintained by such Providence then people who transgress boundaries of human compassion must be guided by a malevolent force.

In De Providentia, the philosopher discusses the fortunes of the good man and Seneca explains his Stoic perspective on Fortune and Providence. Seneca's philosophy on these matters would later prove invaluable to Christians trying to assimilate Fortuna into a Christian universe, as we shall see below.

At the beginning of his essay, Seneca establishes, as Boethius does at the end of The Consolation of Philosophy, that everything happens for a reason and nothing happens simply by chance:

For the present purpose, it is unnecessary to show that this mighty structure of the world does not endure without some one to guard it, and that the assembling and the separate flight of the stars above are not due to the workings of chance (I.2).

Here Seneca emphasises that since nothing happens accidentally, all events must have a reason and must therefore have a pre-arranged order

- or Providence. He expands on this throughout the essay alongside a lengthy discussion of the good man's fortune.

Later in De Providentia Seneca explains that no evils happen to the good man. Instead when bad things happen the good man should interpret the adversities as an opportunity by a beneficent deity to test the good man's virtue. He suggests that if only good things happened to good men, they would be spoiled, and so God tests the good man with adversity: "[God] does not make a favourite of the good man, he tests him, he hardens him, and he prepares him for his own things" (I.6). In another section of the essay Seneca states that bad things happen to good men not only for the betterment of the individual, but also for the betterment of society. This, he states, is a result of destiny: "I shall add, further, that these things happen thus by destiny, and that they rightly befall good men by the same law which makes them good" (III.1).

Seneca further claims that the bad fortune that happens to good men serves a didactic purpose, "It is only evil fortune that discovers a great exemplar" (III.4). Thus, good men suffer hardships because they are part of a divine pattern and serve as examples to teach others how to endure hardships. His argument a majore is stated plainly in chapter six: "It is so that they may teach others to endure them; they were born to be a pattern" (VI.3). The lessons of Fortune for Seneca correspond to the de casibus lessons Boccaccio aimed to demonstrate by offering the examples of those thrown down by Fortune as evidence of a divine pattern working in human lives.

The most relevant part of Seneca's moral essays for our reading of A Mirror for Magistrates comes in his explanation that while Fortune may adversely affect the good man, God does not allow sin to corrupt him:

Evil of every sort he keeps far from them - sin and crime, evil counsel and schemes for greed, blind lust and avarice intent upon another's goods (VI.1).

So, although good men suffer hardships from Fortune, they do not turn to sin, like bad men. Instead, their examples of hardships endured will help other good men to accept hardships as a test of virtue from a benevolent God.

In De Providentia, Seneca said that the role of the good man is to offer himself up to Fate, and that the path of the good man is not level but shifts from good fortune to bad. Through all of this, Seneca says that the good man will climb the heights of virtue: "His course will not be the level way; uphill and downhill he must go, be tossed about, and guide his bark through stormy waters; he must keep his course in spite of fortune" (V.9). Hecuba, for example, endured the sacrifice of both her child and grandchild so that the Greeks would withdraw from Troy. For Senecans, this meant that the Trojans abandoned the rebuilding of Troy and progressed with the greater task to found Rome. Hecuba thus represents a good person who has given herself up to fortune.

For Christians however, Fortune was considered a temptation to vice, as Boethius clearly indicates in The Consolation of Philosophy, discussed in the next section. Fortune's role in early modern poetry was important because by showing Fortune as temptress to evil, poets were able to preserve a pagan symbol which could evoke a Christian empathy

from the audience. Her classical identity could be preserved only by virtue of the fact that men who fell by Fortune were also sinners.

Howard Patch studied Fortune's Medieval character extensively in The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature (1967). He examined Fortune's history in the medieval age based on European Medieval literature with a specific interest in determining how Fortuna survived Christianity. Using his evidence for Fortuna's place in Medieval heritage we can determine what aspects of Fortune's character in early Elizabethan literature were Tudor additions and mark a shift in thinking about her in a Protestant world.

The early church fathers, including Augustine and Tertullian, characterised Fortune as the personification of disorder. Since there was no equivalent for chance, the goddess Fortuna needed redefining if she was to survive Christianity:

Belief in chance was not officially welcome to the new faith which maintained that even the hairs of the human head are numbered, and that not a sparrow falls without God's knowledge (Patch 15).

In City of God, Augustine addressed the goddess Fortuna in a comparison with the goddess Felicity. He distinguished between chance events and Fortune. In discussing the meaning of destiny and fate, Augustine determined that since nothing happens by accident some events occur fortuitously: "fortune, which is called good without any regard to merit, befalls both good and bad men by chance [fortuito], which is why it is called fortune [fortuna]" (164). Because fortune is arbitrary and is not indicative of good behaviour men should not regard it

as part of God's will. Augustine further states that only the wicked respond to Fortune:

felicity is what good men have earned by their previous good works [. . .] let only the wicked worship [Fortuna], who do not wish to acquire the merits by which the goddess Felicity might be won (164-5).

This distinction is made more clear when Augustine explains that God is the author of happiness and he gives earthly kingdoms to both good and bad men:

He does not do this rashly, or as it were at random; for he is God, not Fortune. Rather, He acts in accordance with an order of things and times which is hidden from us, but entirely known to Him. And he does not serve this order as though subject to it; rather, He Himself rules it as its Lord and disposes it as its Master. As for felicity, however, He gives it only to the good (Augustine City, 184-5).

So while good and bad men may encounter strokes of fortune, only the good can receive felicity.⁵

⁵ For a summary of Augustine's views on the topic of evil, see G.R.Evans, Augustine on Evil. Evans details Augustine's preoccupation with the problem of evil throughout his life and his eventual conclusion: "Augustine's solution of the problem of evil brought him in the end to an extreme position. Evil consists in the act of the free will of a rational creature which has turned away from the good. When Adam fell, the whole race of men who were to come from Adam was condemned with him; it became a massa damnata. Human nature itself was changed, so that the human will could not in practice choose the good any longer without assistance. Instead it developed a runaway tendency to will evil, with the result that willing became lusting and desires exceeded the bounds of reason" (170).

Some medieval Christian writers simply altered Fortuna's features so that she could exist in a Christian world-view. The development of Fortune into the Christian world was probably most influentially voiced in the writings by Anicius Manlius Boethius, a sixth century Roman consul under the emperor Theodoric. Boethius' most famous work, The Consolation of Philosophy, rearticulates Seneca's philosophies on Fortune and Providence mentioned above. In England, Geoffrey Chaucer's reworking of Boethius' text, Boece, is the primary source of the early modern English literary inheritance of Seneca's moral philosophy. The following section looks at how Seneca's moral philosophy infiltrated the English literary tradition through Boethius and Chaucer.

Chaucer's Seneca

During his imprisonment for treason charges against Theodoric, Boethius contemplated the workings of Fortune in the fates of men. While he was in exile Boethius wrote his seminal work, The Consolation of Philosophy, in which he speaks with Philosophy, who reveals the uncertainty of earthly fortune and highlights the true value of virtue. The speaker in the dialogue argues that all fortune is good fortune because for the good man fortune is a test of virtue, while for the bad man fortune serves as a punishment:

'And therefore,' [said Philosophy], 'a wise man ought not to take it ill, every time he is brought into conflict with fortune, just as it would not be fitting for a brave man to be vexed every time the sound of war crashed out. Since for each of these the difficulty is itself the occasion, for the

latter of increasing his glory, for the former of further fashioning his wisdom. And this is indeed why virtue is so called, because relying on its own powers it is not overcome by adversity. For neither have you, who are set on the road to virtue, come here to wallow in luxury or swoon with pleasure. You are engaged in bitter mental strife with every kind of fortune, lest ill fortune oppress you or pleasant fortune corrupt. Hold to the mean with firm strength; whatever either remains below the mean or passes beyond it has contempt for good fortune, but not the reward for labour. For it is placed in your own hands, what kind of fortune you prefer to shape for yourselves; for all fortune that seems adverse, if it does not exercise or correct, punishes (Boethius 379).

In the description of fortune as a servant to divine providence, Boethius repeats Seneca's conclusions about fortune found in the moral essays.

Boethius emphasises Fortune's inconstancy when lady Philosophy explains that although Fortune's behaviour appears inconstant it is in fact consistent with her character:

You imagine that fortune's attitude to you has changed; you are wrong. Such was always her way, such is her nature. Instead, all she has done in your case is remains constant to her own inconstancy (Boethius 177).

After she clarifies this point for Boethius Philosophy spends most of Book II explaining to Boethius the fickle methods Fortune employs.

Towards the end of The Consolation of Philosophy Boethius' Lady Philosophy reinforces the doctrine that nothing happens by accident:

We may therefore define chance as the unexpected event of concurring causes among things done for some purpose. Now causes which are made to concur and flow together by that order which, proceeding with inevitable connection, and coming down from its source in providence, disposes all things in their propose places and times (Boethius 389).

Boethius was positive, like Seneca, that all events are planned, and that nothing happens by chance, or on accident. His description of Fortune, or chance, as a tool used to implement a divine plan profoundly influenced the understanding and development of Fortune during the middle ages.

Chaucer inherited his understanding of tragedy primarily from his translation of Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy and the medieval commentary by Nicholas Trevet.⁶ In Boethius' text Fortune asks, "What else is the cry of tragedy but a lament that happy states are overthrown by the indiscriminate blows of fortune?" (II.39-40). In Chaucer's translation Fortune asks Boethius, "What other thyng bywaylen the crynges of tragedeyes but oonly the dedes of Fortune, that with an unwar strook overturneth the realms of greet nobleye?" (Boece 409). He

⁶ Kelly argues that Chaucer was familiar with Jean de Meun's French translation of the Consolation of Philosophy when he translated the text from the Latin original. Nicholas Trevet's commentary included glosses that indicated his perception of tragedy according to his reading of Boethius, but Chaucer had his own understanding of tragedy and did not stick to Trevet's gloss. In Chaucerian Tragedy Kelly discusses the relationship between Chaucer and Boethius at length in chapter two, "Chaucer on Tragedy", 39-91. In his discussion Kelly shows that in Boethius's text, and in Chaucer's understanding of Boethius, there is no indication of tragedy as dealing with an evil protagonist who brings about his or her own fall. Instead, the primary lesson in the examples of Fortune is the randomness of misfortune (52).

includes a gloss for this question of tragedy that is consistent with his definition of tragedy in "The Monk's Tale", "Tragedye is to seyn a dite of a prosperite for a tyme, that endeth in wrecchidnesse" (409-410). Here it is important that Chaucer retains what Boethius says about Fortune's role in human affairs and that she brings about men's falls from prosperity to wretchedness.

Wickedness is not a central part of the medieval de casibus tradition but in his inclusion of Boethius, Chaucer initiates a way for writing about Fortune that departs from the medieval tradition. Chaucer includes the qualification that Fortune affects a fall from high estate, although not necessarily towards a wicked life. This is a significant point of departure in the late-Tudor application of Fortune when the de casibus form is applied to examples of wickedness.

Fortune's role in the tragic events of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde is further evidence of Boethian influence. In the story Chaucer uses Fortune as the instigator of the tragedy; Fortune brings about Troilus' final fall into wretchedness but not because of sin.⁷ Troilus begins by crying out to the goddess Fortune:

But O Fortune, executrice of wierdes,
 O influences of thise hevenes hye!
 Soth is, that under God ye ben oure hierdes,
 Though to us bestes ben the causez wrie.
 This mene I now: for she homward hye,
 But execut was al bisyde hire leve
 The goddes wil, for which she moste bleve

⁷ It will help to identify some of the key terms in Troilus' lament: "executrice of wierdes": she who carries out (the plan of) the Fates; "influences": astrological influences; "hierdes": shepherds; "wrie": concealed, hidden; "execut": done; "bisyde hire leve": without her leave; "bleve": remain

(Troilus and Criseyde, 616-623).

Chaucer represents Fortune as a servant to God and so the tragic action in Troilus and Criseyde is not a result of chance, but a result of a divine plan. Crucially the divine plan includes human free will so the characters have the ability to divert their fall into wretchedness: so although Troilus' fall was unavoidable because Fortune acts on behalf of the Christian God, the intensity of his wretchedness depends on how Troilus internalises his fall. In the late-Tudor de casibus accounts discussed in this thesis we shall see how the idea that sinners are marked out for damnation before their fall changes the parameters of English tragedy.

Chaucer's importance to the medieval understanding of de casibus in England is primarily evident in Lydgate's influential Fall of Princes (which, of course, A Mirror for Magistrates is modelled on). Although his source material was Boccaccio's De casibus virorum illustrium, Lydgate reinforces the emphasis on pity and wretchedness in English tragedy that Chaucer attached to tragedy.⁸ In the final section before moving on to discuss A Mirror for Magistrates, I aim to show how Lydgate influenced the transition from thinking about de casibus in Chaucerian tragic terms, towards thinking about de casibus and wickedness in the same frame of reference.

Lydgate and Bochas: Musings on the Vicissitudes of Fortune

Lydgate began his Fall of Princes as an English translation of Laurent de Premierfait's fifteenth-century French translation of Boccaccio's de casibus text. But when he offers praise to Chaucer in the Prologue, he

⁸ For further discussion on this point see Kelly Ideas and Forms.

unintentionally launched his Fall of Princes into a mode of tragedy and away from the historical perspective of Boccaccio's model:

My maistir Chaucer, with his fresh comedies,
 Is ded, alas, cheeff poete off Breteyne,
 That whilom made ful pitous tragedies;
 The fall of pryncis he dede also compleyne,

(Lydgate 7: 246-249).

Lydgate's recognition of the importance of Chaucer to the English de casibus tradition is essential to his interpretation of de casibus. But, perhaps more importantly, it also signals a change in thinking about Fortune. When Boccaccio refers to Fortune he only intends to emphasise God's power. The goddess was invoked to show how Fortune is changeable and so too is man's position in life. The fear of God was all that early Christians sometimes needed to change their sinful lives and repent.

When Lydgate assumes that the victims entangled in Fortune's snare deserve our pity, he changes the examples from evidence of a divine pattern in history to examples that include a moral lesson. This becomes especially evident towards the end of his text when the goddess Fortune speaks with Bochas and explains her motives. In book six of The Fall of Princes Lydgate imagines Bochas in his study, philosophising on the workings of Fortune. He recalls the goddess' mutability:

In his studie allone, as Bochas stood,
 His penne on honde, of sodeyn aventure
 To remembre he thoute it ded hym good,
 How þat no man may hymself assure

In wordli thynges fulli to recure
 Grace of Fortune, to make hir to be stable,
 Hir dayli chaungis been so variable (6:1-7).

Lydgate writes that Bochas' musings focused primarily on the way Fortune provides prime examples of how there is no assurance in worldly wealth. As he is considering these things the goddess appears before him but he does not recognise her:

Bochas astonid, fearful for to abraide
 Whan he beheeld the wonderful figure
 Of Fortune, thus to hymself he saide:
 'What may this meene? is this a creature
 Or a monstre transffoormyd ageyns nature,
 Whos brennyng eyen sparklyng of ther liht
 As doon sterris the frosti wyntres niht?' (22-28).

Bochas is struck by her horrible features because they are unnatural and we learn that not only does she have a cruel face, but she also has one-hundred hands: "An hundred handis she hadde on ech part / In sondri wise hir giftes to depart" (34-5). Bochas explains that the hands she does not use to distribute gifts are busy lifting men from their position and throwing them down into adversity.

Lydgate maintains the fickle aspect of Fortune's character from Lady Philosophy's argument in Boethius' The Consolation of Philosophy when he retells Bochas' musings on Fortune in his study. Lydgate lists some of Fortune's general characteristics and then says that as Bochas was observing her, almost in a trance, she spoke to him and revealed her knowledge of his task to write the falls of princes touched by Fortune.

She explains her methods according to the way Bochas invoked her in his stories but then stuns him when she asks why men blame her for their falls. This signals Lydgate's inclusion of the moral lessons to be learned from examining Fortune's examples that Lydgate reveals at the very end of the final book.

Fortune asks why men blame her for their falls when they already know her duplicitous nature: "Whi sholde men putte me in blame, / To folwe the nature of my double play?" (162-3). She reckons that nature itself changes frequently and so it is logical that she changes at her will:

Whi also shold I nat have my wille,
To shewe my-silf now smothe and aftir trouble,
Sith to my kynde it longeth to be double? (173-5).

She justifies her malleable character by citing examples from nature and says that only fools can blame her for inconstancy: "Men must at lepis take me as thei fynde [. . .] Sith dublinesse no scaundre is to me, / Which is a parcel of my liberte" (198-208). Lydgate's Fortune is adamant that men have no right to blame her for her duplicity because nature itself is double.

When Fortune finishes her invective against foolish men Bochas finds he needs courage before he can respond. In his reply to the goddess, Bochas tells Fortune his objectives for writing the Fall of Princes and what he has learned since speaking to Fortune:

Yit bi thi talkyng, as I undirstonde,
Ech thyng heer of nature is chaungable,
Afftir thi sentence, bothe on se & lond;

Yit koude I rekne thynges that be stable:
 As vertuous lyf abidyng unmutable,
 Set hool to Godward of herte, will & thouht,
 Maugre thi poweer, & ne chaungith nouht (239-245).

Bochas realises that Fortune was correct about inconstancy in nature and he acknowledges worldly things are not fixed and are constantly changing. But virtue, he determines, is something that is constant in life and not susceptible to Fortune's power.

Since Fortune can only affect worldly qualities, Bochas believes that she can only harm foolish people: "Off thi condicions to sette another preef, / Which foolis usen in ther adversite / For excusacioun" (282-84). Here Lydgate's Bochas echoes the musings of Seneca and Boethius on the distinction between people who behave according to an admirable code of morals - wise men - and people who are foolish. He also echoes the maxim that Fortune cannot affect virtue. Seneca stated, "Virtue is free, inviolable, unmoved, unshaken, so steeled against the blows of chance that she cannot be bent, much less broken" (De Constantia, V.4). In The Consolation of Philosophy Boethius stated that Fortune is a test of virtue for the wise man and an act of punishment for the wicked man: "all fortune that seems adverse, if it does not exercise or correct, punishes" (Boethius, IV: 54-5).

Although he makes her a servant to the Christian god, Bochas still distances the role of Fortune from God's divine plan in a way that the Christian writers after the Reformation do not. Bochas appeals to Fortune for assistance with his book and says that he would really like to know about the mysteries of divine providence. He is doubtful though

whether Fortune can answer his questions. Fortune, Lydgate says in book six, is as ignorant as he is on the workings of God:

But yif I had hid my corage
 Such mysteries of dyvyn providence,
 Withoute envie I wolde in pleyn langage
 Uttre hem be writyng with humble reverence, -
 Predestynacioun nouthur prescience
 Nat apperteene, Fortune (295-300).

Here Bochas imagines Fortune acts of her own volition when she affects both good and bad people and that she is not restricted by pre-existing divine plans. The doctrines about predestination threatened an entirely unavoidable damnation and Fortune's knowledge of such plans increases - in the sixteenth century Fortune becomes an executrix for predetermined damnation.

Fortune tells Bochas that humans are curious creatures because they imagine that Fortune is actually the cause of their greed and consequent falls. In reality, Fortune reveals, people are naturally prone to aspire to greater worldly things:

Your appetitis most straunge & most dyvers,
 And evir ful of chaung & doubilnesse,
 Froward also, malicious & pervers,
 Be hasti clymbyng to worshepis & richesse,
 Alway void of trouthe & stabilnesse,
 Most presumptuous, serche out in al degrees,
 Falsli tatteyne to worldly dignites (463-469).

Lydgate does make any connection between Fortune's ignorance of divine providence and the fact that she only appeals to already present wicked desires. Once the doctrine of predestination was introduced into the discussions about salvation and damnation, Fortune becomes increasingly associated with damnation in the literary discussions of eternal fates. The link between earthly fortune and damnation pervades late-Tudor cultural memory and the discussions that include Fortune, as we shall see by the end of this chapter.

At the end of book nine, Bochas considers the evidence from the examples in the Fall of Princes and determines that people from all estates and all moral inclinations have fallen. He reaches two important conclusions from this evidence: Firstly, he says that men should follow virtue if they plan to avoid Fortune's trickery, and secondly, that Fortune can affect anyone irrespective of birth or title:

Sum man hooly encreseth in vertu,
 A-nother rekles, of froward wilfulnesse;
 Oon is parfit and stable in Crist Jesu,
 A-nother braideth upon frowardnesse;
 Oon encreseth with tresour & richesse, -
 Who list thryve, to labour must entende, -
 Maugre the world, Fortunis doubilnesse
 Doth oon arise, another to discende (3279-86).

The lesson in this, says Bochas, is that people should follow virtue in all instances because all men rise or fall on Fortune's wheel. The second point he makes is that people cannot stop Fortune from affecting a fall, even with virtue. The Boccaccian perspective of the patterns of falls in

history is a teleological one that seeks to prove God's infinite power in human history.

Because there is noticeably a lack of any moral lesson in the examples he takes from Bochas, Lydgate's patron Duke Humphrey suggested that he provide his own musings on the moral didacticism offered by the examples. Although there are moments of moralising in Bochas, Lydgate alters the de casibus form even further from his model when he adds the envoys. The final envoy at the end of book nine is addressed to Duke Humphrey. After reading the examples in The Fall of Princes as evidence of God's infinite power, Lydgate recommends that princes remember Christ before they respond to Fortune's gifts:

Whoo knoweth nat God is falle fer in slouthe;
 Be-war ye Princes evere of thynges tweyne:
 In every quarel that your ground be trouthe;
 Next in ordre, doth your besy peyne
 To love Jesu, your Lord moost sovereyne,
 Truste hym of herte, and he shal nat faille
 To be your socour in pees and in bataylle (3470-3477).

The examples from the text demonstrate that all men are affected by Fortune, despite their personal moral code. This does not necessarily imply that people affected by Fortune are damned.

Just as the two Saints John and Hilde advise William Stranton to remember Christ when he is fearful in Purgatory, in the passage quoted above Lydgate reminds the Christian prince to recall Christ's sacrifice. This is a significant point of departure in the late-Tudor de casibus accounts: Once a person is influenced by Fortune and suffers a fall they

cannot redeem themselves with a simple reaffirmation of faith and repentance. Instead, as we shall see, people afflicted by Fortune are allocated an eternal space among the damned.

Seneca and Boethius both included a discussion on how a good man is rewarded when he endures the hardships Fortune presents: For Seneca the person who endures the hardships of Fortune is heroic because of the value of fortitude in the face of adversity. When Boethius asks Philosophy how evil men are punished she responds vaguely and delays answering in detail:

some [punishments] are executed with penal harshness, but others with a purifying clemency. But it is not my design to discuss these now (Boethius 345).

Incidentally, Boethius never returns to discuss the details of punishment in The Consolation of Philosophy but he does state that the reward for evil-doing is in itself: "goodness is itself the reward for good men, so for the wicked men wickedness is in no doubt that he is afflicted with evil" (Boethius 333). In the end, Philosophy tells Boethius that the causes of god's plans are hidden. She confirms that men cannot ever hope to understand why some good men are afflicted with terrible misfortune and some wholly wicked men seem to live in prosperity.

Lydgate's moralising at the end of The Fall of Princes rings with nostalgia for the medieval and classical philosophers musings of Fortune. When he indicates a possible link between earthly Fortune and damnation he anticipates how Fortune's actions might be reconciled with Protestant Christianity in England.

At times Lydgate flirts with the idea that Fortune only affects the wicked, whom God has already marked out for damnation, but he quickly returns to the overarching historical perspective of Boccaccio's de casibus text. Although he considers Fortune's actions cruel and devious, he never fully links her with damnation: she is, for now, just an instigator, not a messenger. In the next part of this chapter we shall witness how the role of Fortune dramatically changes in the late-Tudor period. Especially in A Mirror for Magistrates, Fortune's role is linked more closely with damnation because the authors say that the ghosts appear to tell their narratives from Hell. This link between earthly fortune and Hell is particularly evident in some accounts where Fortune's presence serves to indicate damnation.

Part II: Early Elizabethan Mirrors of Hell: A Mirror for Magistrates

I. Elizabethan Angst: Earthly Fortune and Damnation

Fortune's presence in some of the accounts in the Mirror, and in early Elizabethan dramatic tragedies, as we shall see in chapter four, is used to explain a figure's fall from prosperity to sin. The shared didactic potential of the de casibus form in poetry and in drama lies in the active role authors choose to allocate to Fortune. Her ability to flatter people marked out for damnation, since flattery appeals to hubris, and lure them to a life of sin, made her a suitable signifier for damnation. In asking the reader to imagine that each fallen figure speaks from the space of Hell to an earthly audience, the accounts create a mirror of Hell.

a. William Baldwin's "Richard Duke of York" and Francis Seagar's "Richard Plantagenet; Duke of Gloucester"

Before working on A Mirror for Magistrates, William Baldwin was known for his text A Treatise of Moral Philosophy published in 1547 by Edward Whitchurch, a printer of Protestant texts. Lily B. Campbell notes that in the dedication to his translation of The Balades of Saloman (1549) Baldwin expresses an allegiance to Calvin's interpretation of the Song of Solomon: "This work was dedicated to the young King Edward VI, and the dedication serves to establish Baldwin as on the side of Calvin against Castellio in the bitter fight over the interpretation of "The Song of Solomon" (Campbell 22).⁹

As early as 1547 Baldwin articulated his attachment to the Calvinist side of the Protestant Reformation, a tendency that expresses itself most evidently in his contributions to the Mirror. In the introduction to an edition of Baldwin's Beware the Cat, William Ringler and Michael Flachmann attribute his name to a translation of Wonderful News of the Death of Paul the Third, which Baldwin identifies as a tragedy. The narrator follows the dead Pope down into Hell and reveals his crimes (murder, incest, bribery and oppression) by a description of them engraved on adamant pillars. The text links the Catholic Church with the whore of Babylon from the Book of Revelations.

⁹ There was a debate about whether the "Song of Solomon" was supposed to be read allegorically or literally. Calvin maintained that the text was not a secular love story but an allegory for the marriage between Christ and the church. The French Reformer Sebastian Castellio opposed Calvin's religious intolerance and his book Concerning Heretics: whether they are to be Persecuted (published in 1554 under the pseudonym Martin Bellius), condemns Calvin's stance with arguments for religious toleration. See Skinner 245-8 for a detailed discussion of Castellio's dispute with Calvin on Biblical interpretation.

Baldwin also wrote a poem of lamentation on the death of the last Tudor king entitled, The Funeralles of King Edward the sixt. This was published in 1560 and identifies the king's untimely death with God's vengeance so that it symbolises a type of punishment against the people for their wickedness:

Whan God had suffred all these thinges a space,
 And saw at last how all refused his grace,
 And that no threates might cause them to retyer,
 To stay the stroke of his consuming ire,
 He fully agreed to take this blessed childe:
 [. . . .]
 [God] called Death, and thus to him he sayd:
 Dispatch at ones, to Greenwich se thou hye,
 Where my elect, King Edward, sicke doth lye
 In paynfull panges, wherin he hath be long,
 Not for his owne, but for his peoples wrong
 [. . . .]
 [Edward] is to good for that ungracious Realme

(Baldwin Funeralls 283-309).

Baldwin knew that in order to maintain his position under the different monarchs he needed to adjust according to the present monarch (i.e. he bent with the willow).¹⁰ For example, although the text was written for the Protestant printer Whitchurch, the second edition of Moral Philosophy was printed during Mary's reign by the Catholic printer John

¹⁰ A good summary of Baldwin's ever-changing political allegiances through English Reformation history can be found in William A. Ringler and Michael Flachmann's introduction to Beware the Cat (xiii-xxix).

Wayland. When Elizabeth succeeded her sister Baldwin adjusted to the new regime with ease. The printer, Thomas Marshe, who printed the poem for Edward VI, re-commissioned Baldwin for A Mirror for Magistrates, initially a Marian project.

Lily B Campbell comments on the inherent Calvinist import in the political teaching of A Mirror for Magistrates in her introduction to the collection. She states that in attempting to teach orthodox Tudor doctrine the Mirror often "bore the stamp of Calvinism", primarily due to the relationship between English political history and the Reformation: "for, as political historians have pointed out, England and the Reformation were forced by circumstances to adopt much the same attitude toward the secular ruler, and the theory which came to be of both ecclesiastical and political necessity" (52). More importantly however is the way that making kings fear to be tyrants draws the space of Hell closer to the Elizabethan stage: by placing the tyrant in this didactic framework and allowing him to "appear" before the authors, A Mirror for Magistrates moulds the shape of the later Elizabethan stage tyrant in a similar framework.

Campbell's statement that the Mirror attempted to teach "orthodox" doctrine limits her evaluation to mapping the "stamp of Calvin" on the text. This part of the chapter offers a reading of the accounts that demonstrates how the doctrines of both Calvin and Luther dominated the Elizabethan conception of the bad behaviour of kings and magistrates. Luther and Calvin differed in their treatment of tyrannous rulers and the consequences of obedience and rebellion and in Baldwin's account of Richard, Duke of York, there is a predilection towards Lutheran doctrines on obedience and rebellion, as we shall see.

In the prose link that precedes his account of Richard, Baldwin identifies certain infernal qualities of Cade's Rebellion, and he subsequently places Richard's motives within this frame. The anxieties created by the emphasis Luther and Calvin attached to the threat of damnation in their discussions of tyrannous rulers and obedience is especially evident in Baldwin's stance on Richard's fate.

In an early essay, Temporal Authority: to what extent it should be obeyed (1523), Luther stated that the visible church should be under the authority of a godly prince and all temporal authority should stem from that ordained minister, or prince. Consequently, the prince is the voice of all authority, which is ordained by God, and therefore the prince must be obeyed. The German reformer maintained that because man is inherently sinful and can only be saved by the grace of God, and not by his own free-will, men must obey God's authority without question. It therefore follows that since all authority is ordained by God, it is ungodly to resist ordained rulers.

For Luther, tyrant rulers are appointed to rule as a direct result of the sinfulness of the people and as such must not be resisted. Even princes who abuse their power must be obeyed according to Luther: "Nevertheless, they let it be known that they are not to be contradicted, and are to be called gracious lords all the same" (Luther 1). But now Luther was faced with the dilemma that he inadvertently made God the author of evil by stating that God appoints tyrants to punish men for their sins.

In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians Luther links tyranny, and tyrannous behaviour, with Hell and Satan. Luther said that when behaviour is governed by love and men do good works even when they are not commanded or asked to do them, they are following the Law

of God. When men defy God's Law they make evident their internal struggle between their own will and God's will. People who resist this Law are resisting a Divine will which indicates a hostility toward God and the influence of Satan. Furthermore Luther says that people who do not perform God's law willingly are damned and "under the dominion of Satan" (qtd. in Watson 109).

The prose link before Baldwin's account of Richard, Duke of York, draws ideas of rebellion and tyrannous rule into a de casibus framework and links that framework with Hell and the devil:

For in dede officers be gods deputies, and it is gods office which they beare, and it is he whiche ordeyneth thereto suche as himselfe lysteth, good whan he favoureth the people, and evyll whan he wyll punysh theim. And therefore whosoever rebelleth agaynst any ruler either good or bad, rebelleth against God, and shalbe sure of a wretched ende: For God can not but maintein his deputie. Yet this I note by the waye concernyng rebelles and rebellions. Although the devyll rayse them, yet God alwayes useth them to his glory, as a parte of his Justice ("Prose 12", 178. Emphasis my own).

In his condemnation of rebels against tyrannous magistrates Baldwin indicates a position in favour of non-resistance in the face of oppressive regimes. Dolman voices a similar warning against rebellion in his account of Hastings when he warns, "Serve truely your prynce and fear no rebells myght, / On princes halves the myghty god doth fyght" ("Hastings", 617-8). Baldwin's Lutheran stance on rebellion is strongly voiced in the Mirror and the link between the devil and rebellion is made clear but raises many complex issues about God's authority.

The prose link imagines the devil as the agitator of rebellion against tyrannous magistrates. This is not far removed from the role of devils and vices in the morality play tradition where devils actively provoke people towards vice. But the distinction here is that here Baldwin locates the turn to vice within God's plan for divine justice on a corrupt officer: Lord Saye and the bishop of Salisbury. In order to justify the cruel administration of the officers in a Christian framework, Baldwin continues, "For God would never have suffred him to have been so used, except he had fyrst deserved it" (179).

Baldwin then connects Cade's rebellion with Richard Duke of York's master plan to claim the crown:

Therefore let hym go, and with hym the Bushop, and all other slaine in that rebellion: which was rayseed as it may be thought, through sum dryft of the duke of Yorke, who shortly after began to endevoure all meanes to attayne the Crowne (197).

The effect of mentioning the link between rebellion and the devil serves to highlight the malicious character of the Plantagenets without suggesting that they were ordained by God to reign tyrannously. By making the Duke of York nothing more than a glorified rebel, the authors are able to cleverly call Richard evil without suggesting that God appointed an evil ruler.

The ghost of Richard begins his narrative by offering a warning against Fortune. Crucially though he includes a lament that he lacked grace:

Trust Fortune (quoth he) in whom was never trust,
 O folly of men that have no better grace,
 All rest, renowne, and dedes lie in the dust
 Of al the sort that sue her slipper trace

("Richard Duke of York" 1-4).

Here Richard admits that men who crave earthly things, like fame, have mistakenly put their trust in Fortune. He tells Baldwin not to fear his terrifying appearance: Baldwin says that the ghosts of Richard and his son stand before him stained in the dye of their own blood. Here, in contrast to St. Patrick's Purgatory, the stains incurred in life are permanent and Richard's headless body attests to his bloody death.

When Richard begins to detail his rise to glory and fall from grace he says that he endeavoured to re-claim the royal throne with the help of Fortune:

Wherfore see Baldwin that thou set [my life and death]
 furth
 To the ende the fraude of Fortune may be knowen,
 That eke all princes well may way the wurth:
 Of thinges, for which the sedes of warre be sowen:
 No state so sure but soone is overthrowen.
 No worldly good can counterpeyze the prise,
 Of halfe the paynes that may therof arise (148-154).

The Medieval idea that Fortune works to illustrate the infinite power of God working in the lives of men is complemented by the moral conclusion in the final lines. Richard first warns of Fortune's fraud, which makes men think beyond their station and only brings trouble. And then he

establishes a divine framework for his example in his final line, "So right shall raigne, and quiet calme ech crime" (168).

In the prose link that follows the authors are reminded to tell the history of Lord Clifford, who killed Richard's son. The subsequent four accounts reverse the historical process leading up to Richard's tyranny and focus on the division within the kingdom. The next account begins with a description of Lord Clifford with an arrow in his throat and blood running down his body. In the prose link that follows the authors remark on the consequences of dividing the realm: "how horrible a thing is division in a realme, to howe many myschiefes is it the mother, what vyce is not therby kindled, what vertue left unquenched?" (196). The authors then link the falls of Richard and Edward with the division between King Henry and the house of York and lament the loss of thousands of soldiers and nobility. In the prose link after the accounts of John, earl of Worcester and Richard and John Nevel, Baldwin comments that Henry VI was the cause of the division of the kingdom: "king Henrye him selfe was cause of the destruccion of many noble princes, being of all other most unfortunate him selfe" (211). Collectively, the accounts that follow Richard's place special emphasis on the division of the kingdom and York's rebellion as the cause of ruin.

There is evidence of the Calvinist position on tyranny that contradicts Baldwin's stance in Francis Seagar's account of the tyrant Richard III. Nothing significant is known about Francis Seagar, and although his name is listed with various courtesy books during the Tudor period his contribution to the Mirror is his primary claim to fame. It is

striking that a man of so little literary renown wrote the account of the most famous tyrant from English history in the Mirror.¹¹

In the prose link before Seagar's account, Baldwin asks the reader to imagine the space in Hell: "For the better understanding whereof, imagine that you see [Richard] tormented with Dives in the diepe pit of Hell, and thence howlinge" (359). Seagar then places Richard's fall and eternal damnation within a divine framework when Richard says: "Content your selves with your estates all, / And seeke not right by wrong to suppress, / For God hath promist eche wrong to redresse" ("Richard Duke of Gloucester", 299-301). His intentional engagement with Fortune only in the last moments of Richard's life distance Fortune from the origin of the tyrant's bad behaviour. The placement of Fortune close to the moments of Richard's death and acknowledgement of his fate juxtapose the goddess with damnation.

Seagar begins his account of Richard III by identifying what he considers the king's primary damnable flaw:

What hart so hard, but doth abhorre to heare
 The ruful raygne of me the thyrd Rychard?
 King unkindely cald though I the crowne dyd weare,
 Who entred by rigour, but ryght did not regard,
 By tyranny proceding in kyllyng kyng Edward,

(1-5. Emphasis my own).

Seagar's Richard does not blame Fortune for his fall but accepts sole responsibility for his fall into sin. At the end of the account Richard says that he was rightly punished for his transgressions against God, since

¹¹ In the Jacobean revision of the Mirror (1609-10), the editor Richard Niccols replaced Seagar's account with his own version of Richard III's story.

tyranny and treason are both acts contrary to God's will: "beholde the due and iust rewarde / Of tyranny and treason which God doth most detest" (288-9).

Seagar understands that Richard's tyranny was justly punished and that the tyrant Richard should be treated as an unlawful magistrate. This understanding stems from the Calvinist interpretation of tyranny as contrary to God's will. In the editions of Calvin's Institutes published after 1539,¹² Calvin proposed that God expected His people to resist rulers who act contrary to the will of God.

Calvin said that subjects may actively resist a lawful magistrate under two conditions: 1) When obedience to the magistrate is disobedience to God then subjects may actively rebel; and 2) If the people appeal to God for mercy in the wake of tyrannous regimes then God may appoint someone to lead a rebellion against that tyrannical regime (Skinner 191-194). At the end of his Institutes Calvin states, "let us console ourselves with this thought, that we truly perform the obedience which God requires of us when we suffer anything rather than deviate from piety" (Calvin 82).¹³

¹² Skinner notes that in the editions from 1536-39 Calvin agreed with Luther that all magistrates are ordained by God and must therefore be obeyed at all times. When confronted with a dramatic volte face of the Protestant Reformation in Germany when the Catholic rulers in Northern Europe turned to violence against the reformers, the Calvinists reconsidered their position on rebellion. Calvin remained firm in his conviction that obedience is imperative but now he was willing to include exceptions to his argument (Skinner 191-4).

¹³ Following Calvin's lead, and after a period of Catholic resurgence which threatened the success of Protestantism in Europe, the Lutherans would eventually turn their argument around and propose certain instances when resistance was acceptable. The thrust of the Lutheran argument in the 1550s allowed for resistance to a magistrate who persecuted his people. In this instance, the Lutherans proposed that an inferior magistrate may be appointed to actively resist the superior magistrate by the mandate of God. For further discussion on this point see Skinner 195-225.

Seagar chose to emphasise Richard's malicious character, and therefore his opposition to God, by stressing the murder of the two princes. He even links his example with the tyrant Herod: "Alas that ever Prince should thus his honour stayne / With the bloud of Innocentes most shameful to be tolde" (29-30). The first seven stanzas focus entirely on Richard's motives for killing the young princes. Richard admits that his actions were unnatural and against God: "Both God, nature, dutie, allegiaunce al forgott / This vile and haynous acte unnaturally I conspired" (26-7).

Once Richard committed his evil deeds Seagar brings Richard's troubled conscience to the fore, only to retract the postulation when Richard considers his deed: "when I heard, my hart I felt was eased / Of grudge, of gryefe, and inward deadly payne" (113-5). Seagar celebrates the spectacle of Richard's earthly punishments, in his troubled conscience, his terrifying nightmares and his mangled corpse on the battlefield to signify Richard's rewards in Hell (as indicated by the prose link that introduces the account). Shakespeare later imagined Richard being tormented on earth for his sins in Richard III. But in the tragedy Richard does not have the hindsight of Seagar's ghost so he does not positively link his plagued nightmares with his bad behaviour.

As the poem approaches the climax of Richard's fall the ghost determines that his troubles started when the earl of Richmond landed at Wales. He links his fall with Fortune's frown: "Thus fawning Fortune began on me to frowne, / And cast on me her scornful lowring looke" (332-33). Here Seagar introduces the earthly presence of Fortune in Richard's life as a signifier for the tyrant's fall and eternal damnation.

Up until this point Richard's ghost makes no mention of Fortune in his life; yet here, at the point where he begins to sense his upcoming

doom, he claims he could feel her disdainful gaze. After he was defeated by Richmond at the battle at Bosworth Richard again remembers Fortune's earthly presence, "But fyckle Fortune alas on me dyd frowne, / For when I was encamped in the fyelde, / Where most I trusted soonest was begyld" (264-6).

Baldwin and Seagar's accounts condemn York and Gloucester by the texts' engagement with both the Calvinist and Lutheran perspectives on tyranny and rebellion. Seagar includes a strong element of Richard's hubris as a determining factor in his tyranny but also reads his example within a divine plan. Baldwin focuses on York's lack of grace and his susceptibility to Fortune's gifts, but is more concerned with York's instigation of rebellion as a cause of his fall and damnation.

b. John Dolman: "Lord Hastings"

Lily B. Campbell described John Dolman's contribution to the 1563 edition of A Mirror for Magistrates as the worst example of poetry in the entire work. She defends its inclusion however by stating that the young lawyer's learning and reflective philosophising on the rewards of evil-doing are of an excellent quality and comparable to Sackville's tragedy (Campbell 46). C.S. Lewis similarly found Dolman's poem full of potential, saying, "he understands better than any of his collaborators, better even than Sackville, what a poem ought to be" (243). Lewis praised Dolman's contribution for the dramatic qualities that distinguish his poem from the others, "the other ghosts are mere mouth-pieces of moral and political doctrine: but Dolman really tries by changes of mood and human inconsistencies to dramatise his Hastings" (243). He further praises

Dolman for the way the character of his poem anticipates the styles of Spenser, Chapman and Donne (244).

Dolman's contribution demonstrates how Fortune's role in damnation would change in the late-Tudor religious climate by the link that is made between Hastings' attraction to Fortune's gifts and Hell. Crucially, for the purposes of this study, Dolman's poem on Hastings indicates how the anxieties about predetermined fates infiltrate discussions of sin.

The prose link before Dolman's account of Hastings states that the reader must imagine the ghost as if he had just crawled out of his grave: "you must ymagyne that you see hym newly crept out of his grave, and speakyng to me as followeth" (267). In the ghost's personal introduction to the reader he asserts the didactic value of his example.

Hastings says firstly, that he is punished in a classical underworld: "In Leathes floud, long since, in Stigian vale / Selfe love I dreynt" (9-10). He does not name the place as Hell or Purgatory though the landscape is not clear on this point. Hastings introduces Fortune into his turn towards sin and his eventual fall from grace when he states that he was enticed by what she had to offer: "Howe fortunes Nurslyng I, and dearest babe, / Ought therto stoope, none maye me well perswade" (21-22). Dolman links Hastings' damnation in Hell with his inclination towards Fortune from the start of the poem. This is elaborated on in his discussion of Hastings' life and sins so that he was marked for damnation on earth but was helpless to change his path. Dolman is successful in creating this connection because of the link he makes between Fortune, devils and earthly sin.

Hastings laments the role that he, Clarence and Dorset played in Richard's tyranny and says that they paid the price for their transgressions: "Oure bloude have payd the vengeaunce of our guylt" (237). He distinguishes their punishments from Richard's when he says "the brystled boare [. . .] shall broyle for the bloud he hath spilt" (235-8). Hell, for Dolman's Hastings, derives from a combination of features from a classical underworld alongside the traditional punitive fires of Purgatory and Hell. Here Dolman states a distinction between Richard's punishment and his, although they all suffer in Hell together:

Clarence, as Cirus, drownd in bloudlyke wyne.
 Dorcett I furthered to his spedy pyne.
 Of me, my selfe am speakyng presydent.
 Nor easier fate the brystled boare is lent.
 Oure bloude have payd the vengeaunce of our guylt,
 His fryed boanes, shall broyle for bloud he hath spilt
 (233-38).

Here Hastings identifies his bloody death and Clarence and Dorset's murders as their punishments but he says that Richard will be punished further after death. His desire to qualify his sin in comparison to other sins in Hell reveals the impact of eliminating the punitive space for earthly sin and redefining the space of Hell.

Further evidence of late-Tudor anxieties about the consequences of sin and eternal damnation is the way Dolman's Hastings continues to emphasise the severity of Richard's crimes on earth. Rather than name devils and vices as a threat to mankind, Hastings compares sinners like himself with devils:

Whoe more mischevouslye of all states deserve,
 As better they, whoe first dyd such preserve.
 Yf those, for gyftes, we reckon heavenly wyghtes,
 These may we well deeme fends, and dampned sprytes.
 And whyle on earth they walke, disguysed devyls,
 Sworne foes of vertue, factours for all evylls.
 Whose bloudye hands torment theyr goared hartes.
 Through bloodsheds horror, in soundest slepe he sterts
(241-48).

The warning that the types of sinners like himself, Dorset, Clarence and Richard are "disguysed devyls" eliminates the need for allegorical vices and devils to draw men toward sin. Hastings' warning links earthly crimes directly with spirits from Hell and anticipates Shakespeare's depiction of the tyrant as a devil walking the earth. In Shakespeare's tragedy Richard III, Queen Anne recognises Richard's villainy and remarks, "Avaunt, thou dreadful minister of Hell" (Richard III I.ii.46).

Towards the end of his account Hastings says that the earth quaked for him when it was time to repay his sins on earth: "The fatall skyes, roll on the blackest day" (377). He tells how he wakes up from a terrible dream to find his arms wrapt around Shore's Wife and was startled by his own sinfulness: "Fye on adultery, fye on lecherous lust" (395). Hastings questions her, "is thy Lord (quoth I) a sorcerer?" (401), and imagines Shore's wife as a servant to a sorcerer.¹⁴ The implied act of sexual union with her may be understood as a metaphorical union with the

¹⁴ Hastings refers to Shore's wife as a sorcerer earlier when he says, "the Queene, and the whore shores wyfe, / By witchcraft (quoth he) seeke to wast my lyfe. / Loe here the wythered and bewytched arme, / That thus is spend by those .ii. Sorceresse charme" (567-70).

Devil.¹⁵ From Dolman's link between the Fortune and Hell we can read the satisfaction of Hastings' earthly desires linked to his fatal fall from grace. Shore's wife is herself an example of someone who falls from good fortune and Hastings' comment about sorcery and her appearance in Hastings' bed thus signifies his link to infernal figures.

In his retelling of Hastings' final days Dolman imitates Cicero's discussion in Tusculan Disputations of fear and distress as disorders of the soul. Dolman translated this text in 1561 for the Protestant printer of A Mirror for Magistrates (1563), Thomas Marshe: Those fyve questions which Marke Tullye Cicero disputed in his manor of Tusculanum. In book four Cicero establishes that disorder stems from erroneous judgement and that there are four disorders of the mind: delight, lust, distress and fear: "the sundrye kyndes of perturbations (they say) have their beginninge of the two sortes of goodes, and two sortes of evels" (Dolman K3r).

Distress comes, Cicero states, when a person believes there is evil present and fear is a belief that there is something threatening present:

Sorowe therefore, is a freshe opinion of some present evel.
In the whych it seemeth ryghte, that the minde shoulde
humble and submitte it selfe to gryefe [. . .] Feare is the

¹⁵ James Sharpe says that there was a trend for writing about witches and devils, only alluded to in English writings on witchcraft, that included references to sexual intercourse between witches and devils: "A massive lore about the sabbat [when the Devil met witches] was constructed by continental demonological writers, with witches flying to the Sabbat by night [. . .] and indulging in sexual orgies in which they, the Devil and attendant demons participated (Sharpe 59-60).

opynyon of some evel hangyng over us, whyche we thinke our
selves scarce able to suffer (Dolman L1r).¹⁶

Cicero says that lust, or desire, is only malevolent when it is excessive:
"Desyre is the opinion of some good likely to come unto us, whych it were
for our profyte presently to have [. . .] lust [stems from] immoderate
desyre" (Dolman L1r).

When Dolman imagines Hastings' reaction to waking up with Shore's
wife in his bed, the threat of damnation manifests itself in Hastings'
foreboding distress.¹⁷ His lust, or desire, a potentially good disorder
according to Cicero, turns him in the direction of distress and fear, the
evil disorders. Hastings' final sin, sleeping with Shore's wife, just as
Faustus' important kiss with Helen, represents a significant union with an
infernal being.¹⁸ Hastings realises this when he asks if his lover serves a
sorcerer.¹⁹

¹⁶ The LOEB translation reads, "aegritudo opinion recens mali praesentis, in quo demitti
contrahique animo rectum esse videatur [. . .] metus opinio impendentis mali, quod
intolerabile esse videatur" "Distress then is a newly formed belief of present evil, the
subject of which thinks it right to feel depression and shrinking of soul [. . .] fear is a
belief of threatening evil which seems to the subject of it [intolerable]" (Cicero, 343).

¹⁷ See also Thomas Churchyard's account of Jane Shore.

¹⁸ When Christopher Marlowe's Faustus departs amorously from Helen the Old Man
abandons his efforts to help him find salvation: "Acursèd Faustus, miserable man, / That
from thy soul exclud'st the grace of heaven / And fliest the throne of His tribunal seat"
(A-text, Doctor Faustus V.i.111-13). In Doctor Faustus the Old Man's words imply that
Faustus' fate was not predetermined and that his salvation was possible.

¹⁹ In the sixteenth century sorcery, or witchcraft, was associated with necromancy and
devil's play. Protestant polemicist sometimes criticised the Catholic communion as a
form of magic, or witchcraft, because of the emphasis placed on the substance of
communion actually becoming the body and blood of Christ. Faustus' turn to necromancy
in Marlowe's tragedy is a key example of how Elizabethans regarded conjuration and
necromancy. Faustus must abandon divinity, "Divinity, adieu!" (I.i.50) before he turns to
his book of magic, "These metaphysics of magicians / And necromantic books are
heavenly" (52). The good angel immediately reprimands him and reminds him of the
infernal nature of necromancy: "O Faustus, lay that damnèd book aside / And gaze not
on it, lest it tempt thy soul" (72-3). In the early seventeenth century Shakespeare

Shocked at the discovery of Shore's wife in his arms, Hastings realises his own sinfulness and contemplates the significance of Divine Providence. He asks, "What should we think of sygnes?" (489). He considers his life and deeds alongside support for the doctrine of predestination. A priest who speaks with Hastings in the Tower before his execution offers him some consolation that his death is unavoidable: "But, whome thou God allotted hast to dye / Some grace it is to dye with wymped eye" (471-2). When he mentions the involvement of God's will in his death Hastings replies by launching into a philosophical discussion of Chance:²⁰

Doth every Chaunce forshew or cause some other?

Or endyng at it selfe, extendth no furder?

As thoverflowyng floude some mount doth choake,

But to his ayde some other floud hit yoake:

So, yf with sygnes thy synnes once ioyne, beware.

Els wherto chaunces tend, nere curyous care

(489-496, Emphasis my own).

Looking back over his own life and how he died at Pomfret, Hastings realises that the link between all chance events in his life was sin. Each sin he committed generated another sin until finally he was choked by sin.

would later link sorcery with tyranny when Caliban comments to Stephano and Trinculo, "I am subject to a tyrant, / A sorcerer, that by his cunning hath / Cheated me of the Island" (III.ii.45-7).

²⁰ Hastings' musings on the idea of Chance from line 501 until 724 are entirely omitted in the editions from 1571 and 1587. Possibly this had to do with the controversial imprisonment of the Queen's cousin Mary, the consequent Babington Plot to free Mary and her eventual execution in 1587. Some of the lines about rebellion and secret plotting among the nobility can be read as analogue for the situation regarding Mary. For example, Hastings warns, "Serve truely your prynce and fear no rebells myght, / On princes halves the myghty god doth fyght. / O much more then forswear a forein foe, / Whoe seeketh your realme and countrey to undoe" (617-20).

The fact that his fate stemmed from his life of sin does not mean that his life of sin determined his fate. Hastings' anxieties about the link between his life of sin and his eternal destiny lead to the ultimate question about God's role in his fall. He asks,

is at one instant
 Of every babe the byrth in heaven so skannd,
 That they that restlesse roll, and never staye,
 Should in his lyfe beare yet so vyolent swaye:
 That, not his actions onely next to byrth,
 But [all his life, and] death be swayed therwith? (505-510).

Hastings reasonably has difficulties comprehending the notion that his fate was inescapable and he was always doomed to his life of sin and terrible death. He questions the punitive system that restricts punishment until after death: "whye were differrd / Tyll nowe, these plages, so long ere now deserved?" (513-4).

In the end he determines that all events are "foresett" and that God has pre-established princes rule on earth and so events must coincide with that divine plan:

Yf for they are tryfles, they ne seeme of care:
 But toyes with god the statelyest scepters are.
 Yet in them to playne, doth appere foresett,
 The certayne rule and fatall lymytes sett.
 Yet thinke we not, this sure forsettyng fate.
 But Gods fast provydence for eche princely state (515-20).

Gifts from Fortune or Chance, Hastings determines, do not stem from God and must be considered outside the boundaries of Providence.

In the prose link that follows Hastings' account the authors comment that although Dolman's contribution was difficult to understand it offers careful consideration of sin and eternal fate. One contributor even proffers that it may be the account read most often: "For that shal cause it to be the oftener reade, and the better remembered" (297). Dolman's insight into chance and divine providence distinguishes a departure from the de casibus sources. More importantly is the way Dolman's account, despite its ineloquence, deliberates the doctrine of predestination and Fortune.

c. Thomas Sackville: "Induction" and "Complaint of Buckingham"

In contrast to Dolman's account of Hastings, the poetic quality of Thomas Sackville's contributions to A Mirror for Magistrates is often commended. William Baldwin's preface to the second part of A Mirror for Magistrates in 1563 offered praise for the poetic quality of Sackville's contributions. Richard Niccols even attributed the poetic success of the collection to Sackville. In the preface to the edition printed in 1609, Niccols states:

by how much he did surpasse the rest in the eminence of his noble condition, by so much he hath exceeded them all in the excellencie of his heroicall stile, which with a golden pen he hath limed out to posteritie in that worthy object of his minde, the Tragedie of the Duke of Buckingham, and in his preface then intituled Master Sakvils induction (qtd. in Campbell Mirror 35).

Both editors considered Sackville's contributions essential to the success of the collection but at the initial stages of the Mirror there was some controversy about Sackville's role. In his explanation of why the "Induction" is placed in the middle of the work Baldwin writes:

After that he understoode that some of the counsayle would not suffer the booke to be printed in suche order as we had agreed and determined, he purposed with him selfe to have gotten at my handes, al the tragedies that were before the duke of Buckingham, Which he would have preserved in one volume. And from that time backward even to the time of William the conquerour, he determined to continue and perfect all the story him selfe, in such order as Lydgate (following Bochas) had already used. And therfore to make a meete induction into the matter, he devised this poesye: which in my judgement is so wel penned, that I woulde not have any verse therof left out of our volume (288-9).

Despite the contributors' differences about Sackville's role, Baldwin could not reasonably dismiss his passages on account of their superlative quality and Baldwin's familial relationship to the Queen (he was Elizabeth's cousin).

Sackville places his two contributions in the frame of a mirror image of Hell on earth in the way he asks the reader to imagine a classically influenced Hell and in the way Buckingham's ghost dramatically appears before him to tell his story. In the prose link that follows, Sackville's account of Buckingham Baldwin avoids the allegation that

Sackville may refer to Purgatory by identifying Sackville's Hell as simply the grave:

although he herein do follow allowed Poetes, in theyr discription of Hel, yet it savoreth so much of Purgatory, whiche the papistes have digged thereout, that the ignorant maye therby deceyved. Not a whit I warrant you [quoth Baldwin] For he meaneth not by his Hell the place eyther of damned soules, or of such a lye for their fees, but rather the Grave, wherin the dead bodies of al sortes of people do rest till tyme of the resurrection. And in this sence is Hel taken often in the scriptures, & in the writynges of learned Christians (346).

To further distance Sackville's poems from heresy Baldwin reminds the contributors that they are writing poetry, not theology: "Tush [. . .] it is a Poesie and no divinitye, and it is lawfull for poetes to fayne what they lyst, so it be appertinent to the matter: And therefore let it passe even in such a sort as you have read it" (346).

Sackville's "Induction" invokes a classical mythology within a Christian moral framework where Virgil's Sybil is replaced with a waif-like Sorrow. The narrator, Sackville, journeys down to Hell with his guide to witness the sufferings endured by sinners after earthly death. Sackville imagines a harsh winter landscape as the setting for his journey: "The wrathfull winter proching on a pace, / With blustering blastes had al ybared the treen" (1-2).

Alan T. Bradford recognises the convention of Tudor writers to embrace the dark winter landscape, not because it was the stuff of good

poetry but because of its relation to the human condition: "[w]hatever the poetic virtue of Sackville's description, it is not to be found in the freshness or acuteness of his observations of nature or in the originality of his expressive vocabulary" (Bradford 13). Sackville's purpose, argues Bradford, was to, "give cosmic resonance to the Mirror tragedies by linking the mutability of human affairs to the ineluctable processes of nature" (27). So when darkness overcomes Sackville as he is about to enter Hell it signifies the solemnity of the journey through Hell.

Sackville says that while he was walking at night gazing at the winter sky, he contemplated the sudden shifts in fortune that men encounter. He considers what is the best way to warn people about the dangers of Fortune when he encounters a mysterious figure clad in black:

And strayt forth stalking with redoubled pace
 For that I sawe the night drewe on so fast,
 In blacke all clad there fell before my face
 A piteous wight, whom woe had al forwaste,
 Furth from her iyen the cristall teares outbrast,
 And syghing sore her handes she wrong and folde,
 Tare al her heare that ruth was to beholde (71-77).

Sackville invokes the dark figure primarily for her piteous appearance and her tearstained face. Sorrow's unconventional presence as a guide, rather than the Sibyl, thus intentionally places the "Induction" in the frame of tragedy, which will become more clear when we look at the Chaucerian influence of this decision.

Moved by her sickly appearance and her never-ceasing tears, Sackville beckons her to speak: "Unwrap thy woes what ever wight thou

be [. . .] Tell what thou art, and whence, for well I see / Thou canst not
dure wyth sorowe thus attaynt" (99, 101-2). At Sackville's request the
figure identifies herself: "Alas, I wretche whom thus thou seest
distreyned / With wasting woes that never shall aslake, / Sorrowe I am"
(106-8).²¹

In Chaucer's translation of Guillaume de Lorris' Roman de la rose,
Sorowe is one of the first figures the narrator passes in his dream, along
with Envy, Felony, Covetousness, Avarice, Elde [Age], Pope-Holy
[Hypocrisy] and Povert[y]. In Chaucer's The Romaunt of the Rose, the
figures are innocuous drawings on the walls:

Sorowe was peynted next Envie
Upon that wall of masonrye.
But wel was seyn in hir colour
That she hadde lyved in languor;
Hir semede to have the jaunyce.
Nought half so pale was Avarice,
Nor nothyng lyk of lenesse;

For sorowe, thought, and gret distresse,
That she hadde suffred day and nyght,

²¹ Cf. Sackville's description of Sorrow recalls the tone of the opening verse of The Consolation of Philosophy: "Verse I made once glowing with content; / Tearful, alas, sad songs must I begin. / See how the Muses grief-torn bid me write, / And with unfeigned tears these elegies drench my face. / But them at least my fear that friends might tread my path / Companions still / Could not keep silent: they were once / My green youth's glory; now in my sad old age / They comfort me" (I.i.1-9).

Made hir ful yelow and nothyng bright,
 Ful fade, pale, and megre also (Chaucer, Romaunt A 301-11).²²

Sackville's use of Sorrow, and her associations with woe and distress, is indicative of the developing trend in Elizabethan tragedy to take place in the space of Hell.

It is possible that Sackville was drawn to Chaucer's Sorrow as an appropriate guide in his journey to the underworld set within the framework of damnation and Hell because of her association with ire. Chaucer's description of her repeatedly mentions that she is enraged: "Was never wight yit half so wo / As that hir semede for to be, / Nor so fulfilled of ire as she" (Romaunt, 312-14). It is the relationship between the tragic figure Sorrow, exuding woe and ire, that makes her a suitable guide in Sackville's poem:

Sorrowe I am, in endeles tormentes payned,
 Among the furies in the infernall lake:
 Where Pluto god of Hel so griesly blacke
 Doth holde his throne, and Letheus deadly taste
 Doth rieve remembraunce of eche thyng forepast (108-112).

After introducing herself she beckons Sackville to witness the fates of men who were beguiled by Fortune: "Cum, heare the playning, and the bytter bale / Of worthy men, by Fortune overthrowe. / Cum thou and see them rewing al in rowe" (150-152).

²² There is some doubt as to the authorship of parts of the Romaunt of the Rose, but Larry D. Benson concludes, "[it] is Chaucerian in style and language and has been accepted by most scholars as an early work of Chaucer's" (Chaucer, 686).

As they approach the entrance to Hell Sackville is overwhelmed by fear and he wants to turn back: "As halfe distraught unto the ground I fell, / Besought retourne, and not to visite Hell" (195-6). Sorrow responds with a gesture that removes his fear and gives him the strength to persevere:

But she forthwith uplifting me apace
 Removed my dread, and with a stedfast minde
 Bad me come on, for here was now the place,
 The place where we our travayle ende should finde.
 Wherewith I arose, and to the place assynde
 Astonynde I stalke, where strayt we approached nere
 The dredfull place, that you wil dread to heare (197-203).

When the goddess bestows this metaphorical grace on Sackville, she removes his dread so that he may continue his journey. This divine gift offered to Sackville recalls the Sybil's gift to Aeneas in book six when the Sybil granted Aeneas the golden bough so that he could safely pass into Hades. By making the gift divine in origin, Sackville Christianises the journey to the underworld and locates the narrative within a Protestant framework.²³

²³ Cf. In a passage in The Schoolmaster (1570), Roger Ascham compares Homer's application to the goddess Pallas to assist Ulysses defeat the perils he encounters to God's grace. Ascham commends Ulysses for his strength of character and wisdom but he attributes some of his success to "Pallas' aid and good counsel of Teiresias" (63). He says that Ulysses defeated the worst dangers and beat temptation on his return to Ithaca because of a divine gift: "Pallas be always at [Ulysses] elbow, that is, God's special grace from heaven, to keep him in God's fear in all his doings, in all his journey [. . .] he shall sometimes fall either into the hands of some cruel Cyclops or into the lap of some wanton and dallying Dame Calypso, and so suffer the danger of many a deadly den, not so full of perils to destroy the body as full of vain pleasures to poison the mind. Some Siren shall sing him a song, sweet in tune, but sounding in the end to his utter destructions. If Scylla drown him not, Charybdis may fortune swallow him. Some Circe

In the Aeneid, when Aeneas approaches the entrance to Hades and performs the commands of the Sybil he too finds himself in a dark cave. David West's translation reads, "There was a huge, deep cave with jagged pebbles underfoot and a gaping mouth guarded by dark woods and the black waters of a lake" (139). As Aeneas enters Virgil imagines a narrow passageway at the end of a dark cave that lead to a porch just in front of the palace of Dis, identified as "Orcus" [Pluto]: "vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus Orci" "Before the porch itself, in the jaws of Orcus [Hell]" (Virgil Aeneid, VI.273, translation my own). Sackville similarly describes the entrance of Hell: "first within the portche and jawes of Hell, / Sat diepe Remorse of conscience" ("Induction", 218-9).

Aeneas and Sackville both pass more-or-less the same disembodied spirits of personified forms of suffering in the passageway towards Hell: Remorse, Dread, Revenge, Misery, Greed, Sleep, Old Age, Malady, Famine, Death and War ("Induction", 218-399; Aeneid, VI.264-294.). Sackville distinguishes his journey from the ancient Roman epic by the moral didacticism the spirits in the entranceway offer. Aeneas only recognises the names of the personifications: "Grief and Revenge have made their beds and Old Age lives there in despair". Virgil spends only thirty lines in a book of over nine hundred lines just naming the figures. Sackville, by contrast, spends almost two hundred lines in a much shorter poem (only 553 lines) describing fewer figures.

shall make him, of a plain Englishman, a right Italian. And at length to Hell, or to some Hellish place, is he likely to go" (62). Ascham contends that Ulysses would not have reached Ithaca without Pallas' assistance and told him about the herb moly: "if Pallas had not always governed him [. . .] to feed daily upon that sweet herb moly with the black root and white flower, given unto him by Mercury to avoid all the enchantments of Circe" (63). Ascham decided to write The Schoolmaster in response to a request from Sir Richard Sackville for Thomas Sackville's young son Robert in 1563, the same year the "Induction" was first printed with the Mirror.

In the "Induction", Revenge, for example, invokes terror because the qualities she exudes are present in people who seek revenge in life. Her surrounding flames suggest intense wrath and ferocity:

And next within the entry of this lake
 Sate fell Revenge gnashing her teeth for yre,
 Devising meanes howe she may vengeaunce take,
 Never in rest tyll she have her desire:
 But frets within so farforth with the fyer
 Of wreaking flames, that nowe determines she,
 To dye by death, or vengde by death to be (239-245).

The emphasis Sackville places on the spirits' involvement in human affairs reflects his concern with the didactic aims of the Mirror. In Virgil the personified forms of suffering are only identified by name because they are not essential to Aeneas' heroic journey to Rome. In Sackville's "Induction", the figures are recognised for the sins they instigate or represent. As in the Purgatorial account discussed in the Introduction, explaining the sins works to remind the reader of the punishments associated with such sins with the aim to discourage sin.

Sackville's underworld is designated as the space of Hell, which is only reserved for those who deserve eternal punishment. Pluto is identified as the reigning infernal deity in this version of Hell:

Thence cum we to the horroure and the hel,
 The large great kyngdomes, and the dreadful raygne
 Of Pluto in his trone where he dyd dwell,
 The wyde waste places, and the hugye playne:
 The waylinges, shrykes, and sundry sortes of payne,

The syghes, the sobbes, the diepe and deadly groane,
Earth, ayer, and all resounding playnt and moane (505-511).

Sackville's infernal deities subvert the traditional roles assigned to Pluto and Proserpine. In classical mythology, Pluto and Proserpine reign over the whole underworld, a place below the earth where all the dead rest after life. But their role as the reigning deities in Hades is not necessarily an infernal role since they do not enact punishments, nor do they order punishments.

Typically, when souls first arrive in Hades they must first convince the ferryman Charon to ferry them across Avernus by proving that they are in fact dead. Next the dead must placate the barking hound Cerberus and receive judgment from Minos. Tartarus, the place for eternal punishment, has its own guard, the fifty-headed Hydra, and has its own judge, Rhadamanthus, who determines the levels of punishment. The king and queen of Hades are not required for any specific administrative duties since the guards and judges in Hell fulfil these roles.

Sackville Christianises his underworld by limiting the pagan qualities to the description of the space of Hell. In this account of Hell, identified when Sackville says, "Thence cum we to the horrour and the hel", Pluto is dreadful and invokes fear. He is directly linked to the terrible punishments endured in Hell by the juxtaposition of his throne and the terrible cries of the punished.

When Sackville links the relentless punishments of Hell with the reigning deity he transfers to Pluto the role traditionally associated with the devils in the Christian traditions. Even Virgil distanced Pluto from

the formula for inflicting punishments and assigned the task to the wardens of Tartarus, Tisiphone, and the judge Rhadamanth. Sackville's underworld is distinguished from its classical counterpart further because there are no divisions between the righteous, the pitiable and the bad figures. Instead everyone in Hell is viewed with the same moral condemnation. This works to emphasise the harsh cost of sin and stress the relentless cruelties in Hell in order to endorse good moral behaviour on earth. Here Fortune's favour is used to indicate something more relevant than simply a lesson of the transitory nature of life. This marks a distinct departure from the medieval Boccaccian tradition and is evidence of Fortune's central role to ideas of damnation and Hell.

The appropriation of Fortune's favour to the lives of sinners emphasises the new direction in de casibus examples in the English tradition. More specifically, the goddess's presence highlights the workings of divine punishment. This is again stressed when Sorrow explains the link between the sinners and Fortune:

Loe here (quoth Sorowe) Princes of renowne,
 That whilom sat on top of Fortunes wheele
 Nowe layed ful lowe, like wretches whurled downe,
 Even with one frowne, that stayed but with a smyle,
 And nowe behold the thing that thou erewhile,
 Saw only in thought, and what thou now shalt heare
 Recompt the same to Kesar, King, and Pier (526-532).

Here Sorrow states that people who climb Fortune's wheel end up in Hell, although not necessarily because they climbed her wheel. Furthermore the goddess says that all sinners are treated the same after death

regardless of their earthly position.²⁴ The dark mood of the "Induction" and the imagining of the horrible cries from the inmates as Sackville and his guide encounter Buckingham emphasises the relentlessness of the punitive space of Hell.

The "Complaint"

The account of Buckingham includes Sackville's own moralising on the causes of sin and its punitive rewards, but ultimately the poem identifies an inescapable destiny as the cause of Buckingham's fall. The ghost begins by attributing his fall to the influence of Fortune: "Beholde he me, and by my death beware: / Whom flattering Fortune falsely so begilde" (5-6). He appeals to Sackville's desire to describe the fall of princes and offers his example as evidence of "unsurety":

And Sackevylle sith in purpose nowe thou hast
The woful fal of Princes to discryve,
Whom Fortune both uplyft, and gayne downe cast,
To shewe thereby the unsurety in this life,
Marke wel my fal, which I shal shewe belive.
And paynt it furth that all estates may knowe:
Have they the warning, and be mine the woe

(8-14, Emphasis my own).

Buckingham's initial invocation adheres to the Boccaccian frame and the Medieval historical agenda of de casibus writings for illustrating God's infinite power. But in the next stanza he places his example firmly within

²⁴ The word "recompt" is an obsolete form of "recount": "To regard, consider, or account (a person or thing) as possessing a certain character or quality" (OED, 3).

an Elizabethan framework by mentioning that his lack of grace also contributed to his fall:

For noble bloud made me both prince and pier
 Yea pierles too, had reason purchast place,
 And God with giftes endowed me largely here.
 But what avayles his giftes where fayles his grace?

(15-18, Emphasis my own).

Without the gift of grace, Buckingham says, earthly gifts are inane and do not signify anything about fate. When he says both that Fortune uplifted him and God bestowed him with gifts, Sackville creates a link between gifts from Fortune and God's will. This could mean that the decision for Fortune to beguile someone stems from God and must therefore be part of a divine plan.

When Buckingham contemplates his role in the murder of the two princes he is overwhelmed by the infernal aspect of his actions. He details how he was plagued by his conscience and was mentally tormented by the memory:

Nowe doubting state, nowe dreading losse of life,
 In feare of wrecke at every blast of wynde,
 Now start in dreames through dread of murdrers knyfe,
 As though even then revengement were assynde

(204-207, Emphasis my own).

Buckingham's difficulty accepting that his fate was prearranged and he murdered the princes because he was damned, not the other way around, is indicative of typical anxieties about salvation and damnation in the

period. In suggesting that "even then" (i.e. before death) Buckingham's damnation was allocated, this passage also reflects the "stamp of Calvin" on Elizabethan orthodoxy that Campbell mentioned in her introduction to the collection (see above, 30).

At the end of Buckingham's account the contributors acknowledge the complexity of examples like Buckingham's, since on the one hand his example rouses pity because he did not act out of sheer malice and he expresses regret, yet he must be eternally damned because he lacked grace.

Sackville's "Induction" and "Complaint" work to adjust Fortune's role in the de casibus tradition by linking her favour not only with a fall but also with damnation. By placing Sackville's detailed account of Hell in the middle of the collection just before the account of Buckingham, Badlwin reminds the reader of the de casibus frame and asks us to remember the threat of damnation for transgression against God. In the "Complaint" Sackville positions sin and Fortune together in the way Buckingham retrospectively associates his earthly success with his life of sin.

Fortune and Hell in the Mirror

The difficulty in trying to categorically identify Fortune's role, or indeed the role of fate or destiny, in the Mirror lies in the fact that there were no universally established guidelines for the new faith. In A Mirror for Magistrates there are people who blame Fortune and consider themselves trapped on Fortune's wheel such as the Duke of Buckingham, Robert Tresilian, Owen Glendower and Shore's Wife. Yet there are also those who suggest they were victims to a predetermined fate but who do not

blame Fortune. Lord Hastings, for example, says that he fell simply because he was destined to: "Erst my proud vaunt: present to thee / My honoure, fall, and forced destenye" (7-8, Emphasis my own).

In shaping the Mirror by the different considerations on Fortune, Providence, virtue and vice, rebellion and fate, Baldwin sets the individual pieces of advice into a dialogue with each other. This not only avoids some scrutiny from the censors but also works to facilitate a discussion of the moral and philosophical issues raised. In a recent article, Jessica Winston shows how the different voices operating within the Mirror helped transform a de casibus form designed to speak to power into one that represented and advanced a conversation about power. Winston sums up,

In the Mirror, Baldwin [. . .] emphasises the process by which the book came into existence, while creating a work whose form raises questions about princely action and the forces that control such action. The purpose of this form is to illustrate for noble readers that there are no concrete guidelines for behaviour and to urge them to consider their conduct in the context of their own situations and, if necessary, to amend their rule (Winston 398).

The different voices within the Mirror exemplify the complexities in thinking about Fortune and damnation in late-Tudor England. The Mirror, focuses on the eternal consequences of bad behaviour on earth by attributing good fortune on earth with unavoidable sin and Hell.

The diverse ways of thinking about damnation create tenuous links between Fortune and Hell that point to Fortune as an indicator for

damnation. By introducing the threat of damnation to the de casibus formula, A Mirror for Magistrates reflects anxieties about predestination that occupy the Elizabethan tragic sphere. Damnation becomes central to thinking about tyranny and rebellion by making it central to the de casibus form.

Chapter Two

'The Monstrous Abuses of the Wicked and Ungodly': The Relentless Punishments of Hell in Richard Robinson's The Rewarde of Wickednesse (1574)

Richard Robinson's The Rewarde of Wickednesse (1574) is a univocal poem that imitates the de casibus form of A Mirror for Magistrates and makes a clear indication of the hellish position of the damned. The poem is a vehemently anti-Catholic epic that draws a distinct link between sinful behaviour on earth and Hell by locating both the consequences and the origin of sin in Hell. Robinson stages the laments in the space of Hell, not simply as ghosts reporting back from the underworld. Sackville's "Induction" and "Complaint of Buckingham" are the key link to the Mirror through the identification of Hell as the reward for sin. Although the theology is somewhat vague in the poem, it is clearly anti-Purgatorial and it is straightforward about the torments in Hell.

Robinson focuses on Pluto's relationship with strong Catholic figures, such as a few key Popes and Bishop Bonner, and he makes this relationship key to understanding damnation and earthly sin. The inclusion of controversial figures such as Pope Joan makes Robinson's Protestant agenda particularly evident (Catholics disputed Joan's existence and maintained that she was merely a product of Protestant propaganda).¹ But that is not to say that the poem is simply an invective

¹ See Barbara Tinsley, "Pope Joan Polemic in Early Modern France: The Use and Disabuse of Myth" for a detailed discussion about the legendary female pope Joan. Catholics, argues Tinsley, transformed the Protestant attempt to invalidate the Papacy by insisting that Joan's reign as pope irreparably breached the uninterrupted male apostolic succession from Saint Peter (381). Calvin and Luther both cited Pope Joan in their evidence for the corruption and fallibility of the Catholic Church: "Calvin said it would be impossible to 'leap over Popess Joan' even if one could exclude the male heretic popes who had similarly interrupted the apostolic succession" (388).

against Catholicism; Robinson's epic condemns bad moral behaviour but in the context of the dialectical opposition between Catholicism and Protestantism.

Through his imagining of a close relationship between Catholics and Pluto Robinson participates in a tradition where Hell's influence on earth manifests itself in particular sins. In this case Robinson focuses on the sins of the Catholic clergy to suggest, at times, that Catholicism itself is a result of Pluto infiltrating the earth through carefully selected agents, as we shall see in the final part of this chapter.

Chapter two places Robinson's poem within the development of Hell in Elizabethan tragedy by focusing on the poet's link between earthly sin and the infernal deity Pluto. The emphasis on Catholicism itself as a sin is particularly relevant to the way Robinson imagines the forces of Hell infiltrate earth. The poem refers back to the medieval Purgatorial accounts that detailed the temporary punishments endured in Purgatory but transfers them to the space of Hell. His emphasis on the relentless punishments is central to understanding the representation of Hell, and infernal persons, on the late-Elizabethan stage.

a) Richard Robinson

The poet Richard Robinson, and author of The Rewarde of Wickednesse, must be differentiated from the compiler and translator Richard Robinson of London (the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography lists the texts written by Robinson from London). The poet Robinson was probably from Alton in Staffordshire and he identifies himself as a servant for the Earl of Shrewsbury. Robinson's The Rewarde of Wickednesse was dedicated to Gilbert Talbot, the second son to the Earl.

In total, three texts are attributed to Richard Robinson from Staffordshire: The ruefull Tragedie of Hemidos and Thelay (1569), now lost and only known from an entry in the Stationer's register; The Rewarde of Wickednesse printed in 1573 (although it is dated May 1574); and A Golden Mirrour (c. 1587), which was dedicated to Gilbert Talbot but published posthumously by John Proctor, who was not acquainted with Robinson.² A Golden Mirrour is not very noteworthy except that it is an inversion of A Mirror for Magistrates that consists of visions predicting good fortune for virtuous Englishmen.

Since the biographical information about Robinson's identity is so limited, it is only by piecing together clues from his text that one can discern his personal agenda for writing and better understand the aims of his epic. Towards the end of The Rewarde of Wickednesse Robinson and his guide Morpheus travel to Helicon where the Muses beckon the obscure writer to reveal what he saw of Hell and Heaven in verse.

Here Robinson is awed by the images of famous poets, first Homer and Virgil, then Chaucer, then Skelton and Lydgate, Wager, Heywood, and Barnabe Googe. But feeling overwhelmed by their greatness Robinson begs the Muses to choose someone more capable than he and offers the names of some "greater poets". He says rather modestly, "Let Studley, Hake, or Fulwood take, that William hath to name. /This peece of worke in hande, that bee more fitter for the same" ("Helicon", R3r). When

² John Proctor included his own dedicatory letter to Lord Talbot before Robinson's text in which he states that he was not particularly well-acquainted with the author and that he purchased the text two years prior to its publication in 1589: "Whereas about two yeares past, I chaunced to have offered me this present Treatise, whiche though I then accepted and gave money for: yet, dreadyng least I might be over rashe in committynge it to the Print, especially before I had fully seene into the end and puspose of the writer, whom I understood to bee a Gentleman of the North Countrey: yet now after long deliberation, I finding this same both pleasaunt and profitable have adventured the charge of Printyng it" (A2r).

Robinson calls on these three writers for the quality of their moral writings he indicates his didactic purpose is not so much about Protestantism but about good moral behaviour.

Studley is most famous for his translations of Seneca's tragedies: Agamemnon (1566), Hippolytus (1567), Hercules Oetæus (1581) and Medea (1566). But Studley was also a loyal Puritan and disapproved of Roman Catholicism and it is his translation of Bale's Pageant of Popes that Robinson's poem invites the reader to recall, as we shall see when the chapter moves into a discussion of Pope Alexander VI.

Fulwood was primarily known for a work that gives instruction for writing letters: The enemy of idleness (1568). In this text, Fulwood followed the formula for the rules of rhetoric for writing a letter set out by Erasmus in his De Ratione Conscribendi Epistolis. But Fulwood's name is also attributed to a text called, The shape of ii monsters, printed in 1562. In the introductory lines Fulwood attributes disfigurement in earthly creatures to God's power: "Chefe straunge sights, the Almighty God sendeth unto us that we should not be forgetfull of his mighty power and be thankful for his greate mercies" (t.p.). Robinson names Fulwood because his work is informed by his moralizing against various types of sin and Robinson's poem shares this frame.

But it is Robinson's mention of Edward Hake (fl. 1564-1604) that is the most useful for identifying his writing aims because they shared the same publisher and distaste for Catholicism. His liberal translation of an Erasmian didactic text, A Touchestone for this time present, expresely declaring such ruines, enormities, and abuses as trouble the Churche of God and our Christian common wealth at this daye was printed with William Williamson in the same year Robinson's The Rewarde of Wickednesse was printed. Hake was a lawyer and writer of satire, a

fervent Puritan who despised Roman Catholics. His two primary works, Newes out of Powles Churchyarde (1567) and, A Touchestone for this Time Present (1574), promote a Christian education and parental supervision for moral righteousness. Hake's first text, Newes out of Powles Churchyarde, is a dialogue between Bertulph and Paul in the aisles of a cathedral discussing corruption among the clergy and other inferior magistrates.

Many of the texts Williamson printed in the 1570s include a strictly Protestant agenda, especially evident in the 1573 translation of François Hotman's invective against the Catholic Guises for their treatment of Protestants in France:

True and plaine report of the furious outrages of Fraunce & the horrible and shameful slaughter of Chastillion the admirall, and diuers other noble and excellent men, and of the wicked and straunge murder of godlie persons, committed in many cities of Fraunce, without any respect of sorte, kinde, age, or degree (Hotman Outrages, t.p.).

Williamson must have been concerned with the progress of the Protestant Reformation since he was occupied with printing Reformation texts from the continent as well as from England. In addition to Hotman's treatise he printed other French and Dutch writings on Reformation politics (see Appendix B for a full list of texts Williamson printed).

Not all Williamson's texts emphasise a Protestant agenda though, for instance, John Jones' The arte of science and medecine (1574) and H. Grantham's A most brief tables to know readily how many ranks of

footmen go to the making of a just battle (1574). The texts by Hotman, and the reports from Continental reform, indicate that Williamson supported a radical Protestantism in England but do not limit his interests to Protestant pamphleteering. But Robinson's text must have somehow persuaded Williamson to publish it alongside more well known authors like Hake and Hotman and the anti-Catholic dimension of Robinson's epic corresponds to the majority of Williamson's projects.

b) The de casibus framework of Robinson's poem

Robinson's discussion of the Catholic sinners, like Pope Alexander VI and Bishop Bonner, is key to the link made between Hell and earthly sin in the poem. Robinson firmly establishes this link between the infernal realm with sinners on earth through satirising the flaws in Catholic doctrine. He emphasises an inherent sinfulness in all Catholics towards the end of the poem when he overhears some Catholic souls discussing how to climb the ladder between Heaven and Hell. In the (Medieval) Catholic account of William Stranton's descent into Purgatory, discussed in the Introduction, the purpose of a ladder was a passageway for repentant sinners to move from Purgatory to Earthly Paradise. Robinson's description of a ladder towards Heaven is particularly important to his condemnation of Catholic Church leaders as liars working for Pluto to increase his realm.

The title page for The Rewarde of Wickednesse brings Robinson's Protestant agenda into focus by identifying wicked and ungodly figures as Catholic clergy. The title states that the poem aims to detail the wicked lives of sinners and locates itself in a historical de casibus framework in the tragic mode:

The rewarde of Wickednesse: Discoursing the sundrye monstrous abuses of wicked and ungodlye worldelinges: in such sort set downe and written as the same have beene dyversely practised in the persones of Popes, Harlots, Proude Princes, Tyrauntes, Romish Byshoppes, and others. With a lively description of their severall falles and finall destruction. Verye profitable for all sorte of estates to reade and looke upon. Newly compiled by Richard Robinson (The Rewarde of Wickednesse, t.p., emphasis my own).

When Robinson identifies himself as the compiler rather than the author he emphasises that he is using well-known stories and he is not inventing them. Since the form of his narrative (a journey to the underworld with Morpheus) naturally lends itself to interpretation as fiction, Robinson attempts to realign it in the frame of truth. He suggests that the accounts contain historical truth when he distinguishes himself as the compiler rather than the author so the reader understands that he did not invent the stories but simply collected them.

The title is complemented with a brief caveat that points the reader in the direction of tragedy: "A dreame most pitiful, and to be dreaded". All of the key words that Robinson draws to the reader's attention on the title page (especially: monstrous, ungodly, wicked, pitiful, dreaded and strange) point to the polemical nature of his epic because of their association, in the early modern period, with anti-Catholic propaganda.

On the title page Robinson avoids using the word "tragedy" to maintain his insistence on the text as history (truth), but a four line

introductory poem on the title page further indicates the dark nature of the poem's material:

Of thinges be straunge,
 Who loveth to reade:
 In this Booke let him raunge,
 His fancie to feede.

Here we can see that before the poem begins Robinson indicates without question that this de casibus poem is primarily in the frame of tragedy: Firstly he explains that the poem is about the monstrous abuses of the wicked, then he says the content is to be dreaded, and now, with the mention of things that are strange, Robinson indicates that his poem is about secret truths that need to be revealed, such as the final destiny of bad clergy.

The word "strange" was usually applied to people, or customs, that were foreign or different, sometimes when discussing matters of faith, as shown in the quotation from Fulwood cited above. Mark Thornton Burnett's study on monsters in early modern England details the significance of the use of monstrous shapes and forms in the theatres, fairgrounds and exhibitions spaces in the sixteenth century. It was widely accepted that characteristics that deviated from the boundaries of what was considered normal were monstrous.³ The term "monster" was used to describe people, actions and social practices which were

³ William Fulwood wrote a prose piece entitled, The Shape of ii Monsters which was published in 1562 that discusses deformity in the context of early modern ideas of strangeness and religion: "These straunge sights, the Almighty God sendeth unto us that we should not be forgetfull of his mighty power and be thankful for his so greate mercies" (t.p.).

considered unnatural (Burnett Monsters, 23-31). Some people even thought that monsters, or unnatural appearances, were an indication of sin: "monsters [. . .] owed their conception to sin, with the monstrous actions of the parents being reproduced in the monstrous shapes of their progeny" (26).

Furthermore Burnett cites how things that were "monstrous" were also considered devil-like and this was sometimes indicated with the word "strange". The OED cites examples of the word "strange" from the fourteenth century to the sixteenth century which applied the term to matters of faith ("strange," def.6). In trying to determine the causes of types of "monstrous" shapes, early modern writers maintained that "monsters" were the result of divine interference or even devilry. Burnett writes,

The myriad arguments that 'monsters' were the result of bestiality, copulation during menstruation, devilry, incest [. . .] posit a relationship between a transgression of godly injunctions and the precipitation of dire parturient consequences (Burnett 27).

In Robinson's application of the words "monster" and "strange" to the examples of ungodliness and wickedness, he acknowledges the cultural anxieties about sin and inescapable damnation that his poem explores. The relationship between ungodliness, monsters and damnation suggested in Robinson's tragic poem is fully emphasised in late Elizabethan tyrant tragedies like Tamburlaine and Richard III, for example, where the tyrant-protagonists physically embody monstrosity and devilry, as we shall see in part III of this thesis.

Robinson continues to prepare the reader for the material in his epic by stressing the relentless punishments of Hell that await sinners after death. In the four introductory poems ("Author to the Book", "Book to the Author", "Praise of the Author" and "Prologue") Robinson describes his purpose in writing, and what he hopes to achieve. Firstly he indicates the horrible rewards that await sinners in Hell:

[My book's] woefull plaints, thy rueful face, and carefull
 countenance shew,
 To all the wordle: bee not tonguetide, reveale abroad the
 woe
 That is among the sillie soules, in Plutos ouglie lake,
 For wickednesse done on the Earth, howe Jove doth
 vengeance take
 Blushe not my booke, to thunder foorth, the tormentes thou
 hast seene,
 Tell wilfull wits, and hatefull hearts, what just deserved
 teene:
 In Plutos pitte they shall abide, that headlong plunge in
 sinne,
 Bee not abashte to tell the best, what plagues be there
 within ("Author to the Booke", A3v, emphasis my own).

This warning from the author to the book works to stress the harshness of Hell for sinners and emphasise that without the space of Purgatory the rewards for sin are relentless. Robinson misleadingly states the teleological perspective of his epic when he links the didactic aims of his poem to repentance:

And now the paines & plagues below, where Charon rowes the
 barge,

As Thauthour hath commaunded mee, I shall declare at
 large.

And if I chaunse to speake amisse, thy pardon here I crave,

Repentaunce at the sinners hande, Is all Christ seekes to

have ("Book to the Author", A4r).

While both Protestants and Catholics believed that sins ought to be repented before death, only Catholics believed that your salvation or damnation could be determined by it. Robinson's poem lacks theological clarity in his discussions of doctrine but he is emphatic about the relentlessness of punishments in Hell as the reward for sin (cf. the discussion of Sackville's Hell in Chapter One). Robinson's lack of theological uniformity is not necessarily indicative of any controversial yearning for a return to the old faith, but is a testimony to the "unsurety" of the period (see above, 90). Robinson's primary emphasis in the epic lies in his detail of what types of sin are punished and how those sins are punished in Hell.

The poem flirts with various different interpretations for the cause of damnation: at times the poems simply stress a strong interpretation that the sinner was predetermined to sin, while at other times the sinner's fall is attributed to a lack of grace. Robinson's concern with these matters in the 1570s is later echoed in Christopher Marlowe's protagonist Doctor Faustus. Faustus struggles with the complex theological backdrop of Calvinism in his struggle to save his soul and

finally determines that he cannot repent: "And now `tis too late" (V.ii.49), he says ominously moments before his death.

Section II: The Rewarde of Wickednesse

a) The Infernal Court

In the prologue Robinson draws from a variety of accounts of journeys to the underworld, including Thomas Sackville's "Induction" discussed in the last chapter. Robinson's "Prologue", like the "Induction", is written in rhyme royal and there are parallels with Chaucer's tragedy Troilus and Criseyde and The Legend of Good Women. Chaucer's detail of the histories of famous women includes Medea and Lucrece, who also feature in Robinson's epic. Chaucer portrays the women as victims and asks the reader to pity Medea because she was betrayed by Jason.

The opening stanzas of Robinson's prologue recall the landscape of Sackville's winter journey to the realms of Hell with his guide Sorrow. Robinson begins ominously:

In December when daies be short and colde,
 And irksome nights amid the storms gan rore,
 That flockes from feeldes forsake their folde,
 And Birdes from swelling floodes do shrinke to shore,
 The plowgh doth rest that cut the soyle of yore.
 And toyling Oxe in cabin close doth stande,
 That wonted was to travayle painefull land ("Prologue", B1r).

Sackville also commented on the cold and harsh conditions of winter:

"The wrathfull winter proching on a pace, / With blustering blastes had al
ybareed the treen" ("Induction", 1-2). Similarly, in Chaucer's The House of
Fame the narrator's dream occurs, like Robinson's dream, in December:

Of Decembre the tenthe day,
Whan hit was nyght to slepe I lay
Ryght ther as I was wont to done,
And fil on slepe wonder sone (111-114).

Robinson adds a light-hearted tone in this seemingly dark setting when he tells us how he stumbled upon a local ale house and began drinking with the locals: "In this season it was my lotte to fall, / Among a masque chosen for the nonce" (B1v).

Alan T. Bradford comments that Sackville's use of the winter landscape marks a second phase of an evolutionary process for using the imagery of winter to represent the poet's state of mind: "the winter landscape is invariably emblematic [. . .] of the human condition" (3). Bradford argues that Sackville was participating in a tradition for linking the cycle of the seasons with the "postlapsarian vicissitudes of human life" (19). He dismisses Robinson's winter landscape from his study because it does not meet the literary standard of Sackville's poem. But Robinson's poem is important to the tradition for writing about Hell because of the way it departs from earlier descriptions of Hell and includes special emphasis on the relationship between sinners on earth and the infernal deities.

Robinson's guide through Hell is the god of sleep Morpheus, who wakes Robinson from his drunken slumber: "Slugge, why sleepest all the

night? [. . .] I am a God, beholde that standeth here" (B2v). In calling on Morpheus, Robinson's dream vision parallels the Chaucerian dream-vision models in The Book of the Duchess and The House of Fame.⁴ Robinson's framing of his account as a dream narrative with Morpheus as a guide links his poem with Jasper Heywood's translation of Thyestes and the latest edition of A Mirror for Magistrates, edited by John Higgins in 1571. Heywood added a lengthy preface to Thyestes that details a dream encounter between Heywood and Seneca. He begins,

It was the fowre and twentieth daie
of latest monthe save one
Of all the yere [.]
When (as at booke with mased Muse
I satte and pensive thought
Deepe drownde in dumps of drousines
as chaunge of weather wrought,)
I felt howe Morpheus bound my browes
and eke my Temples strooke,
That downe I soonke my heavy head
and sleapt upon my booke (91-118).

In a similar manner, and possibly taking his cue from Baldwin's prose links, Higgins framed the Mirror as a dream vision. Following the

⁴ In The Book of the Duchess, Chaucer includes Morpheus to guide the narrator into his dream. They do not visit Hell together, though, and the god of sleep only serves to introduce the dream. In The House of Fame, a text which more closely resembles Robinson's Rewarde of Wickednesse, the narrator is reading Virgil's Aeneid when he falls asleep but he visits the heavens. But the relationship between the texts is only superficial since Chaucer was writing about love and nature rather than sin and punishment.

account of Richard of York Baldwin writes, "I dreame [the accounts]" (191). The narrator in Higgins' edition falls asleep on a winter's night while reading A Mirror for Magistrates and he is guided by Morpheus to see the examples of British figures who were brought down by Fortune (see Budra Mirror 31-4).

When Robinson is ready Morpheus tells him that they are going to travel to Pluto's kingdom together: "To Plutoes kingdome with mee thou take thy waye" (B2v). The infernal court in Robinson's Hell is significant because the hierarchical structure suggests that the infernal god has some control over the fates of men and that eternal punishments are not fixed before death.

In the "Induction" Sackville located Pluto just past "Rude Acheron" and the guard "Blacke Cerberus, the hydeous hound of Hell" ("Induction", 480, 499). Once he and the goddess Sorrow pacify the fierce dog they recognise Hell by Pluto's throne:

Thence cum we to the horroure and the hel,
The large great kyngdomes, and the dreadful raygne
Of Pluto in his trone where he dyd dwell (505-7).

Sackville does not include the judge Minos in Hell; there is no need for a judge because anyone that Sackville spies beyond the gates of Hell is unconditionally damned. The poems in A Mirror for Magistrates do not dwell on the types of punishments administered only on how sinners fall on earth. Since Robinson's poem reinforces the spectacle of Hell's torments and emphasises a direct link between Hell and sin on earth, he includes the rulers and the judge Minos to indicate their active role in the eternal fates of sinners.

Just as Sorrow recognised Sackville's fear of Hell, the god of sleep offers reassurance to his companion as they progress into Hell:

And going by the way these wordes he sayde,
 Be of good cheare, me thinkes thou lookest pale,
 Plucke up thy hearte and be no deale afrayde,
 Although thou goe into this ouglie vale ("Prologue", B2v).⁵

Robinson and his guide travel through the first ward of Hell where Morpheus has to pacify the barking hound Cerberus. Morpheus recognises that Robinson is afraid of entering Hell but encourages him to persist.

As they pass Cerberus Robinson describes a variety of allegorical figures that tend the second ward of Hell. These figures represent some of the seven deadly sins and other typical medieval dramatic figures:

So to the seconde warde wee came at last.
 Where Wrath kept the walles, and Envie the gates,
 Associate with Pride and whoredome their mates.
 With cruell countinaunce terrible to see,
 These horrible officers fixed their eyes,
 Filthie to beholde monstrous and ouglie,
 They gathered to the gates like swarmes of Bees (B3r).

These figures in the second ward recall the sins that often appeared as allegorical figures in the Morality plays. In The Castle of Perseverance,

⁵ Cf.: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me: thy rod and thy staff they comfort me" (Psalm 23:4).

discussed in the Introduction, for example, the figures Pride, Wrath and Envy attend the Devil.

Finally Morpheus and Robinson arrive in the third ward of Hell where Pluto and his queen Proserpine reside. This ward is "fortefied with Tirauntes" and other nasty vices who are wary of the newcomers. The figures Robinson names recall the figures Sackville witnessed in the jaws of Hell ("Induction", 218-292) and look back to Virgil's throat of Hell (Aeneid VI.273-281).⁶ Robinson adds the allegorical figures Oppression and Private Gain to attend to the rabble (B3r) and he lists other figures who are partly derived from the traditional Vices and partly from personified sins.

For Virgil, and for Sackville, the origin of sinful behaviour was not located in Hell itself, and the figures representing the sins are located on the outer edges of Hell. Their placement of these figures at the entrance space is a significant point of departure for Robinson because it means that the origin of sin is in Hell. In earlier accounts sinners are linked with Hell because of their choice to follow sin and, usually, their failure to repent for their sins. Even Virgil states that the sinners in

⁶ For Virgil, those punished in Tartarus, are superhuman rebels and evil men, but Aeneas does not have any direct vision of their punishments. At Aeneas' request the Sybil explains that after sinners condemned to Hell have confessed all their crimes to Rhadamanth, Tisiphone flogs them until the Furies come to take the sinner further into Tartarus where they will be eternally punished. She describes the punishments of certain superhuman rebels such as Salmoneus, Tityos, Ixion, and Theseus, who offended the gods with their disobedience. When the Sybil comes to the mortals who are punished in Tartarus, she does not recall their names but only categorises them according to their crimes. Virgil was content though to leave most of the description of the punishments of Hell to this second-hand account from the Sybil, who concludes, "Even if I had one hundred tongues and one hundred mouths, and a voice of iron, it would not be possible to capture all the types of crimes or to run through all the names of the punishments" (Translation my own). Robinson repeats this sentiment when he describes the allegorical vice figures in the second ward of Hell: "Many thousandes there were that I omit, / For want of time fullie to describe, / To tell truth the number passeth skill and wit, / To be namde of mee, that howled there and cryde" ("Prologue", 169-172).

Tartarus are damned because they did not repent before death: "they had postponed atonements incurred at the late hour of death" (Aeneid VI.569). Sackville's account of the link between damnation and earthly sinners points in the direction of Robinson's reasoning when he mentions Fortune as the cause of people's ruin:

Whence come I am, the dreery destinie
 And luckles lot for to bemone of those,
 Whom Fortune in this maze of miserie
 Of wretched chauce most wofull myrroures chose
("Induction", 113-16).

Sackville thus indicates that Fortune touches those chosen to fall but he does not imply that she was the cause of their damnation. Robinson's topographical division of the infernal realm places the sins squarely within Hell. By placing the sins in Hell in this way, rather than on the perimeter, Robinson suggests that earthly sin ultimately derives from Hell.

The rabble in the third ward are reluctant to allow Morpheus and Robinson to approach Pluto and Proserpine. The rabble crowd around the newcomers and question Morpheus: "And whats thy name [?]" A little irritated by their harassment Morpheus answers:

Whome Pluto doth admire, and honor both I trowe,
 And Proserpine your Queene, mightie though they bee,
 And Mynos your Judge will doe the same I knowe.
 I am the God that alwayes dreames doth show.
 I am free this waye to guide and leade eache man,
 Without demaunde to knowe from whence I came.

("Prologue", B3v).

At this reply one of the rabble leave to tell Pluto: "My Lorde (quoth hee) thers straungers come to hel". The word "strangers" here indicates foreign rather than unknown since Morpheus already demonstrated that he was familiar with Pluto, Prosperpine and Minos when he introduced himself. In the title page the word "strange" responds to ungodly and different from virtue, but here it is reversed so the sinful rabble look at the god Morpheus and his companion Robinson as strange, meaning foreign.

After greeting the infernal king and queen Pluto reminds Morpheus that everyone in Hell is fixed in their place: "Except you two, who is in my gates within, / To pray for pardon it profytes not a pin" (B4r). Pluto's words call the reader's attention to the absence of a "harrowing of Hell" where Christ offers salvation to the damned on judgment day. Robinson's message is rigorously anti-Purgatorial and Pluto's words reinforce the point that the terrifying punishments in Hell are endless and inescapable.

But Morpheus is already aware of the rules in Hell and says that his only aim is to show Robinson how sins are punished. The didactic purpose in Robinson's journey depends on the harshness of the sins in Hell and Pluto grants them leave to travel anywhere in the realm:

Content (quoth Pluto) and commaundment he gave,
 Eache place for to searche in Hill, Dale, and Clowgh,
 In thicke or in thin, in smooth or in rough,
 In hote or in colde where ever it bee,
 The wickeds rewarde we shoulde both heare and see (B4v).

Although traditionally the topography of Hell is dominated by images of flames and fires, the infernal deity offers Morpheus an unlimited travel passport to roam freely in the areas that are both hot and cold.

Alan Bernstein offers a comprehensive account of the formation of Hell from its ancient Egyptian, Greek and Roman origins, its New Testament meanings and the tensions concerning the existence of Hell in the early Christian world in his comprehensive book The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds. He cites at least three New Testament books that state evidence of a place of eternal fire for the guilty: Matthew 25.31-46, John 3.16-17 and Revelation 20.10, 13-15.

Even in the Medieval Purgatorial accounts the sinners are always punished in flames and fire, and Robinson does not include a sinner tortured by arctic chills. It is possible Robinson was attempting to create a hyperbolic image of Hell through the stark contrast between hot and cold and did not feel that it was necessary to include an example of such a punishment.

Dante also referred to the cold of Hell in Inferno III when Virgil and Dante pass the gates of Hell. The travellers approach the place where Charon rows and the ferryman shouts to the travellers:

Woe to you, perverted souls!

Give up all hope of ever seeing Heaven:

I come to lead you to the other shore,

Into eternal darkness, ice, and fire (Inferno, III.84-7).

Satan's palace is in the centre of Dante's Hell - an arctic ice palace surrounded by darkness and the punitive fires. Charon's emphasis on the

eternal qualities of the darkness, the heat and the ice, work to stress the horrors of Hell to the pilgrim (Terpening 128-9). Robinson's contrasting adjectives do not carry the same weight that Dante's do because they are in the mouth of one deity to another in amicable conversation rather than a threatening image of the afterlife to a timid guest.

Robinson and Morpheus begin their journey and travel past the left side of Pluto's cave and this is where they officially enter Hell.⁷ The prologue is written in the past tense and so it looks back at his journey to Hell, not forward. Robinson therefore has the wisdom that the reader will have only after reading his account. He beckons his readers,

But what I sawe in this my drowsie dreame;
 And who they were as now to minde I call,
 Why and wherefore to you I shall proclaime,
 That thus they lost the joyes supernal,
 And have possest the wofull place infernall.

Lende me your eares for now my tale beginnes,
 How wicked wightes rewarded be for sinnes (B4v).

The focus of the poem is summarised in the final line quoted above and this effectively excuses the poet from his wavering theological views on some points. The only consistent point Robinson is confident of in the poem is that even in their earthly manifestations, sin and Hell are linked.

b) Tyranny, Pluto and Catholicism

⁷ Cf. In Virgil's *Aeneid* the path to the left after the Mourning Plains leads to Tartarus and the right leads to Elysium.

Robinson's epic includes the personal accounts of eleven famous sinners from myth and history. Only two of the figures discussed at length are distinguished by their corruption of the true faith, Pope Alexander VI and the legendary Pope Joan. Towards the end of his journey the poet catches a glimpse of Bishop Bonner chatting harmoniously with Pluto midway along the path in Hell near a makeshift ladder towards Heaven. Since the scope of this study does not permit me to provide a full detailed discussion for the entire poem, I limited the discussion of Robinson's de casibus accounts with a focus on the way he connects Pluto to Catholicism and earthly sin.

The most common sins Robinson attributes to the fallen figures in his de casibus epic are pride, ambition, whoredom and tyranny. The table below lists each figure and the sins attributed to them in Robinson's poem. Many of the figures in Robinson's poem are guilty of tyranny. Most of the figures recognise that they are in Hell because either they failed to beg for grace before it was too late, or because their damned fates were predetermined.

Sinner	Sins
Helen of Troy	lust and pride
Pope Alexander VI	ambition tyranny deceit necromancy
Young Tarquin	pride whoredom
Medea	whoredom murder
Tantalus	tyranny hypocrisy ambition envy
Vetronius Turinus	ambition pride tyranny
Heliogabalus	tyranny ambition whoredom
The Two Judges of Susanna	tyranny and false accusations
Pope Joan	ambition and deception
King Midas	tyranny
Rosamund	murder and pride

In Robinson's Hell all sinners are punished equally although each punishment he describes is distinctly suited to the sinner. Medea comments on this particular aspect of infernal justice when she compares her own crimes with Helen of Troy:

I knowe thou camst from place where Hellen rowes,
 in th' irksome lake where doubtfull Dragons bee,
 And yet hir wicked life and mine God knowes
 are not to be comparde ("Medea", F2v).

In the examples of different Catholic figureheads Robinson stresses how "this ouglie God" Pluto uses false doctrine to increase his kingdom. Catholics like Pope Alexander VI and Bishop Bonner are imagined as working for Pluto, the king of Hell, and Robinson makes them devils. This is consistent throughout the poem in Robinson's treatment of the Catholic sinners; Pope Alexander VI and Pope Joan and the two judges of Susanna from the Apocryphal Book of Susanna. The next section details Robinson's handling of the relationship between Hell and Catholic figureheads firstly by looking at the account of the wicked Pope Alexander VI and then at the meeting between Bonner and Pluto near a ladder towards Heaven.

The account of Pope Alexander VI opens with the infamous Pope appealing to Hell, the furies, and the prince of Hell:

O Hell, O Hell, deserved long agoe,
 and raging Furies that beare immoral spight
 [.]
 Thou filthy floode of Lymbos lurcking lake,

From choaked pitte, come belche abroade thy flames:
 Why come you not you Furies for to take
 a greater vengauce, I call you by your names
 [. . . .]
 Come Prince of darcknesse, give thy fearefull judgement
 O Hell unfolde thy gates ("Pope Alexander VI", D1v).⁸

After calling on the forces of Hell Alexander actually identifies his Catholicism as his weightiest sin:

O vile Idolatrie, the Prince of perdition,
 the waye thou directes to everlasting paines:
 O filthie moment, and wicked superstition,
 O blynde doctrine, Interpretor of dreames.
 O rotten relikes with all your addiction,
 fye upon you all, sith thus it comes to passe.
 Falsehoode in the end hath no remission,
 as witnesse our devillishe detestable mase (D2r).

In his placement of various nuns, priests, friars and monks in the same space as the Pope, Robinson uses the example of Alexander VI to represent the sinfulness of all Catholic dignitaries. Because he was particularly wicked on earth Robinson has further proof of the corruption in the Catholic Church.

⁸Alexander's plea for Hell to rise up and physically punish him on earth reflects the influence of Jasper Heywood's additions to Seneca's tragedy Thyestes on the tradition for writing about Hell that will be discussed in chapter three.

The Pope reveals that he used necromancy and conjuration to summon the Devil, who made him Pope in exchange for his soul. But Robinson imagines him as a tyrant because he corrupts Christians and actively recruits souls for Hell. In the book's verdict the book reprimands Alexander for leading the people astray:

And thus the wolfe devoured our good, & made us slaves &
drudges

Sackt our countries, spolyled our bloode, and made us live
like snudges.

Kilde our soules and bodies two, defloured wives and maydes:
And kept from us Christs testamet new, and gave us bels and
baides

Olde rotten rellickes, stockes, and stones, and Ceremonies
blinde:

With stinking pardons for the nonce, to feede our follish
minde (D3r).

Alexander's tyranny is understood in terms of his ability to keep the true religion from his people. His union with the devil serves to emphasise, for Robinson, the hellish nature of false doctrine. The idea that Hell has agents to recruit people for sin and damnation derives in part from the Elizabethan conception of Seneca's protagonists but also from the changing role of the vice figure in Elizabethan tragedy (discussed in chapter four). In the final part of this thesis we shall see how this idea that Hell physically recruits people on earth is a central part of thinking about sin and damnation.

Robinson's account of Pope Alexander as a particularly wicked Pope was not unique, nor was his link between the pope and the devil.

Alexander's corruption was stressed in Studley's translation of Bale's The Pageant of Popes printed in the same year as Robinson's poem (1574).

Studley's translation begins,

Alexander the sixt was a Spaniard borne in Valentia, called
 first Rodericus Borgia, he succeeded Innocentius: his deedes
 were so opprobrious and wicked, as hath beene sildome
 hearde. He was a very ryotous tyraunt & in league with the
 devil to obtaine the Papacye (fol. 170 r).

Bale further links the pope to wickedness in one of the verses made for his death in which he is compared to the tyrants Nero, Caligula and Heliogabalus.

Bale's confirmation that Alexander was assisted by the devil in his desire to be pope bestows earthly powers on the devil. By identifying Alexander as an agent for the devil, Studley shows how he brought ruin to others:

Though Alexanders name upon the stone be graven,
 Tis not that great: but he yet late was prelate shorne and
 shaven.

Who thirsting after bloud devoured so many a noble towne,
 Who tost & turned the ruthful states of kingdoms
 upsidedowne.

Who to enrich his sonnes so manye nobles slew,
 And wast the world with fire and sword & spoyling to him
 drew (fol. 173 r).

Here Studley says that Alexander was known to be vicious and bloody in order to increase his congregation and his personal wealth. Robinson imitates this appropriation when he links Alexander's vile character with his task as a recruiter for Hell in order to increase Pluto's realm.⁹

The link between Hell and sinners on earth is emphasised further when Robinson reports on the news between the Pope and Pluto in an interlude entitled, "Newes between the Pope and Pluto and of the Proclamation about the Ladder twixt Hell and Heaven". As they progress through Hell, Robinson notices a dark cave set aside from the main area. Looking past the cave he notices a passageway that opens up into a glade: "mee thought I sawe a glade, / That made a shoe as it a passage were, / Which was in deede of very purpose made" ("Newes", R1v). The glade is guarded by a "Gorgon with a Clubbe", who only allows sinners from Rome (i.e. Catholics) to pass into the cave: "Except from Rome, in, there he might not passe, / Or else some suche as trusted in the Masse" (R2r). The purpose of this reserved space in Hell is for the punishment of Catholics who died believing in false doctrine.

The Gorgon porter reveals that the cave leads to a ladder for souls to pass from Hell to heaven: "This way passe souls from paines to endesse blisse, / When please the Pope to sende his letters thither" (R2r). Sure enough Robinson and Morpheus see a messenger of the Pope bring a bundle of pardons and offer them to Pluto. This is a gesture of goodwill towards the infernal king, who appears pleased with the Pope's bundle and laments that this Pope had to die: "(A worthy Pope) thy decay

⁹ A further connection to Studley's translation is in Robinson's mention of Alexander's incestuous relationship with his daughter Lucretia. Robinson's Alexander tells that he left his son all his treasure but made his daughter a common concubine: "I lefte his Sister (whome both wee twoo) / as ofte as pleased us did use and take, / Carnallye eache night and daye wee knowe" ("Alexander" D2r).

I much deplore. / A Cater for my Kitchine, provider of the praye" (R2r). Pluto's remarks authenticate a previously uncertified conjecture about the relationship between Hell's king and the Pope. Furthermore, Robinson's poem points to a way of thinking about the Hell that indicates an anxiety that Pluto has agents on earth actively working for the souls of mankind.

After the messenger departs Robinson sees a friar of St. Francis calling together all the sinners whom the Pope sent to Hell because he pardoned them by virtue of the Mass (R2v). The sinners believed that this signifies their time of release from punishment and so they eagerly gather around the friar. Robinson notices that some men were not true to the Pope and were in doubt about their salvation: "Having no trust in the Pope nor his traditions, / But cal him the Captaine of Idolatrous superstitions" (R2v). Everyone else though, including Bonner, Gardiner and Fecknam,¹⁰ must try make a special ladder to escape what they think is Purgatory: "And the rest of [the Pope's] Rable in hande for to make, / A Ladder to reache into Heaven for your sake" (132-3). Their punishment

¹⁰ John Feckenham (c. 1510-1584) was Queen Mary's chaplain and confessor. He attended the disputations with Thomas Cramner, Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley. He was sent by Mary to question Lady Jane Grey (then Lady Guildford Dudley) about her treason and Protestantism and later stood by her as she awaited her death on the scaffold. He also questioned Princess Elizabeth but when she was crowned in 1559, Feckenham was allowed to remain at Westminster Abbey despite remaining true to the Catholic faith: "As the last de facto - as opposed to titular - abbot he has a prescriptive place in Catholic and especially Benedictine history; he belongs in equal measure to the old English monasticism of his first profession, and to resurgent tradition which reckons its descent from Marian Westminster" ("Feckenham", DNB). Stephen Gardiner (c.1495-1555) was a theologian who studied with Erasmus and who became indispensable to Cardinal Wolsey and Henry VIII, and, later, one of the most influential Catholic polemicists, for which he was imprisoned during Edward's short reign. During the reign of Mary Tudor Gardiner was freed and one of the pioneers for the restoration of Catholicism in England. He strongly advocated the arrest and imprisonment of Elizabeth and proposed that she was declared a bastard. John Foxe claimed that he even ordered Elizabeth's execution in the Tower, but there is no conclusive evidence for this. He died a natural death before the end of Mary's reign ("Gardiner", DNB).

is that they are forever paying the Pope, who offers them pardons, and despite the futility of the ladder, they continue to build towards heaven:

But loe (alas) the Popes willing minde,
 For money to release you of these bitter paines:
 So many thousands strove this ladder to climbe,
 That you mist the Heaven, and hee his great gaines:
 For bending it brake, with waight of your Chaines.
 By meanes whereof, therein, who put trust,
 World without ende, remaine heere they must
 And too short it was, by full ten degrees,
 And never could reach Gods glorye and blisse:
 Although hee, and his, were as busie as Bees (R3v).

The moral crux of this section is stated plainly in the next stanza when Robinson comments that the Catholic Church has confounded the Gospel of Christ and invented the idea of this imaginary ladder between heaven and Hell, "this Ladder, of the Popes owne device" (Q3r). He states that these transgressions against the true church have led not only to the Popes' falls and damnation, but also eternal damnation for everyone who follows Catholic doctrine.

Robinson's comic portrayal of the pitiable Catholics trying to reach Heaven follows the form of the dramatic dumb shows and their explanations in the tragedies discussed in part II of this thesis in the way the scene reveals meaning in Robinson's poem. Through a farcical representation of the Pope as Pluto's recruiter, luring Catholics with promises of salvation and redemption, and even continuing this farce in

Hell, Robinson discloses what he sees as a definitive physical connection between figures in Hell and sinners on earth.

This link is made explicit when Robinson and Morpheus spy Pluto commending Bishop Bonner as they depart from Rosamund and begin their exit from Hell. Robinson imagines the episode between Bonner and Pluto in a dramatic fashion with Bonner as the hero. At the sound of a trumpet, a yeoman announces Bonner's arrival:

Then after a while upon a stage full hye,
 An yll faste yoman a blacke Trumpet blew:
 And when silence was made, hee proclaimed a crye,
 In the name of Pluto for tydinges most true.

(Quoth hee) bloodie Boner the Butcher comes here,
 That hath furnisht our kitchin this many a yere
 ("Rosamund", P1v).

In the passage cited above Robinson repeats the idea that Hell has appointed agents on earth trying to increase Pluto's realm.

Robinson's interlude with Bishop Bonner in which he links Bonner directly with Pluto mimics the tone of Lemeke Avale's invective against Bonner, A commemoration or dirige of bastarde Edmonde Boner (1569).

Avale first establishes that Bonner cannot be considered a rightful bishop:

Boner, late usurped bishop of London, was a bastarde, and also the soonne of a Bastarde: that is a Bastarde in grosse, and a Bastade can not, neither maie not bee a bisshop. Boner was a Bastarde, ergo no bishop, and this a true conclusion ("Preface", A1yr).

Towards the end of *Avale's* text he offers a lesson from Bonner's example that links the bishop's actions on earth with Hell:

Boner was a greate hunter:
 Per ignem with, fire hotte,
 Nunc in putredine God wotte

Ubi est ergo nunc
 Either Frier, Nonne, or Monke,
 That can for a little space,
 Put hym a purging place:
 Now good man sir Pope,
 What doe your worship hope:
 In inferno nulla est redemptio (Ab2r).

Avale imagines Bonner as a hunter who is now in Hell, because no pope, friar, nun or monk can actually guarantee purgation after death. He also identifies Bonner as an agent for Hell when he says, "[Bonner] had a cancred proude looke, / With bell and candell, and Popishe booke: / In cursyng Gods people with hellishe grace".

Another link between *Avale's* account of Bonner and *Robinson's* epic is the episode with a ladder between Heaven and Hell. *Avale's* Bonner discusses his "Romish waies" and says that he could not bear the Protestant idea of justification by faith alone:

Justification I could not abide,
 Specially if it came on Christes side:
 I will clime heavens walles with Scala coeli (Ab2r).

The ladder to the skies ("Scala coeli") that Avale's Bonner mentions refers to the "sacred steps" in Rome that Catholics believe are the same steps Christ climbed when he received judgment from Pilate.

The steps, like the cave of Saint Patrick's Purgatory in Ireland, have been used as a place for earthly penance where Christians pray for salvation in the direction of Heaven. But the steps became just another feature of Indulgences Catholics could purchase from the Church for their salvation. Avale's juxtaposition of Bonner's rejection of "justification" and belief in the ladder to heaven is satirised in Bonner's repeated laments that he is not in purgatory now, but in Hell. Robinson makes more of relationship between Bonner and Hell by imagining him as one of Pluto's most honoured subjects.

In Robinson's Hell, the yeoman reminds his audience how precious Bonner is to their king and queen when the damned souls prepare a grand stage for Bonner's entrance: "nothing was wanting to set out the showe, / As by their diligence full well did appeere, / No man coulde be more welcome there I know" (P1v). Finally the stage is ready, "Foordth came Pluto, and Proserpin the Queene, / To meete Boner the sucker of soules, flesh, and bones" (P2r). Bonner is treated like royalty in Hell and all the souls line up to meet the famous officer so no one notices the god of sleep and his companion leave through Cerberus' gates: "Of Morpheus, and mee no man tooke regarde, / Their minde ranne so much of this noble man" (P2v).

In the next part of this study we shall see how the sentiment that Hell actively recruits humans is applied in the tragic dramas that engage with the Senecan trope for invoking Hell, such as George Gascoigne's Jocasta and Marlowe's Tamburlaine. Gascoigne's imagining that the Furies from Hell rise up to recruit men for Hell begins: "The wrathfull

sprites of all the furies there, / Who when they wake, doe wander every where, / And never rest to range about the coastes, / Tenriche that pit with spoile of damned ghostes" (Gascoigne 282). One of Tamburlaine's motivating philosophies is that the infernal deities appoint men, such as himself, to increase the size of Hell. He declares, "Hell and Elysium swarm with ghosts of men / That I have sent from sundry foughten fields / To spread my fame through Hell and up to heaven" (I Tamburlaine V.i.466-7). Both of these examples are discussed at length in chapter four and six respectively and both are evidence of the altered way Elizabethans were thinking about Hell's relationship to earthly horrors.

From where they spy Bonner and Pluto, Morpheus leads Robinson to Helicon. The Muses explain to Morpheus and Robinson why there was such excitement around Bonner's arrival in Hell: "A ha (quoth they) is Bonner there? That's Plutoes Butcher bolde. / It's Plutoes parte to welcome his, for service done of olde" ("Noble Helicon", R1v). The Muses' way of phrasing their understanding of Bonner's relationship to Pluto does not necessarily imply that Pluto picks agents, only that Pluto praises Bonner's active role in increasing the realm of Hell. This limits Pluto's role in encouraging sin so that events can still be seen within the frame of divine providence with God as author.

Robinson distances Heaven from Hell further by making Morpheus and Robinson the Muses' only means of knowing what goes on in Hell. The Muses weep at hearing about the punishments for people who longed for grace, even after death, and they say they are indebted to Robinson: "But in the fine a thousand thankes, they yielded Morpheus there: [. . .] And yong man (quoth Melpomina) sith thou hast taken paine, / Wee doe confesse for recompense, thy debtors to remaine" ("Noble Helicon", R1r).

Morpheus reports to the Muses how Alexander still has a dedicated retinue even in Hell: "[Morpheus] tolde [the Muses] of the Pope, that Alexander hight, / And of the Service that they sang, and used day and night" ("Noble Helicon", R1r). The Ladies of Heaven laugh out loud for the Pope, "The Ladyes all on Laughing fell, yea, rounde about the Tower", but lament the fates of all the other examples in The Rewarde of Wickednesse: "Yet wofull for the rest they were, because they wanted grace" (R1r). Alexander, once the head of the Catholic Church, is the only example in the poem who does not regret that he did not cry for grace and so the ladies of Heaven feel no pity for him as they do for the others. Here Robinson's idea of grace sounds a lot like repentance; he is a mouthpiece for the Elizabethan complexities in the doctrine of grace that penetrated doctrinal discussions.

d) Pluto's Court and Tyranny

In the epic, Robinson imagines a close relationship between Hell and tyranny in Pluto's kingdom. But his articulation of this relationship focuses on his understanding of the tyrant as someone who acts contrary to God. This is evidence in support of the theory of resistance to tyrannous rulers mentioned in the last chapter. Robinson links the magistrate who is seen to act contrary to God's will, as in the case of tyrants, with the infernal realm. The author fortifies this link between tyrants and Hell further by using tyrants not only as examples of sinners in Hell, but also as disciplinarians in Pluto's realm.

In the tale of Medea, rewarded in Hell for whoredom and murder, she warns the reader that those who chose to lead a tyrant's life will end up tormented in Hell:

But who so ever meanes, in wickednesse to byde,
 or leade a Tyranuntes life, in thend shall have rewarde,
 According his deserts, this cannot be denyed

("Medea", G1v).

Even though Medea never identifies tyranny as her sin, here she links her sins, whoredom and murder, with tyranny. Robinson qualifies Medea's tyranny as transgression against God in the lines that follow.

Firstly Medea laments, "O that witches and Conjurers knew so well as I, / of Joves mightie doome that doth in heaven sitte, / Then would they mende, if they had grace of witte" (G1v). So Medea's formula for avoiding Hell depends on grace, which allows sinners to mend their wicked ways, but those who choose to live the tyrant's life will endure the eternal punishments in Hell. Since she lacked grace, Medea claims she could not repent for her life of sin and thus she is tormented in Hell by tyrants:

To see the staring Devilles with fiery speares,
 on Dragons backes with poisoned pumples pight:
 As at a Quintan, at Medea, eche Tyrant beares,
 and through her runnes, that trickling blood appears.
 Then from the scalding heart, by violence out teares,
 Hote flames of fire, at woundes on every side,
 Monsters with hornes, and lothsome louped eares,
 Ranne on this wretch [Medea], with gnashing teeth (G2r).

Robinson imagines the devils that enact punishments in Hell as tyrants here and in the account of Helen. As she keeps her boat between the

shore and the jagged rocks, Helen says she must avoid the tyrants waiting to torment her:

For in a Boate berent on every side,
 (and as I sayde) [Helen] sittes, in every hand an Ore:
 And striveth styll betweene the winde and Tyde,
 nowe haling from the Rockes, and by & by from shore.
 The choyse is harde, when this refuge is best,
 to toyle amid these flaming fluddes as shee:
 Or else t'arive amid the Serpentes nest,
 for on the lande with blades the Tyrantes bee

("Helen", E3r).

In imagining the space of Hell, Robinson associated the acts of tyrants on earth alongside the acts of devils in Hell. The language he uses to describe the punishments in Hell combines the devil with tyranny and tyrants because of the way tyrants inflict terrible crimes against men on earth.

In the account of Rosamund, Robinson again shows tyrants inflicting the punishments to sinners in Hell:

And with these wordes a Tyrant with a hooke,
 In tender sides, the morall woundes hee printes,
 Another on a forke this wicked woman shooke,
 Nothing prevailed lesse, then for to crye with plaints
 A thousande naked blades in her they thrust,
 And still (quoth they) this woman was unjust

("Rosamund", P1r).

Rosamund is punished by tyrants with various utensils for her transgressions against *God* and here tyrants are imagined as devil's agents in Hell. In the next section of this thesis the link between earthly tyrants and Hell is made more evident in the way tyrants' actions on earth may be seen to mirror the tyrants behaviour in Hell.

Other examples of Robinson's link between the acts of tyrants on earth and in Hell occur throughout his journey in Pluto's court but he does not elaborate on the point. Vetronius Turinus, for example, tells Robinson and Morpheus that for his sins against the people to increase his power and wealth he was condemned to Hell and endures a punishment fitting for a tyrant:

The Gods also condemned me into Hell,
 Among the wicked sorte with whome I am possest.
 Of yrkesome Stigion whereas Phlegethons flames,
 The pompe of cruell Tyrauntes ever dayly tames.
 Loe this the lotte of wicked life in th' ende

("Vetronius Turinus", I3v).¹¹

In a similar fashion the Emperor Heliogabalus, by whom Turinus was employed, is punished in Hell for his tyranny. But Heliogabalus claims that the devil himself sparked his hunger for power and directed him in his tyranny (Turinus only claims that he lacked grace): "The Devill so

¹¹ Cf. Robinson's treatment of Turinus and Thomas Kyd's description of Hell. Here Turinus must endure the curses of his victims for his sins and one of the punishments that Robinson assigns him is that boiling gold is poured down his throat. In Thomas Kyd's *Induction*, the ghost of Andrea witnesses this punishment as he passes the usurers in Hell.

kindles his fire in my breast, / and fostered in mee such a detestable vice" ("Heliogabalus", K3r).

Robinson's understanding of sin and Hell relies on a personal relationship between devils and men; the damned are either chosen by the devils, as in the case of Heliogabalus, or they are working for the king of Hell to recruit more sinners, as in the case of Bonner and Alexander VI. The link with tyranny that is articulated inherently in Robinson's understanding of the personal relationship between the living damned and the devil is made clear in the context of tyranny as opposition to God.

In the case of King Midas, the ancient king from Phrygia is actually known by the name "Tiranny". Robinson imagines that Midas' earthly crimes were so detestable that Hell verbally reacted to his tyranny:

Whome lended hee his eares unto, but onelye unto suche,
As unto Pluto sacrificde theyr soules to gaine him muche?
Tyl at the last his Tiranny, the ayre corrupt with smell,
Whereat the Skies, did turne theyr hewe, and Limbo gan to
yell.

The Mountaines roare by Eccos voice, unto the Heavens hye,
The srikes and cryes of wronged wights, and al together
flye (Q1r).

In defining Midas' relationship with Hell, Robinson repeats the Senecan conceit that the universe reacts to human criminality (see chapter three) by closing the heavens and allowing Hell to infect earth. Earthly tyranny thus mirrors Hell by making the elements react unnaturally, as they might in Hell.

The examples Robinson includes in his account of Hell have one significant quality in common - that they all lacked grace. In the text, some sinners failed to beg for grace while others, for example Pope Alexander, did not even want grace. Bishop Bonner is depicted as a henchman for Hell and through his example, as in the example of Alexander and other Catholics, Robinson links sin on earth with the realm of Hell - in this particular case the sin is false doctrine. The other sinners' behaviour on earth; ambition, tyranny, deceit, necromancy, pride, whoredom, murder, hypocrisy, envy, false accusation and deception, are forgivable in themselves, except that these sinners failed to call for grace.

Tyranny, though, seems to go hand-in-hand with damnation and at times Robinson uses the term interchangeably with sin. We witness Pluto thank some of the damned for bringing in more souls to Hell but he does not actually appear to appoint anyone to do this task. But Robinson's link between Bonner and Pluto, and equally with Pope Alexander VI, is evidence of the shift in thinking about the origins of earthly sin.

At times Robinson is tentative about this relationship because it could suggest that there is an active and successful adversary to God. This is why the doctrine of predestination is particularly useful for Robinson in trying to negotiate the complexities inherent in topics about sin and damnation, but he does not consistently, or confidently, apply it to all the examples.

The poem's exploration of matters of sin and damnation in relation to Hell and Pluto acknowledge the relevance of these issues to an Elizabethan audience. Robinson's application of the de casibus form to the examples places them in the Elizabethan mirror tradition by making them proffer warnings about the rewards for sin.

Robinson's epic is a testament to the anxieties created by alternate ways of thinking about sin and damnation by its failure to direct the reader to any clear definitive way for avoiding sin or damnation. Willard Farnham comments, "[Robinson] simply serves in his humble way as a sign of the fervour which the conception of tragic justice was beginning to arouse" (306).

The way Robinson applies the frame of Hell to the de casibus form, emphasises, as in A Mirror for Magistrates, the relationship between Hell and earthly sin. This relationship is further developed on stage in the tragedies that create earthly mirrors of Hell discussed in the next part of this thesis.

Part II

Seneca and Elizabethan Infernal Tragedy

Part II
Seneca and the Elizabethan Tragic Mode

The meditations on sin and damnation that occupy the poems in the Baldwin editions of A Mirror for Magistrates and Richard Robinson's epic poem The Rewarde of Wickednesse, over ten years later, are a testament to the period's indecision regarding matters of faith. Coupled with the realisation in Protestant England that eternal damnation was the harsh cost of sin, was the threat of damnation irrespective of earthly sin in the doctrine of predestination.

The Reformers exploited the fears about damnation in their discussions about obedience under tyranny and rebellion, mentioned briefly in chapter one, by applying the threat of damnation to all sides of the argument. For example, while some key Protestant reformers stated that damnation was the cost of disobedience and rebellion, others maintained that obedience to a tyrant was ungodly and damnable. The poems in the Mirror testify to the relevance of the topic of tyranny to the Elizabethans and also indicate that there was a tendency to place the badly behaved magistrates in a hellish frame of reference. In the examples I discussed it was evident that some authors hinted at an active infernal role, usually in the form of Fortune, working in the fates of sinners, but this idea was not fully developed. In Robinson's poem there was a direct link made between Pluto and sinners on earth but the poet did not explore the implications of suggesting such a link. Robinson restricted this connection by making Pluto simply applaud a sinner in Hell although he did not necessarily assign the sinner's role on earth.

Part of the problem in trying to identify the origin of sin in de casibus accounts in light of revised theology lies in the poetic form.

When transferred to the stage, the de casibus form takes on a new dimension because authors can physically represent the influence of evil.¹ The second part of this thesis looks at the conventions for de casibus dramatic tragedy that influenced the thinking about Hell on the stage. Before discussing how early Elizabethan tragedies reflect this growing concern with Hell and damnation, chapter three examines the significance of the Tudor translations of Seneca's tragedies for representing evil and the Reformers' discussions of tyranny and obedience.

The influence of Seneca has been duly noted in various studies on Elizabethan tragedy and chapter three is designed only to place Heywood's translations, and his additions, in the context of early modern mirrors of Hell. Following on from that, chapter four locates the tragedies from the 1560s in this context by addressing their reliance on the debates on resistance and obedience under a tyranny that also occupy an element of the discussions in A Mirror for Magistrates.

¹ For further discussion on the tendency in early modern England to put strangeness, or otherness, onstage, see Bartels Spectacles, 1-26. Bartels shows how the tendency to put "otherness" onstage relates "the prominent emergence of imperialist ideologies and propaganda" (xiii).

Chapter Three The Elizabethan Senecan Tradition and the Reformation

In the Senecan tragedies over and over again comes emphasis in some form upon the folly of all ambitious effort, Seneca is a fountainhead of much ready-phrased thought for Christian Europe (Farnham 19).

The influence of Jasper Heywood's translations of Seneca's tragedies on English tragedy is most evident in the way ideas of Hell for Elizabethan cultural memory are shaped by Senecan tropes. Heywood placed special emphasis on the relationship between Hell and earthly sin by further framing the action in Seneca's tragedies in Hell. This chapter is designed to show how Heywood's translation of, and additions to, Troas and Thyestes were crucial to the development of Hell in Elizabethan tragedy.

Heywood's translations of three Senecan tragedies, Troas, Thyestes and Hercules Furens were all printed in England between 1559 and 1561; and by 1581 ten Senecan tragedies were available in English: Heywood's translations of Troas, Thyestes and Hercules Furens; Thomas Newton's Thebias; Studley's Agamemnon, Hippolytus, Hercules Oetaeus and Medea; Thomas Nuce's Octavia and Alexander Neville's Oedipus. Thyestes was possibly the most influential of Seneca's tragedies (even imitated by the young Shakespeare in Titus Andronicus).¹ Heywood's

¹ Robert S. Miola demonstrates how Seneca's Thyestes infiltrated the Elizabethan tragic sphere indirectly through Boccaccio and Lydgate: "Boccaccio included the stories of Atreus and Thyestes in his De Casibus and relied on Seneca tragicus elsewhere in the work" (Influence, 4). Miola's study focuses on Senecan influence in Shakespeare and he names five texts that stand out particularly; Troas, Phaedra, Thyestes, Agamemnon, and Hercules Furens. In another study on Shakespeare Miola specifies Thyestes as central

translations and John Studley's translations of Agamemnon and Medea, which first appeared in 1566, are the most influential source material for early Elizabethan ideas about Hell. Unfortunately the scope of this study does not permit a full investigation of all Elizabethan translations of Seneca and so I have limited the discussion to just Thyestes and Troas.

Jasper Heywood elaborated on Seneca's link between tyranny and Hell when he added a final scene to Thyestes and the figure of Achilles' spirit in Troas. Heywood's attention to this relationship between Hell and earthly sin anticipates the way later writers represent Hell on stage and will be made more evident in the final three chapters.

Past scholarship on Senecan influence on Elizabethan tragedy does not make enough of the Elizabethan translations of Seneca and importance of Hell in the translations. Before discussing the texts I will briefly outline the primary areas of study in Renaissance Seneca. My discussion of Heywood's two translations moves away from these readings and focuses on the use of Hell as a framing device for the main action in the tragedies.

The Elizabethan interest in Seneca coincides with the Reformers' lively debates about resistance and obedience under a tyranny. The link between the two types of writing is most evident when we look at how both inform early Elizabethan de casibus tragic dramas, such as the ones discussed in the next chapter.

The final part of this chapter offers a summary of the debates concerning tyranny during the late Tudor period. It is the disagreement amongst the reformers that particularly stands out from these

to Renaissance revenge tragedy, "Seneca's plays, especially Thyestes, shaped revenge tragedy into a three-phased action consisting of 1. atrocity; 2. the creation of the revenger; and 3. atrocity" (Reading, 116).

discussions and informs the tragedies that stage tyrants. Resistance theory was complex and involved the threat of damnation and Hell for those who made the wrong decisions. The Elizabethan dramatists in the 1560s responded to this uncertainty in their presentation of the correct moral stance in the face of tyranny.

I. Seneca and the Elizabethans

John W. Cunliffe rightly recognised the importance of Seneca on the Elizabethan tragic tradition in his straightforward study, The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy. Cunliffe's study highlights the inter-textual relationship between various Elizabethan tragedies and passages from Seneca but he dismisses the relevance of Heywood's additions to the development of tragedy. He rather crudely condenses Heywood's alterations:

Jasper Heywood added a long soliloquy to the Thyestes, and made in the Troas a considerable number of alterations, which he details in the preface to that tragedy; his additions are affected to some extent by the tastes of his time, but are for the most part after the style of the original, the third Chorus in Heywood's Troas being borrowed from the third Chorus in Seneca's Hippolytus (Cunliffe 4).

Cunliffe does not make more of the additions because his study is primarily concerned to show parallel passages in a selection of Elizabethan tragedies and the Elizabethan translations of Seneca.

Scholarship on the Senecan import in Renaissance tragedy has progressed considerably since Cunliffe's lacklustre study. In the 1980s Gordon Braden sought to define the Senecan tradition in its Roman and

Renaissance manifestations. In his book, Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege, Braden argues that past scholarship on the Senecan influence on Renaissance tragedy has overlooked, and therefore undervalued, crucial aspects of Seneca. Instead of reading Seneca's influence in the Renaissance as simple imitatio, Braden says that emphasis should be placed on the processes of continuity and change through which Senecan and Renaissance tragedy are linked (64). Braden demonstrates how England's Senecan connection evolved during the Renaissance and its particularly unique adaptation in Elizabethan tragedy.

Braden further locates the tragic mode in Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine and Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy as evidence of how Senecan rhetoric enveloped the English stage in the late-sixteenth century. Marlowe, says Braden, embellished the typically Senecan bombast: "Tamburlaine's rhetoric finds significant common ground with Senecan rhetoric as the language of the self's autarceia" (184). On the English stage, Braden contends, the villain hero comes into his own, as both a cautionary example, and as a figure we can sympathise with (196).

In the late 1990s, A.J. Boyle recognised the importance of the palimpsestic quality in Senecan tragedy, noting: "The pattern of tragic myth, like the pattern of history, remains constant. [. . .] Like the past, the myth changes to remain the same" (90). Senecan tragedy thus shares with the de casibus stories an element of showing a divine pattern that the repetition of falls in human history should emphasise.

Boyle notes many important aspects of Seneca in Renaissance tragedies but still stated that the most important influence of Seneca on English drama is the tragic rhetoric. He argues that in English tragedy, "a host of Senecan rhetorical topoi [. . .] express the inexpressible, to give the control of rhetorical form to unbridled passion and pain [. . .] to

construct tragic character out of the very grandiosity and cosmic dimensions of the language used" (160).

In her recent book, Tragedies of Tyrants: Political Thought and Theatre in the English Renaissance, Rebecca Bushnell recognises the importance of Senecan Stocism to early modern Europe. She points out that Seneca's criticism of the tyrant looks hypocritical next to his intellectual and political support and financial gains at the side of the emperor Nero. But, Bushnell points out, Seneca indicates this ethical ambivalence in his philosophy that traditional wisdom serves the needs of imperium (Bushnell 32).

Seneca's essay De Clementia (On Mercy) is addressed to Nero and was intended as a guidebook for the young prince, who had only just turned eighteen. The tyrant, said Seneca, could be distinguished from the king by his clemency: the tyrant shows no clemency but the king does and so even if a king is greedy and cruel at times, he may still be called king if he shows clemency:

Tyrants take delight in cruelty. But the difference between a tyrant and a king is one of deeds, not of name [. . .] it is mercy that makes the distinction between a king and a tyrant as great as it is, though both are equally fenced about with arms; but the one uses the arms which he has to fortify good-will, the other to curb great hatred by great fear, and yet the very hands to which he has entrusted himself he cannot view without concern

(Seneca De Clementia, I.xii.1.3).

The Senecan tyrant, argues Bushnell, is more ambitious, more bloodthirsty and more self-obsessed in his overreaching desire: "Seneca

represents the tyrant as possessed by the savagery of passion" (Bushnell 32). She later determines, "It is the Senecan tyrant, above all, who thus helped to shape the Renaissance tyrants consumed by ambition as well as lust" (34).

In Seneca's essay "On Providence", mentioned earlier in chapter one, the philosopher explained that the world does not work arbitrarily but that all events are governed by a higher power: "Even those phenomena which seem irregular and undetermined [. . .] no matter how suddenly they occur, do not happen without a reason" (I.3-4). The ideas expressed in Seneca's philosophical works on providence and clemency are reproduced in different forms in the tragedies. The introduction of prophecies and curses, such as the threats of the Fury Megaera in Thyestes and the presence of the spirit of Achilles in Troas to the ideas of providence and clemency, make the tragedies applicable to the Elizabethan concerns about damnation and Hell.

a) Thyestes and the Inexorable Curses of Hell

The appeal of the tragedy Thyestes in England at a time of religious questioning reveals some of the important elements that contributed to the anxieties about damnation. Seneca's Atreus is driven to commit heinous crimes against his brother when he hears of an alleged affair between his brother and his wife and becomes inflamed with rage, or furor. He even goes as far as to impose his own fantasy on Thyestes when he claims that Thyestes did not kill Atreus' sons and serve them in a banquet to him because Thyestes thought his nephews were actually his own sons: "it was only one thing that stopped you, you thought they were yours" (Seneca Thyestes, 1109). Atreus' gross misunderstanding of his brother's character reflects his own wickedness and he frames his

horrifying revenge as justice for the crimes Thyestes may have committed against him.

There is no textual evidence for the charges of adultery against Thyestes and his brother's wife, Aerope, and thus Thyestes is apparently an innocent victim to his brother's ire. Yet Thyestes fails to respond to his brother's verbal attack with equal tenor and in the end Atreus' evil nature is triumphant while Thyestes cowers to seek divine justice from the heavens.

The audience is meant to feel uncomfortable with Atreus' victory and Thyestes' passive faith in the heavens. For Seneca, this difficult end perfectly represents human irrationality and the effects of uncontrolled passions. But for Jasper Heywood, this moral paradox was not suited to a Christian audience; in the added material at the end of the tragedy he transforms Seneca's morally unresolved tragedy with Christian eschatology. By adding an additional scene in which Thyestes, not Atreus, begs for punishment from the infernal deities, Heywood returns the play to Hell, where it began. All the events in the tragedy are therefore framed by the infernal realm and we can map the intrusion of Hell onto the earthly events of the play.

Seneca's Thyestes and his brother Atreus both act according to the destructive curse of the Fury on the house of Tantalus. In the first scene the Fury rouses Tantalus with threatening words to remind him of the consequences of his sins for his descendants:

Onward, damned shade, and goad thy sinful house to madness
[furiis]. Let there be rivalry in guilt of every kind; let the
sword be drawn on this side and on that; let their passions
know no bounds, no shame; let blind fury [caecus furor] prick

on their souls; heartless be parents' rage, and to children's children let the long trail of sin lead down; let time be given to none to hate old sins - ever let new arise, many in one, and let crime, e'en midst its punishment, increase (Seneca Thyestes, 24-32).

Thyestes, who maintains his composure throughout his stay with his brother in Argos, enacts the fury's curse and is driven by caecus furor. When he implores the gods to curse Atreus at the end of the play, Thyestes echoes Megaera's curse on Tantalus. In turn, Thyestes' furor will only bring further destruction to the house of Tantalus and so the cycle of tragedy on their wretched house will continue, sine fine.

On the day Atreus slaughters Thyestes' sons to feed them to their father, the sun ominously refuses to shine. Heywood's translation of Seneca's chorus works to tell the audience how nature failed to engage with the earth on this fateful day:

The wonted turnes are gone of day and night,
 The ryse of Sunne, nor fall shall be no more,
 Aurora dewish mother of the light
 That wonted to send the horses out before,
 Doth wonder much agayne returne to see,
 Her dawning light
 [.]
 And now commandes the darkenes up to ryse,
 Before the night to come prepared bee

(Heywood Thyestes, 191-202).

For Thyestes, this sudden darkness was a sign that the punishments Tantalus was promised for him and his progeny would be realised on earth.

In the Latin original Seneca highlights the brutal contrast between the brothers in their final dialogue with one another. Seneca portrays Atreus as wholly evil as he relishes his crimes, but Thyestes invokes our sympathy when he learns that he has consumed his own children.

In Seneca's tragedy Thyestes' only response to the knowledge that he has consumed his own children is his vota: "The punishing gods will be present; / my prayers for your punishment will be delivered to them" (Seneca Thyestes, 1110-2). Thyestes' reply distances him from his evil brother on a moral level but it also reveals a misplaced confidence in the divine judicial system following his failed pleas to Jupiter in an earlier scene (Tarrant 243). In vain, Thyestes appeals to Jupiter when Atreus tells him the fate of his children and the substance of their feast: "O thou, exalted ruler of the sky [. . .] make compensation for the banished day" (Seneca Thyestes, 1077-85). His appeal goes unanswered and Thyestes accepts his [mis]fortune: "But if naught moves the gods, and no divinity hurls darts against the impious, may night stay on forever, and cover with endless darkness boundless crimes" (Seneca Thyestes, 1092-96).

In the end Atreus achieves another verbal defeat over his brother's vota by getting the last bitter word: "I deliver you to your sons for punishment" (Seneca Thyestes, 1112). Atreus turns Thyestes' vota around and offers him the constant reminder that he has consumed his own children: "Atreus clearly gets the better of this last exchange, since the punishment he speaks of is not of hope (vota te tradunt mea), but a reality (te ... trado)" (Tarrant 243).

The difference between the brothers' characters is even more salient in the context of Seneca's musings on human virtue and vice. For Seneca, tyrannical behaviour and immorality were indelibly linked. He discusses the fate of the tyrant, or the cruel man, contrasted with the fate of the virtuous in the moral essays (see chapter One). In De Constantia Sapientis, Seneca differentiates between insult and injury because he says that virtuous people can tell the difference. Seneca determines that injury is far more serious than insult, which should only be complained of and not avenged.

What distinguishes virtuous people is that they do not react to insult or injury with vicious behaviour. The wise man cannot be affected by the proud or the arrogant and so he is not affected by insult because only the proud and arrogant bestow insult. Furthermore, the only people affected by insult are the weak: "And so, any man who is affected by insults shows himself to have neither wisdom nor self-confidence (Seneca Constantia X.3, Translation adapted slightly). By refraining from reacting with equal vice, Thyestes acknowledges a divine pattern working in human events because he leaves the punishment to the gods. However, Heywood's additions work to transform Thyestes' weakness into laudable Christian humility.

Kerrigan summarises the relationship, in Senecan tragedy, between nature and human events:

Senecan tragedy presents a natural order which convulses with horror at human perversion. This is why, when Thyestes devours his children, the stars and planets go awry and darkness covers the day (Kerrigan 112).

This subversion of the natural order of day and night reflects the earthly crimes of men. By doubly framing the play with scenes invoking Hell, Heywood reinforces the idea that nature reacts to human horrors because the infernal presence of Hell offends nature's sensibility. There is no satisfying conclusion or resolution at the end of the tragedy and the audience is left with the sense that Megaera removed all sense of order from the world (of the play) with her curse.

Heywood's additions at the end of the play go further than simply a moral separation of good and evil by making Thyestes accept moral culpability for this crime.² Thus Atreus is portrayed as morally wicked and wholly undeserving of any sympathy despite the charge of adultery. Consequently, Thyestes's plea for purgation is intended to frame him as a repentant sinner, thus opening up the possibility, for the Catholic Heywood, for his salvation. In Heywood's additional material Thyestes cries out to the furies in Hell and is reminded of Tantalus' sins before he begs for the transfer of all punishments suffered in Hell onto him:

Flocke here ye fowlest feendes of Hell,
 and thou O grandsier greate,
 Come see the gluttid gutts of mine,
 with suche a kynde of meate,
 As thou didst once for godds prepare.
 let torments all of Hell
 Now fall uppon this hatefull hed,
 that hathe deserved them well (2729-2736).

² That is not to say that Seneca's tragedy is only about the separation between good and evil. Seneca explores the causes and consequences of moral opposites and in Thyestes evil is represented by furor, epitomised in an actual Fury, Megaera.

Heywood's protagonist begs the infernal deity (Pluto) to punish him for his wicked deeds but he does not ask for death - or an end to this tragedy.

Thyestes protests that his crime is far worse than his ancestor Tantalus': "Thou slewst thy son but I my sons, / alas have made my meate" (2745-6). Crucially, in the additional scene Heywood's Thyestes desires punishment for the act of eating his children, not, for the alleged affair with Atreus' wife. The sin that Thyestes expresses regret for is one he was unable to avoid and that he committed without knowledge. This further complicates our understanding of the tragedy - the Fury's threats at the beginning indicate that both brothers are doomed to fall. From the audience's perspective, Atreus is the morally culpable brother for killing and cooking his nephews and serving them to Thyestes and so Atreus' fall should be read as a moral one and Thyestes' fall is psychological.

In Richard Robinson's poem discussed in the last chapter, Alexander's cries to Hell to bring forth punishments on him, "unfolde thy gates" (see above, 119), echo Heywood's Thyestes' cries to Dis:

Thou filthy floud of Lymbo lake,
 and Stygian pool so drye,
 From choaked chanell belche abrode.
 thou ferfull freate of fyre,
 Spue out thy flames O Phlegethon:
 and over shed the grounde.
 With vomite of thy fyrye streame,
 let me and earth be drownde. (2769-2776).

The one crucial difference between Heywood's added lines and Alexander's cries is that Thyestes begs for punishments on earth and asks Hell to rise up from below to punish him, but Alexander is already dead when he calls for Satan to punish him.

So for Heywood, Thyestes' cries for punishment are an acknowledgment of his sins before death and give him the opportunity for salvation. But Robinson's Alexander, and indeed most of the characters encountered in The Rewarde of Wickednesse, waited until it was too late to beg for grace and are eternally damned. Heywood leaves the possibility that Thyestes can pay for his sins in Purgatory but Robinson stages his poem in Hell to emphasise the consequences of sin.

In the final scene, Heywood imagines Thyestes invoking the chthonic deities to come up from Hell and punish him on earth. He beckons Hell to swallow him for his sins:

Breake up thou soyle from botome deepe,
 and geve thou roome to Hell,
 That night, were day, that ghosts, were gods
 were woont toraigne, may dwell.
 Why gapste thou not? Why do you not
 O gates of Hell unfolde? (2777-82).³

Here Thyestes begs for castigation before death so that Nature can return to a clean state: "Take vengeance fyrst on him, whose faulte /

³ Cf. Alexander Neville's translation of Oedipus' response to discovering his familial ties to Jocasta at the end of Oedipus: "O Earth why gapst thou not for me? why doe you not unfolde / You gates of hell mee to receave? why doe you hence withholde / The fierce Infernall Feends from me, from me so wretched wight?" (Neville 230).

enforceth you to flee" (2795-6). Finally, completely distraught, Thyestes cries,

And on your wrathe, for right rewarde
to due deserts, wyll call.
ye scape not fro me so ye Godds,
still after you I goe,
And vengeance aske on wicked wight,
your thunder bolte to throe (2807-2812).

The open cry for punishment stems from the fear of the terrifying punishments in Hell but equally from the belief that punishments can be curative and work towards a soul's salvation.

Thyestes' repetition of Tantalus' sin (eating his children), and his echo of Megaera's curse on to his brother at the end, stresses the endlessness of their tragedy and the futility of men to counter a divine ordinance. Thyestes' curse also emphasises Atreus' control, since Thyestes can only defend with words, and not actions. Similarly, in Marlowe's epic drama, discussed in chapter six, opponents to Tamburlaine's tyranny are only allowed verbal resistance, and even that can be fatal, as in the case of Agydas and Calyphas.

In Seneca's essay "On Anger", the Stoic links furor with uncontrolled ire and consequently with destruction, even endless tragedy. For Seneca, anger and its companion furor represent two of the most serious ills for mankind: "How great a blessing to escape anger, the greatest of all ills, and along with it madness, ferocity, cruelty, rage, and the other passions that attend anger!" ("On Anger", II.xii.6). But Seneca does not believe that men are naturally prone to anger by nature and he explains how men may overcome the dangers of ira: "There are a thousand other instances

to show that persistence surmounts every obstacle and that nothing is really difficult which the mind enjoins" (II.xii.5).

For those unable to control their anger, Seneca argues, the path towards ruin is inevitable. At one point Seneca employs the legendary example of Ajax's madness to show how furor infects men and leads them to commit acts of destruction:

There is no quicker road [than too much passion] to madness. Many therefore, have continued in the frenzy of anger, and have never recovered the reason that had been unseated. It was frenzy that drove Ajax to his death and anger drove him into frenzy. These all call down death upon their children, poverty upon themselves, destruction upon their house, and they deny that they are angry just as the frenzied deny that they are mad (II.xxxvi.5).

The repetition of the word "frenzy", or "furor" in Latin, in the line to explain Ajax's disaster brings into focus the malevolence of this particular characteristic. The Latin reads, "Aiacem in mortem egit furor, in furorem ira".⁴ The words that stand out for our attention in this sentence point to Seneca's emphasis here - we notice the words "death", "madness" and "anger".

The relevance of furor to tragedy, at least for Seneca, is most poignantly made in the tragedy Thyestes when an actual personification of the emotion, the Fury Megaera, rouses Tantalus from Hell. As a result

⁴ Here Seneca recalls Sophocles' dramatisation of Ajax's tragedy whereby he was inflamed with furor by the goddess, and went mad, killed a herd of sheep thinking they were the Greeks, and then committed suicide.

of Tantalus' crimes Thyestes and Atreus both act according to the destructive curse of the Fury on the house of Tantalus.

Although the Fury never actively engages in Atreus' malice, she claims responsibility for the ensuing tragedy as she torments Tantalus at the start of the play. In this frame Atreus' quest for revenge, for an affair which apparently never occurred, is not only uncontrolled ire, but it demonstrates the irresistibility of Hell's influence on human actions.

In the example of Thyestes and Atreus, the Fury claims to incite hatred to avenge Tantalus' crimes against the gods, but there is no evidence that Megaera actually influences the wicked brother. The induction indicates that the brothers were fated to fall but it was Atreus' freely-made decision to punish Thyestes by feeding him his children. There is a presiding element of predestination that orders the events in the play and Atreus' inherent wickedness is framed within this providential plan by the Fury's prophecy; the alleged affair is simply a plot device to instigate Atreus' wickedness.

When Heywood supplements Seneca's tragedy in the final scene, he emphasises the endless cycle of tragedy, but he also verbally attempts to move Hell to earth. In Seneca's tragedy, the brothers' crimes are imagined as part of an infernal plan, especially in the way a Fury begins the play with her threats to the house of Tantalus. The end of the tragedy mirrors the beginning but, crucially, the final scene takes place on earth.

The force of Hell, furor, which is the motivation for the tragedy, thus creates a mirror of Hell on earth in bringing about the tragic events. The suffering and torments inflicted as a result of furor anticipate similar events in Hell, which is why, for example, Tantalus is plagued with eternal hunger and thirst for serving his son Pelops as food to the gods

and why his house is cursed to repeat violent acts from generation to generation: Tantalus' crimes are repeated in Hell and on earth. Heywood complicates the Senecan formula by making Thyestes plea for purgation but the idea that the forces of Hell can influence earthly actions is what Elizabethans respond to when they apply this frame to de casibus tragedy.

b) Troas: Infernal Achilles

Seneca's tragedy, Troas, has two simultaneous plots and does not have a single principal character, although Hecuba remains central to the two stories. Both plots involve the sacrifice of a young Trojan; one plot focuses on Polyxena's struggle for her life and the other on Astyanax's. The tragedy examines the human suffering of Hecuba, wife to king Priam and mother of Hector and Polyxena. Hecuba's tribulations are exacerbated because of her familial relationship to both victims: she is also Astyanax's grandmother (Hector and Andromache were the parents of Astyanax). Because she does not turn to sin or vice following the death of her husband and the double tragedy of losing a child and a grandchild, Hecuba is an example of moral strength in the face of harsh adversity.

In the end both Polyxena and Astyanax are sacrificed to make amends for the Trojan War. John G. Fitch recognises that the experience of suffering in Troas is central to Seneca's tragedy. He argues that the tragedy proclaims a lesson in the fragility of power and the idea of death as a haven (Fitch 167). Heywood recognised the link between Seneca's tragedy and the de casibus examples because Hecuba, like the Biblical Job, was an exemplar of God's infinite power.

Heywood even adds a chorus at the end of Act One that places the tragedy in the Boccaccian de casibus framework. The chorus warns,

[The Fates] sit above, that hold our life in line,
 and what we suffer, downe they fling from hye
 No carke, no care, that ever may untwine
 the thrids, that woven are above the skye

(Heywood Troas, 537-40).

This warning follows Hecuba's lament over the fallen state of Troy and all the lost heroes. The chorus continues to mention the volatility of Fortune and how she mixes pain with pleasure:

In slipper joy, let no man put his trust
 let none dispayre, that heavy happes hath past
 The swete with sowre, she mingleth as she lust
 whose doubtfull web, pretendeth nought to last (553-6).

Heywood's additional chorus works to locate the example of Troy within the de casibus frame by introducing the workings of the Fates.

However, after the additional chorus, Heywood adds a scene where the spirit of Achilles appears onstage to demand a human sacrifice (in the Latin original Talthybius only repeats the spirit's demands). This alters the scope of the de casibus framework Heywood applies to the classical tragedy by emphasising the infernal influence. But also, more importantly, by staging a ghost that claims to come up to earth from Hell, Heywood creates a dramatic mirror image of Hell on earth from Seneca's dark psychological portrayal of human suffering.

When the spirit of Achilles first arrives onstage he states that Hell seeks vengeance for his slaughter in the holy temple of Apollo. But immediately following, he states that his ire was so great that Hell could not contain him:

The depe Averne my rage may not sustayne
 Not beare the angers of Achilles spright
 From Acheront, I rent the soyle in twayne
 and through the ground, I grate again to sight
 Hell could not hide Achilles from the light,
 Vengeans and blood doth Orcus pit require,
 To quench the furies of Achilles yre (616-622).

Before he reveals what his vengeance will include, Achilles reinforces the image of Hell on earth with the mention of his revenge. In three consecutive stanzas he verbally augments his threat from Hell. First he says that the fates conspire from the deepest pits of Hell to seek vengeance: "But now of vengeans comes the yrefull day / and darkest dennes of Tartare from beneath / Conspire the fates: of them that wrought my death" (634-6). And then he says that the river to Tartarus craves blood for Achilles' murder:

Now mischief, murder, wrath of hell drawth nere
 and dyre Phlegethon flood doth blood require
 Achilles death shalbe revenged here
 With slaughter such as Stygian lakes desyre
 H[ecuba's] daughters blood shall slake the spirites yre
 (637-41, emphasis my own).

Here the infernal spirit makes the claim that Hell's fury, the wrath of Hell, is getting closer to earth and seeking vengeance. And in the next stanza Achilles imagines the fires of Hell threatening earth for revenge:

From burning lakes the furies wrath I threate,
 and fyer that nought but streames of blood may slake
 The rage of wynde and seas these shippes shal beate,
 and Ditis depe on you shal vengeans take,
 The sprites crye out, the earth and seas do quake
 The poole of Styx, ungrateful Grekes it seath,
 With slaughtred blood revenge Achilles death (644-650).

Achilles' threats climax in this stanza when he maps the world of Hell onto Troy. Finally the spirit claims, like Tamburlaine will also claim, that he makes the earth quake with fear, "[t]he soile doth shake to beare my heavy foote / and fearth again the sceptours of my hand [. . .] For dreade and terrur of Achilles spryte" (651-7). Heywood's inclusion of the spirit of Achilles alters Seneca's tragedy by making it not just a tragedy of human frailty but about the sinister workings of Hell and its citizens on earth.

Heywood's additions to the tragedy Troas show that Hell can penetrate the earth and influence the actions of godly men and women in the way he frames the tragedy of Hecuba in the context of a curse by an infernal spirit. Heywood's vision mapped onto the two tragedies, Thyestes and Troas, contrasts with the way late-Elizabethan tragedies map a plan of preordained damnation on to the lives of sinners. In Thyestes, Heywood moves the narrative from the space in Hell where

Megaera curses Tantalus to Argos where Thyestes imitates the opening scene by naming the horrors of Hell (780-1023 cf. 2685ff.). The Tudor embellishment of Seneca's tragedies thus presents the forces of Hell on earthly actions as a powerful obstacle in human experience.

Shortly after leaving Oxford in 1558, Jasper Heywood left England for Rome, where he was accepted into the Society of Jesus and eventually was ordained as a Jesuit priest in 1570. On his return to England, Heywood was imprisoned in the Tower and later exiled to the South of France where he later died. Even though Heywood's additions are rooted in a Catholic tradition, they influence the thinking about Hell for the Elizabethan Protestant tradition. Despite leaving the tragedy open to a positive resolution with Thyestes' cry for forgiveness, the tragedy still ends with the impact of Thyestes invocation to the chthonic deities. The Senecan philosophy regarding divine providence that governs the action in the tragedy makes it particularly poignant to Elizabethan Protestantism. In a world where good and evil actions are governed by the powerful force of destiny the threat of Hell, or the "wrath of hell", can make earth feel like Hell, as Hieronimo discovers when he searches for justice in The Spanish Tragedy.

Thyestes is a victim of a force that could not be reckoned with; Atreus' actions could not have been anticipated or warded off with good moral behaviour, as the de casibus accounts in A Mirror for Magistrates might suggest. Equally, Hecuba could not counter the Hellish spirit of Achilles with virtue because she was not in control of this aspect of her destiny and her personal tragedy should not be understood as reflective of her moral character.

Heywood's additional material to the Senecan tragedies place the narrative examples of people afflicted by bad fortune in a hellish frame

of reference. The link between Hell and bad Fortune is a key element to the Elizabethan anxieties about predetermined damnation and signals a shift in thinking about damnation and sin that some early Elizabethan tragedies evidence. Heywood's additional links between Hell and sin on earth in Seneca's tragedies are typical despite the Catholic beliefs of the writer and reflects the cultural concepts of sin and Hell during this period.

Questions of obedience and tyranny are central to the tragedy Gismond of Salerne, first performed in 1567/8. The collaborative tragedy is the only extant tragedy from the 1560s which directly links hell with tyranny. In the fourth act, written by Sir Christopher Hatton in the style of Sackville's "Induction" and Heywood's additions to Thyestes, a Fury appears onstage. The tragedy was published in a modernised version in 1591 as Tancred and Gismond and although it was not very successful the second time, its publication during a period of heightened interest in stage-tragedy demonstrates the commonness of the idea that the spirit(s) of Hell directly influence actions on earth.

Hatton's fury Megaera claims that she was summoned at the request of a grieving ghost, Gismond's dead husband:

Blacke Pluto [. . .]

in winning Ceres daughter Quene of helles,

and partly movèd by the grevèd ghost

of her late prince, that now in Tartar dwelles,

and prayed due paine for her that thus hath lost

due care of him (Gismond, IV.i.26-31).

The fury reveals the three judges in the underworld agreed to send ruin to Gismond's father Tancred and to Gismond by sending the infernal Fury to earth:

by great and grave advise
of Minos, Æac, and of Rhadamant,
hath made me pearce the soile, and rise
above the earth, to dole and drere to daunt
the present joyes wherewith Gismonda now
fedes her disteindëd hart (31-36).

Here, Hatton's appropriation of the three judges from the underworld places them in an infernal role; sending a Fury to earth to wreak ruin in Gismond's house. By staging the Fury Hatton demonstrates how writers represent the fear that the forces of Hell infiltrate human actions on earth.

The examples of Tancred and Gismond gain the most relevance to the development of the relationship between tyranny and Hell from the plays links with the "A Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion", which could almost act as a gloss. The epilogue brings this reading of the play sharply into focus:

And for the furie yow shall understand,
that neither doeth the litle greatest God
finde such rebelling here in Britain land
against his royall power, as asketh rod
of ruthe from hell to wreke his names decay
(Gismond, Epilogue 17-21).

As we shall see in the next section, the "Homily" is unswerving in its defence against rebellion: even if the ruler is cruel and tyrannous, the people must obey: "a rebel is worse then the worst prince, and rebellion worse then the worst government of the worst prince that hitherto hath ben" ("A Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion", 214). In this light, Gismond's disobedience to her father, the king, demands punishment.

II. Reformation Resistance Theory: Obedience and Rebellion

Initially, Martin Luther decreed that any resistance to any magistrate is unlawful because all authority is ordained by God.⁵ Luther's essay, "Temporal Authority: to what extent it should be obeyed" (1523) explains his social and political thought regarding the Christian's place in the spiritual kingdom (the Church) and in the political world (the realm of secular authority). Both kingdoms, Zwei Reiche, are ordained by God, but the realm of secular authority is distinct from the spiritual world of Christ because it concerns civil obedience.

Luther proposed that the visible Church ought to be under the control of the godly prince:

since the temporal power is ordained of God to punish the wicked and protect the good, it should be left free to

⁵ The term magistrate was applied to both sovereigns and also any subordinate officers within the state, such as judges, lords and dukes during the Renaissance. From the fourteenth century the word magistrate simply meant any member of the executive government. From around the middle of the sixteenth century the term was applied mostly to judicial powers ("magistrate," OED).

perform its office in the whole body of Christendom without restriction and without respect to persons, whether it affects Pope, bishops, priests, nuns or anyone else (qtd. in Skinner 15).

In attributing all temporal authority to an ordained secular minister, the prince, Luther also proposed that since this authority was God's providence, the prince's power should be always be obeyed.

In response to a period of misrule in Germany, "Temporal Authority" begins by first recognising the problems in the present government: "For God the Almighty has made our rulers mad" (Luther 1). Luther reprimands princes who abuse their power but acknowledges the contradictions inherent in the premise that even tyrannical rulers must be treated as gracious. From his insistence on the Pauline contention that all powers stem from God (Romans 13.1), Luther argues:

[tyrannical rulers] are thereby presumptuously setting themselves in God's place, [. . .] Nevertheless, they let it be known that they are not to be contradicted, and are to be called gracious lords all the same (Luther 1).

The German Reformer's teaching oscillates between the idea that all rulers must be obeyed because God must be obeyed, and the belief that tyrants should be passively resisted, yet still endured.

After the German Peasants Revolt (1524) Luther revised his doctrines of non-resistance to tyranny. In his essay, "Whether Soldiers too can be Saved", he still maintains his stance that all political rule is ordained by God and that resisting this rule is resisting the will of God.

He still contends that men must endure the rule of the tyrant: "If injustice is to be suffered, then it is better for subjects to suffer it from their rulers than for the rulers to suffer it from their subjects" (4). But now Luther includes his contentious argument that the tyrant is appointed by God periodically to punish men for their sinfulness.

Luther was persistent in his belief that rulers, good or bad, should not be opposed with violence. Basically, God reserves the right to punish ungodly rulers; in fact, Luther says that God even allows evil rulers a period on earth. Citing Scripture, he says that "[God] permits a knave to rule because of the people's sins" (5). For Luther, the existence of a mob is only further proof that the people need punishment: "The presence of the sword shows the nature of the children under it: people who, if they dared, would be desperate scoundrels" (5). Since a tyrant cannot harm a soul, Luther advises men to suffer the injustices of tyranny. God, he says, will punish the tyrant but if men actively resist the tyrant then they will also be punished for defying God.

When men defy God's Law⁶, Luther argued, they make the struggle between their will and God's will evident and therefore initiate Divine wrath because this is evidence of how God's will is opposed to the sinner's will: "The Law and the exposure of sin, or the revelation of wrath, are convertible terms" (qtd. in Watson 119 n.110). Men who resist the Law of God therefore also resist the Divine will, which is, as Luther points out,

⁶ For Luther the Law is revealed in the natural law, the Mosaic law (or Decalogue: man's duty to God and man's duty to his neighbour), and the Gospel commandment of Love (of God and our neighbour). The Law is fulfilled when, "our behaviour is governed by love in our hearts, and love of such a kind that we would 'do the works' even if they were not commanded" (Watson 106). However, Luther says that only men who are fallen are under the Law, because their will is at variance with the Divine will and they do not abstain from evil and love by their own accord (108).

hostility to God. According to Luther, these signs can only indicate Satan's influence.

Jean Calvin's 1536 edition of the Institutes of Christian Religion also promoted the doctrine of obedience even to tyrannical rulers. Calvin cited Scripture and determined that tyrants and bad magistrates were appointed under God's command in order to punish men for their wickedness. Calvin altered his argument in the later editions of the Institutes by making exceptions to this rule when he argued the people could resist a magistrate. In the revised editions he firstly stipulated that if obedience to the tyrant was disobedience to God then the people could rebel; and secondly, if the people beg God for mercy against a tyrant, God may send someone to assist in their plight (Skinner 191-194). At the end of the 1559 Institutes, reissued in response to various Catholic uprisings across Western Europe, Calvin writes, "let us console ourselves with this thought, that we truly perform the obedience which God requires of us when we suffer anything rather than deviate from piety" (Calvin 82).

In 1550 the Lutheran pastors at Magdeburg openly discussed a theory of rightful resistance in light of the Catholic uprisings. Their conclusions, published in The Confession and Apology of the Pastors and other Ministers of the Church at Magdeburg, diverged from the Calvinist response that God sometimes chooses citizens, or His servants, to take action against an ungodly magistrate. The Lutherans categorically insisted that an inferior magistrate is allowed to resist a superior magistrate when that magistrate persecutes the people: "our magistrates ought to resist this oppression by the mandate given by God" (qtd. in

Skinner 208).⁷ The key distinction here is that the Lutherans only granted powers of resistance to other magistrates while the Calvinists decreed that Christian subjects had obligations to resist tyranny, but not necessarily react against a tyrannous magistrate.⁸

By the 1550s the aims of the radical Calvinists in England and Scotland diverged from the aims of the Calvinists in Germany and Switzerland. On the continent, the Calvinists focused their attention on a theory of resistance via an inferior magistrate. The Calvinist in England and Scotland,⁹ though, turned to the private-law argument for political resistance put forward by Luther and the Philipp Melanchthon.

In England, the key Reformers John Ponet and Christopher Goodman argued that if God ordained tyrants to reign on earth and men believe it is just to resist them, then we problematically make God the author of evil. They both resolved this dilemma by suggesting, quite controversially at first, that not all powers are ordained by God. The arguments of Ponet and Goodman vary in their methodology but in the end they both reach the same conclusions: "When our rulers are tyrants or oppressors, 'they

⁷ During the same time as the Confession, Calvinists like Bucer and Beza were proposing their own theories of resistance similar to the one offered by the Church at Magdeburg. Both Lutherans and Calvinists then were developing similar theories of resistance which were largely based on a Lutheran theory of constitutional resistance put forward in 1530 by Brück, and later accepted by Luther and Melanchthon.

⁸ After the Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre in Paris (1572), Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor in Geneva, revisited the question of obedience to tyrants in a document entitled, De Jure Magistratum / On the Rights of Magistrates (1574). In support of the military action by the Huguenots in France, Beza suggested that inferior magistrates could legitimately resist a tyrannical ruler. This was fully realised in the Edict of Nantes (1598).

⁹ In 1554, Calvin formally disassociated himself from the Scottish Calvinist John Knox, whose writings against female monarchs displeased Queen Elizabeth and also threatened the success of Calvinism in England. For the purposes of this study, Knox's writings are of minimal importance and so I prefer to focus on John Ponet (1514-56) and Christopher Goodman's (c. 1520-1603) writings. Ponet and Goodman both aimed to develop a theory of lawful resistance based on the private-law theory of the Lutherans which Calvin himself refused to accept.

are not God's ordinance', so that 'in disobeying and resisting such, we do not resist God's ordinance'" (Skinner 228). Tyrannous magistrates, argue Ponet and Goodman, come to their position accidentally - or when the people make the wrong choice. They determined, from evidence in Scripture, that God preordained magistrates and enabled His people to recognise and accept His choice (by God's gift of grace). Ponet and Goodman supplied lists of criteria for choosing and electing a ruler, if the ruler is tyrannical then it is the fault of the people, not God.

In A Short Treatise on Political Power Ponet established how to distinguish a tyrant from a godly magistrate. He determined, "an evil governor men properly call a tyrant" (Ponet 5). Next he addressed the question of whether it was lawful for men to depose a tyrant. Both secular and Biblical history, he argued, provided many examples of instances where it was just and lawful to depose or kill a tyrant: "to depose and punish wicked governors has not been only received and exercised in political matters, but also in the church" (Ponet 6). Ponet emphasised how Christians have a duty to uphold God's commandments even if that means resisting their ruler.

Ponet's argument for resistance includes positive examples of men and nations who resisted tyranny. In closing Ponet offers English Christians the following warning:

Read all the history of the Bible, and the prophecies of the prophets, and you will evidently see how people and nations have been destroyed for maintaining such idolaters and wicked men as the papists are, and where such wickedness has been used and not corrected (Ponet 21).

In the 1550s the English Protestant reformers saw resistance to tyranny as an obligation Christians had to their God. Failure to meet this obligation and permit tyrants and idolaters to rule leads to the annihilation of nations and people.

Christopher Goodman proposed a slightly altered doctrine for resistance in his treatise published about the same time as Ponet's. His proposals differed from Ponet's because he supported the private-law theory proposed by Luther and Melanchthon. With the reissue of Melanchthon's Epitome of Moral Philosophy in 1546 and Prolegomena to Cicero's Treatise on Moral Obligation in 1554, the Reformers enforced the theory was that when a magistrate behaves immorally and exceeds the limits of his office then he eliminates himself from an ordained position. The unlawful magistrate reduces himself to a private citizen and therefore is subject to the laws of that society. In Goodman's treatise How Superior Powers Ought To Be Obeyed By Their Subjects: And Wherein They May Lawfully By God's Word Be Disobeyed And Resisted (1558) he states this view plainly,

But whereas the kings or rulers are become altogether murderers of their subjects, then ought they to be accounted no more for kings or lawful magistrates, but as private men: and to be examined, accused, condemned, and punished by the Law of God, where unto they are and ought

to be subject, and being convicted and punished by that Law, it is not man's, but God's doing: whom as He does appoint such magistrates over His people by His Law, so does he condemn well them as the people transgressing against the Law (Goodman 38).

Goodman further stated that Christians only owe obedience to those magistrates and superiors who fulfil their office. If they are not obedient to God and His will then the Christian should punish the ungodly magistrate and depose him. Goodman determined that if people endure the reign of such a magistrate and you continue to flatter him then they will not obtain peace but the wrath of God and be subject to His punishments (Goodman 52).

In total contrast to Ponet's arguments, the popular Tudor document "A Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion" defends passive resistance to tyrannous regimes. The homily, which was printed first in 1547 and then again in 1570, states that the only way to overcome the punishment that God sends is to pray for forgiveness so that he may send a good prince, or make a tyrant act like a king. But this was not confined to the discussions of religion as issues of obedience and rebellion were published by the government of Mary Tudor.

The author offers a warning that men must remain obedient or be condemned to Hell, like Lucifer:

Wherefore, good people, let us as the chylidren of obedience feare the dreadfull execution of God and lyve in quiet obedience to be the chylidren of everlasting salvation. For as heaven is the place of good obedient subjectes, and Hell the

pryson and dungeon of rebels against God and their prince, so is that realme happy where most obedience of subjectes doth appeare, being the very figure of heaven; and contrarywyse where most rebellions and rebels be, ther is the expresse similitude of Hell, and the rebels them selves are the very figures of feendes and devyls, and their captayne the ungratious patterne of Lucifer and Satan, the prince of darknesse, of whose rebellion as they be folowers, so shall they of his damnation in Hell undoubtedly be partakers ("Homily", 229. My emphasis).

In the passage cited above the author clearly links rebellion with Hell and the devil. The threat of damnation for rebels contrasts with the author's reflections on heaven and obedient subjects so that the reader clearly understands that rebellion should be regarded as a devil's game and indicative of damnation.

It was not just that the moral character of the tyrant that interested the Elizabethans, but also of the victims of tyranny. The scope of the discussions on obedience and resistance demonstrate that both sides of the debate used the threat of damnation for very different ends: Ponet, for example, said that by allowing a tyrant to reign subjects disobey God and therefore bring their own damnation but the Homily threatened damnation to those who rebelled against any of God's magistrates.

The writings of the reformers on the continent and in England and Scotland were mirrored in the political and religious motivations of tragic dramas from the early part of Elizabeth's reign. Despite the intense

radical debates among the Reformers, English prose writers, poets and dramatists tended to follow the formal stance of the government in representing tyranny and resistance.

So although there were radical ideas circulating about resistance, they were, at first, restricted to Protestant treatises while poets and dramatists tended to follow what they understood as the homiletic line. That is not to say that writers began to consciously incorporate this aspect of the argument into their writings or that they did not struggle to point to a specific way of dealing with tyranny and rebellion.

Chapter Four

From Among the Grisly Ghosts: Tyranny and Obedience in Four Early Elizabethan Tragedies (Cambises, Gorboduc, Jocasta and Horestes)

The debates about political resistance were arduous and lacked consistency: the Calvinists contributed to the discussions by identifying a distinction between the office and the person of a magistrate. With this distinction in place, the Reformers could distinguish between a lawful magistrate and an ungodly one. The next hurdle for the Protestant polemicists concerned the question of whether a magistrate who did not fulfil his duties was a power ordained by God. On the one hand they argued that magistrates are decreed by Divine Providence, yet, at the same time they maintained that tyrannous magistrates were not ordained at all. The theory of constitutional resistance suggested that it could be lawful to resist a tyrant-magistrate. The discussions disclose how problematic it was to now argue that God preordained tyrants to reign periodically because their resistance would be defiance of God's will.

Between the start of the Protestant Reformation in Europe, when Luther famously nailed his Ninety-Five Theses on the door of a church in Wittenberg in 1517, and the 1550s when Ponet and Goodman were writing theological treatises in England, the Protestant argument concerning tyranny dramatically "flip-flopped" (to borrow a phrase from the recent US election campaign).

Initially, Protestant doctrine stated that it was damnable to resist the rule of a tyrant. But later the doctrines changed and threatened Christians that they would be damned if they did not resist the rule of a tyrant: by allowing the tyrant to reign Christians were breaking God's commandments. The foremost theologians in each emerging confessional identity attempted to establish the legitimate ways that a Christian could

resist a tyrant by using the threat of damnation in each of their arguments. At one point Protestants were told that they could only passively resist their magistrate, but this later changed so that in certain circumstances active resistance was permissible.

Due to their concern with questions of obedience, tyranny and rebellion, the tragedies discussed here reflect the unease with which the Elizabethan public responded to yet another change of regime; the fourth including *Lady Jane Grey*, in just over a decade.¹ English tragedies from the 1560s mark a significant point of departure in English drama because of the way they apply the de casibus form to the discussions of Hell and damnation.

This chapter examines the interplay between Elizabethan discussions of tyranny and obedience and Elizabethan anxieties about damnation in Cambises (1560/1); Gorboduc (1561/2); Jocasta (1566) and Horestes (1567). Each tragedy discussed in this chapter is important to the development of English Renaissance drama because they offer evidence of the impact of the discussions on tyranny and obedience and the fear of the infernal forces of Hell infiltrating human actions.

The hellish description of life on earth that is associated with the reigns of tyrants in later-Elizabethan tragedy, such as Tamburlaine and Richard III, is not commonplace in the 1560s but there is an indication

¹ Stephen Greenblatt has recently summarised the spirit of this period concerning Shakespeare's life influences: "within [his parents'] living memory, England had gone from a highly conservative Roman Catholicism - in the 1520s Henry VIII had fiercely attacked Luther and been rewarded by the pope with the title "Defender of the Faith" - to Catholicism under the supreme headship of the king; to a wary, tentative Protestantism; to a more radical Protestantism; to a renewed and militant Roman Catholicism; and then, with Elizabeth, to Protestantism once again. In none of these regimes was there a vision of religious tolerance. Each shift was accompanied by waves of conspiracy and persecution, rack and thumbscrew, ax[e] and fire" (Greenblatt Will, 93-4).

that acts of tyranny in the plays are linked to Hell and the devil. Collectively the tragedies from the 1560s offer further evidence of Elizabethan thinking about tyranny and resistance. Two tragedies performed in the 1560s, Cambises and Gorboduc, address topical concerns of government: the first deals with the consequences of tyranny and obedience to a tyrant and the second makes advice to the ruler on succession matters its didactic framework. Two other important tragedies from the late 1560s, Jocasta, and Horrestes, use a classical, pagan setting rather than a quasi-historical English background. In these tragedies the authors conscribe a Christian moral message onto the pagan framework in the discussions of tyranny and evil.

Early in the last century W.A. Armstrong commented that the growth of royal power in Tudor England was paralleled by what he calls, a heightened "ethical and literary interest in the moral responsibilities of kings and in the manifold evils which arose when they did not observe them." (162-3). Rebecca Bushnell recently reiterates Armstrong's point that sixteenth-century "discourses of tyranny" centred on classifying the tyrant in terms of moral character (Bushnell 37-8).

This chapter looks at the representation of the tyrant, and responses to that figure, in the reformers' debates about tyranny and resistance to tyranny. In determining what leads a king to behave like a tyrant, as in the example of Cambises, Elizabethans questioned whether the sinister nature of a person was crucial to understanding acts of tyranny. That questioning, which comes through in the tragedies' concern with forms of obedience and resistance, is intimately bound up with the "unsurety" (see above, 87) in the period with regard to damnation and Hell.

The four tragedies discussed in this chapter are a testament to the concerns raised by the disagreements about resistance and obedience. Both Cambises and Horrestes imagine tyranny and wickedness as products of a direct sinister influence and contribute to our understanding of the relationship between tyranny on earth and Hell in the way the political sphere and the infernal realm are linked. The discussions of Jocasta and Gorboduc focus on the tragedies' concern with civil disobedience under a tyranny.

In the recent past, scholarship on early Elizabethan tragedy has focused on placing the plays from the 1560s into the larger development of English drama. Critics have looked primarily at how the playwrights altered, or imitated, source material and adapted it to the native homiletic and morality traditions. At present, the scholarship on early Elizabethan tragedies reveals that there is a gap in our understanding of how early Elizabethan tragedies fit into the development of English tragedy. One of the aims of this chapter is to reconsider the plays in light of the political discourses and the concern with damnation and Hell they engage with and how this affects the development of Elizabethan tragedy.

In the alterations from their sources do these plays reveal anything that may help us to understand the tragedies of Kyd, Marlowe and Shakespeare? Equally, do the later tragedies of Kyd, Marlowe and Shakespeare provide evidence for a better understanding of early Elizabethan tragedy? To understand how meaning in late Elizabethan tragedy is enhanced by the early Elizabethan tragedies we must first look to the tragedies from the 1560s and identify the crucial innovations that are particular to England in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. This chapter will argue that in their exploration of tyranny and resistance

theory, the early Elizabethan dramatists pioneered a new hellish direction in English tragedy.

Part I: Reformation Resistance Theory in Cambises and Horestes

a) Cambises

Thomas Preston's tragedy Cambises and John Pickering's Horestes address questions of obedience and resistance from opposite doctrinal perspectives. The distinction between Horestes' duty to actively resist the tyranny of Clytemnestra and the passive resistance to Cambises tyranny wholly encapsulates the complexities of the Elizabethan conception of the polemical tracts on resistance and obedience.

Both tragedies stage a vice character who is uniquely Elizabethan in the way he departs from the traditional metaphoric role of the vice. In their departure from the homiletic morality plays these tragedies, I will argue, give evidence for the relevance of Senecan tragedy to the native tragic tradition. *Ambidexter* and *Revenge*, like the *Fury Megæra* and the spirit of *Achilles*, play no active role in the tyranny of their protagonists or their falls. Although they represent an evil force in the world of the plays, their role is metaphorical and only serves to place the narratives in relation to the discussions of tyranny.

In Cambises and Horestes the Vice is simply a personified characteristic, and although it is still metaphorical, here it is an abstraction of an already present characteristic. So, if *Cambises* is predisposed to behave like a tyrant, the Vice *Ambidexter* will bring that quality to the fore. Preston and Pickering allude to contemporary discussions on tyranny and obedience with an emphasis on divine providence. Thus, the role of the Vice is not central to the audience's

interpretation of what causes the protagonists' tyranny but reveals how the protagonist was predisposed to villainy. The discussion of these two early tragedies juxtaposes the discussions of tyranny and evil in Cambises and Horestes with the objectives of "An Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion" discussed in the previous chapter.

W. A. Armstrong (1946) describes Thomas Preston's tragedy Cambises as a morality play shaped by Elizabethan orthodox ideas of tyrannicide. He locates the play within a group of tragedies that depicted the falls of evil kings and argues that these types of plays conform to the contemporaneous sermons and chronicles about tyranny, notably the "Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion". Armstrong concludes that Preston stages a self-inflicted death for the tyrant because Elizabethan political doctrine forbade resistance to Cambises' rule:

The sudden death of King Cambises by divine intervention, without a subject's raising a hand against him, is the ideal solution to the problem of his tyranny from the point of view of contemporary morality (165).

Bernard Spivack and Irving Ribner (Age of Shakespeare) read the play similarly, agreeing (loosely) that Preston's play teaches Tudor political doctrine. Spivack finds Cambises' death as evidence of the doctrine that magistrates and rulers are subject to divine providence:

in the tyrant's 'odious death by Gods Justice appointed' the playwright is able to point up an admonitory example of the

penalty to which evil rulers and magistrates are subject at the hands of divine providence (Spivack 284).

Spivack maintains that the ethical formula for Cambises is undermined by the play's violent sensationalism and while it aims at keeping with the moral homiletic tradition, the play actually appeals to the audience's emotions.

Tracing the story of Cambises through Johan Carion's Chronicorum Libri Tres, Richard Taverner's The Garden of Wyshedom and finally Preston, Ribner links the texts through the political doctrine that wicked rulers will eventually be punished by God. He identifies the drama as an historical morality play:

A classical story [. . .] told in order to illustrate principles of political theory, and morality abstractions mingle upon the stage with real historical characters. Thus the morality level and the historical level are separately preserved (Ribner Age of Shakespeare, 50).

All three texts, argues Ribner, show that obedience is necessary at all times despite extraordinary evil: "The oppressed subject, however, may feel certain that God will always exercise his power of vengeance" (53).

Ribner places Preston's play in the context of a developing tradition for English tragedy, a tradition which understood tragedy as illustrating retribution to men for crimes that stem from his own sinful nature and his own deliberate choice of evil (57). Cambises' chief purpose, suggests Ribner, is to show that tyrant rulers and tyrannous regimes will inevitably come to an end through divine providence.

But an audience accustomed to the didacticism of texts like A Mirror for Magistrates and John Foxe's Acts and Monuments could not be content with the example of a wicked tyrant who is punished only with death, which comes eventually to everyone. One of the aims of this chapter is to show how in staging the Vice Ambidexter, who does not play an active role in the play, Preston's tragedy is more complex than Ribner's historical and moral limitations allow.

Spivack recognises the innovations to the traditional homiletic Vice in Ambidexter. He states,

like the play to which he belongs, Ambidexter is the Vice theatricalised and in transition - a metaphor so common that it has partially lost its dependent meaning and become self-sufficient (Spivack 291).

Spivack's recognition of the altered role of the Vice, whom he says could only survive because he was metaphysical, only extends to the naming of the vice in order to identify the infernal role, rather than the evil he personifies.

In his study of the way writers were thinking about tragedy in the 1560s, Peter Happé reconsiders Spivack's conclusions about the role of the vice in Preston's play. Happé argues that by the addition of Ambidexter to the historical material from Taverner's Garden of Wyshedome (1539), Preston highlights a malicious aspect to the king's fall. The playwright is thus able to highlight the particular evil of double-dealing and uses ambidexterity as the cause of Cambises' fall: "Playing with two hands is dealing in destruction, and thus [Ambidexter] is the agent of the devil working in the traditional way for the ruin of mankind"

(210). This is an aspect of Cambises' ruin that is not mentioned in his source material and is an important element to understanding why Preston includes *Ambidexter*, if not simply to explain Cambises' turn to tyranny. Since *Ambidexter* does not actively attempt to ruin figures in the play our understanding Cambises' turn to tyranny is complicated by his presence.

The Prologue in *Cambises* establishes the moral dimension of the de casibus framework by presenting three key pieces of advice for a ruler, citing a tragedian, a politician and a philosopher. The first point of advice stems from an ancient tragic poet, Agathon;² the second from the ancient Roman orator and rhetorician, Cicero; and the third from the philosopher Seneca: "The sage and wittie Seneca his words therto did frame: / 'the honest exercise of kings, men wil insue the same'" (11-12). Seneca is cited here as a philosopher although he is primarily known as a tragedian.

After citing Seneca's warning about dishonesty in kings, the crux of the tragedy is made clear: "But, contrariwise, if that a king, abuse his kingly seat, / His ignomie and bitter shame, in fine shalbe more great" (13-14). With this, Preston's tragedy is firmly placed within the Elizabethan de casibus tradition.

The prologue of *Cambises* acts like Baldwin's dedication to A Mirror for Magistrates by introducing the relationship between bad kingship, or tyranny, and ignominy. Baldwin's dedication even parallels bad rule with devils: "What a fowle shame wer it for any now to take upon them the name and office of God, and in their doinges to shew them selves divyls" (Campbell Mirror, 65). Preston's recognition of this relationship launches

² "Agathon, son of Tisamenus of Athens, was the most celebrated tragic poet after the three great masters [Sophocles, Euripedes and Aeschylus]" ("Agathon," OCD).

his tragic drama in a similarly infernal frame when he introduces the lessons of abused kingship.

Before the play begins the Prologue places Cambises' death within a Providential plan so that he is punished, in the end, for his immoderate hubris:

When he had wrought his wil,
 Taking delight the innocent his guiltlesse blood to spil
 Then mighty Jove would not permit to procecute offence,
 But, what mesure the king did meat, the same did Jove
 commence,
 To bring to end with shame his race. Two yeares he did not
 raign (29-33).

In staging his tragedy as a mirror for kingship, Preston realigns the story of Cambises, his one good deed and his fall to tyranny and death, by including a moral dimension and making it a mirror for present magistrates. To emphasise the mirror aspect of the tragedy, the play even begins with a mirror for Cambises in the figure of the wicked judge Sisamnes.

At the start of the play we witness Cambises begin his reign with intentions to extinguish vice and proceed in virtue. He declares this intention to his counsel at the start of the play when he speaks of following in his father's footsteps. In response his counsellor advises him to remain steadfast in these goals:

But then your Grace must not turne backe from this
 pretenced will;
 For to proceed in vertuous life imploy indeavour stil;

Extinguish vice, and in that cup to drinke have no delight;
To martiall feats and kingly sport fix all your whole delight
(Cambises 31-34).

Cambises agrees that these are also his goals and he proceeds to follow the good advice from his counsellors until after his one good deed he turns to vice.

To understand why Cambises dramatically changes from a just king to a terrible tyrant it is important to recognise the steps in the process of his transformation to tyranny. The audience are reminded that Cambises was once a good king; that he appointed a judge to rule in his absence, and then punishes that judge for his transgressions. But later Cambises kills the innocent child of his counsellor Praxaspes, has his brother murdered, and then orders the assassination of his wife. The cause of Cambises' turn to wickedness is suggested, I will argue, in the cup that the counsellor advises Cambises to avoid. This is made more evident at the middle of the play when Shame reveals that Cambises drinks daily from the "damned Vices cup" (348).

The wicked judge Sisamnes' corruption is at first contrasted to the benevolent rule of King Cambises because he punishes the judge's transgressions publicly. Ambidexter even acknowledges, "Cambises put a judge to death, - that was a good deed" (1151) at the end of the play. However after this initial act of righteousness, the king progresses from one bad action to another, bringing ruin to those around him. At the end of the play Ambidexter highlights the king's cruelty by mentioning how he killed a young boy, his brother and his wife just prior to his death on stage.

Cambises' wilful transformation into the epitome of an evil tyrant ultimately leads to his own fatal fall. Ambidexter complicates this example by locating Cambises' change of character within a Chaucerian tragic frame when he says that the king's actions are the "pitie" of his life.

The counsellor who speaks with Cambises at beginning of the play and advises him to appoint a magistrate in his stead also advised the king, "Extinguish vice, and in that cup to drink have no delight" (33). For the start of his political career Cambises outwardly follows this advice, but before he appears on stage a second time, Shame discloses hidden information about the relationship between Cambises' character and Hell.³ Shame, who comes up from Hell, suggests that even before Cambises meets Ambidexter he already turned to vice:

From among the grisly ghosts I come, from tirants testy
train.

Unseemely Shame, of sooth, I am, procured to make plaine
The odious facts and shameles deeds that Cambises king
doth use.

All pietie and vertous life he doth it cleane refuse;

Lechery and drunkennes he doth it much frequent;

The tigers kinde to imitate he hath given full consent;

He nought esteems his Counsel grave ne vertuous bringing-
up,

³ Cf. Stephen Hawes' The Pastime of Pleasure where Fame details noble historical figures and then tells of the beauty and virtue of La Bell Purcell in the Tower Perilous. Fame directs him first to the Tower of Doctrine and leaves her two greyhounds Governance and Grace to assist the poet in his journey. Preston's employment of Shame here instead of Fame further indicates the ungodly implications her presence indicates.

But dayly stil receives the drink of damned Vices cup
(341-48).

Here, Shame associates tyrants and grisly ghosts together in an unmentioned place that sounds very similar to Hell when she uses the adjective "grisly". Sackville's *Sorrow*, for instance, used the word "grisly" to describe her residence in Hell: "Among the furies in the infernall lake: / Where Pluto god of Hel so griesly blacke / Doth holde his throne" ("Induction", 109-11).⁴

When Shame identifies a purpose to her presence she indicates that she is a type of messenger. Just as good fortune, or Fortune's presence, anticipates damnation in *A Mirror for Magistrates*, Shame's presence indicates a similarly damnable occupation: "As Fame doth sound the royal trump of worthy men and trim, / So Shame doth blow with strained blast the trump of shame on him" (351-2). Here Shame reveals that she only blows her horn for men who drink from the cup of vice.

Shame's confession maps a predetermined plan on to the life and deeds of Cambises so that his turn to tyranny is understood accordingly. Because he is understood as an ordained ruler, this explains, in part, why no one in the play actively resists Cambises (and survives). More importantly however, is how Shame's confession dismisses Ambidexter

⁴ Sackville also uses the word "grisly" to describe Avernus and the mouth of Hell later in the "Induction": "first to the griesly lake / [. . .] An hydeous hole al vaste, withouten shape, / Of endles depth, orewhelmde with ragged stone, / Wyth ougly mouth, and grisly Jawes doth gape" ("Induction", 176-206).). The word "grisly" was commonly used to describe infernal qualities in Elizabethan tragedies: Jasper Heywood's translation of Seneca's *Thyestes* identifies Pluto as the king of the "grisly ghosts of Hell"; Thomas Churchyard questions, "Thou sprite, thou man, thou grisly ghoste: Why standst thou still" (*A Pirates Tragedie* 1579). See also Edmund Elviden's tragic poem *The Historie of Pesistratus and Catanea* (1570).

from blame for Cambises' turn to tyranny since the king has not even met the Vice yet.

Shame links the "damned Vices cup" that Cambises drinks from with his wickedness and reminds the audience of the cup that holds the wrath of God in "Revelation": "And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth" (16:1). When the angels pour the contents of the cup on earth everything comes to ruin: the seas flow with blood, the sun scorches everything and darkness covered the earth. But the most pernicious effect is of the unclean spirits that are released when the seven angels empty the vials of God's wrath: "For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth" (16:14).⁵

Just after Cambises orders the execution of the wicked judge, the counsellor, Praxaspes, approaches the king with concern about his drinking habits: "O king, in freendly wise I councel you in this, - / Certain vices for to leave that in you places is: / The vice of drunkennes, Oh king, which doth you sore infect" (479-481). The king is enraged at Praxaspes' suggestion of drunkenness and seeks revenge against the counsellor's words: "Me to revenge these thy words I wil go wreke this spight: / When I the most have tasted wine, my bow it shalbe bent" (510-11).

Cambises tells Praxaspes to bring his young son before the king and if the king can hit his heart with his arrow then this may serve as proof

⁵ Because of the wine contained in Cambises' cup, the audience are also reminded of the whore of Babylon, the mother of all abominations: "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through an abundance of her delicacies" (Revelation 18:3).

that he is not drunk. But before Praxaspes returns, the king beckons for more drink in preparation for his task:

Once againe inlarge this cup, for I must tast it stil.

Drink.

By the gods, I think of plesant wine I cannot take my fill!

Now drink is in, give me my bow and arrows from sir knight;

At hart of childe I meane to shoot, hoping to cleve it right

(531-4).

The wine increases Cambises' wicked desires yet it does not seem to make him drunk - he is even able to shoot the child in the heart as he planned.

At the end of this episode Cambises mocks Praxaspes for thinking that the wine was making him drunk: "Esteem thou maist right well therby no drunkard is the king / That in the midst of all his cups could doo this valiant thing" (564-5). It is the king's outward appearance of sobriety that suggests the cup affects him in a hidden way: because Shame identified Cambises' cup as the cup of Vice, alongside the cultural relevance of the book of Revelation, the audience should recognise the sinister nature of the cup.

Cambises' brother recognises the implications in the king's drinking habits. When he mentions the king's tyrannous behaviour Diligence replies, "If that wicked vice he could refraine, from wasting wine forbere, / A moderate life he would frequent, amending this his square" (632-3). Smirdis' companions blame the cup that Cambises continues to drink from, stating that he could stop his wicked deeds if he ceased taking the wine. Diligence also advises silent obedience to the tyrant

when he tells Smirdis to remain quiet and not to speak of the king's bad behaviour.

After Ambidexter reveals all Smirdis' concerns, Cambises orders his brother's execution. Preston achieves a further association of tyranny with Hell on earth when Smirdis replies to Murder and Cruelty as they strike him, "Consider, the king is a tirant tirannious: / And all his dooings be damnable and parnitious" (724-725). When Smirdis asks the executioners to consider that the king is a tyrant, he questions Cambises' authority: if the king is a tyrant and his acts are damnable then he may no longer be considered a rightful king and subjects are not under obligation to obey him.

The executioners may agree with Smirdis that the king is a tyrant, but to be caught admitting this would bring charges of treason, as the next scene demonstrates when Ambidexter accuses Hob and Lob (754-811). The "Homily" advises people to follow the example of obedient subjects and speculates, "If we will have an evyl prince [. . .] God wyll eyther displace hym or of an evyll prince make hym a good prince" (215). In this frame, Smirdis is in the wrong to stand up against his brother and this scene works to show that Elizabethans distinguished between degrees of resistance.

By the 1560s, the radical Protestant reformers in England, like Ponet and Goodman, employed a strong argument against a ruler who,

fails to discharge the duties of his 'office and authority' and turns instead to the infliction of atrocious and notorious injuries, attempting 'to spoil and destroy the people' instead of protecting them (Skinner 222).

Preston's depiction of Cambises' reign reflects his readings of the teachings of German Reformer Martin Bucer. Preston contributed a selection of Latin verses at Cambridge's honorary ceremony for the German Reformer in 1560 and was largely influenced by his teachings while studying at Cambridge.⁶

Bucer firmly reverted to an old Lutheran doctrine for his theory of resistance and obedience. He insisted that since all rulers and magistrates are ordained by God, any act of resistance (even to a tyrant ruler) is an act against God and therefore punishable with damnation. Preston stages this type of resistance in the example of Smirdis but still departs from Bucer's argument in Smirdis' argument to his executioners. Ponet and Goodman's counter-argument stated that a tyrannical king gives up his authority and is reduced to a private citizen. By identifying Cambises' actions as damnable and locating his tyranny within this frame, Smirdis argues that obedience to Cambises is illegitimate (see Knapp 147-9).

We do not witness the king command the new executioners to kill his brother but rely on their testimony to Smirdis: "King Cambises hath

⁶ Martin Bucer arrived in England in 1549 and was soon after appointed professor of divinity at Cambridge. The English winter had fatal effects on the German reformer who died (probably from tuberculosis) in 1551. His writings were very influential during the Edwardian Reformation in England, most evidently in his De regno Christi which contributed to the reform of canon law, but also in Latin translation of the Bible (to be used as an authoritative source for an English translation) and his editorial contributions to the Book of Common Prayer in 1551. Thomas Preston arrived at Cambridge in 1553 and although he did not encounter Bucer there, he certainly witnessed his influence on Cambridge life. When Mary came to power she attempted to eradicate Protestantism at Cambridge and she tried Bucer and Fagius for heresy and ordered their bones exhumed and burned on a market day in Cambridge 1557. After Elizabeth's succession Cambridge University held a commemorative ceremony to honour Fagius and Bucer and restore them to their important place in English reformation history (See "Martin Bucer" ODNB, and Hill "Cambises", 411-13).

sent us unto thee, / Commaunding us straightly, without mercy or favour,
 / Unto thee to bestow our behaviour, / With cruelty to murder you and
 make you away" (719-722). Later, when Cambises calls for Murder and
 Cruelty to kill the Queen they respond, "With courageous harts, O king,
 we will obey" (1110). Where Smirdis and Ambidexter identify Cambises as
 a tyrant and advocate disobedience, Murder and Cruelty insists that he is
 a "king" and it is necessary to obey him. This distinction between the
 characters who recognise Cambises' tyranny and those who outwardly
 honour him as king indicate that there was a split in Elizabethan ways of
 thinking about resistance to tyranny.

Robert Knapp reconciles Bevington's analysis of Cambises as an
 affirmation of the duty of passive obedience with the stronger
 affirmation of a councillor's obligation to guide the monarch with truth.
 In the final prayer to Elizabeth this goal of the tragedy is firmly stated:

As duty bindes us, for our noble Queene let us pray,
 And for her Honorable Councel, the truth that they may
 use,
 To practice justice and defend her Grace eche day;
 To maintain Gods woord they may not refuse,
 To correct all those that would her Grace and Graces
 lawes abuse;
 Beseeching God over us she may raigne long,
 To be guided by truth and defended from wrong

(Cambises, Epilogue 15-21).

The distinction between lawful magistrates and tyrants includes placing the tyrant within a hellish frame of reference so that his actions appear damnable and his death is warranted. Preston achieves this firstly by what Shame reveals to the audience about Cambises' wickedness, the emphasis on Cambises' cup of vice, and the words of an actual Vice figure: Ambidexter. Preston's text points to a reading of Cambises' accidental death as part of a divine plan as punishment for his ungodliness and transgressions against god. At the end of the play one of the lords comments on Cambises' death: "A just rewarde for his misdeeds, the God aboove hath wrought" (1186-7).

Preston reinforces the message about divine providence in the epilogue with a final prayer to Elizabeth. The epilogue links Cambises' tyranny and fall with his transgressions against God. The lord's message and epilogue clearly state God's role in bringing Cambises' reign, and life, to an end. The final scene confirms a stance of non-resistance to tyranny because God will punish tyrants in the end.

Cambises' death is still problematic, not least because it subverts the traditional fall account: disaster does not afflict Cambises as a result of his tyranny in the same way it afflicts the examples in texts such as A Mirror for Magistrates and The Rewarde of Wickednesse. The audience witnesses Cambises' decline into sin but, as Happé notes, Preston fails to present a tragic pathos through the tyrant's suffering. Instead, Cambises offers a sensational example of divine punishment not only because he dies but because he dies without an heir.

b) Horestes

John Pickering's tragedy, Horestes, similarly explores issues of obedience and resistance. Pickering's depiction of resistance under tyranny as a

duty contrasts with Preston's stance on resistance and demonstrates the scope of the Elizabethan discussions on obedience and resistance.

Literary historians still remain perplexed as to the identity of John Pickering, the author of Horestes. Some have proposed, quite convincingly, that John Pickering, author of Horestes, is also John Puckering (1543/4-96), lawyer, speaker of the House of Commons (1596-7) and Lord Keeper (1592-6). The tragedy's concern with legality and legitimisation, both morally and politically, does not derive from the source material and betrays the author's intimate knowledge of the sixteenth-century legal process. The frequent return to the laws of god, nature, and man are Pickering's own invention and suggest John Puckering's legal training.⁷

In The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (1936), Willard Farnham discusses the ethical scope of Pickering's tragedy and calls attention to the moral dilemma of the play's conclusion. Farnham determines that Pickering left the tragic problem unresolved because he could not answer it:

One must suspect that when Pickering approached the end of his labour he had wearied of effort at originality, and simply allowed [his source] Caxton to carry him through. He saw fit, in conclusion, to let Truth moralize the play as a tragedy showing sure retribution for the following of unrighteous and personal desires (Farnham 262).

⁷ James E Phillips, who presents the most convincing argument that Pickering is also Puckering, names Caxton as the primary source material. In an article published after Phillips' article, Karen Maxwell Merritt persuasively illustrates that Pickering's source was not Caxton but Lydgate's Troy Book ("The Source of John Pickering's Horestes", RES 23: 1972, 255-266). Her conclusions are still that Horestes' motives and justifications for revenge are original material.

Peter Happé disputes Farnham's injudicious remarks and instead determines that Pickering's play engages with the moral dilemma in morality terms:

it is tenable that at this time the writers of the moralities were struggling to reconcile the tragic circumstances of human experience with the techniques and ethical preoccupations of the morality (219).

He claims that Preston's tragedy, and John Pickering's tragedy Horestes, represent a new stage in the morality tradition rather than an early stage in English tragedy. For Happé, Pickering's tragedy explores damnation through the embodiment of the threat of damnation. The Vice, who is inextricably linked to the tragic tone of the play, symbolizes that threat.

For David Bevington, Pickering's play has particular relevance to the Elizabethan discussions concerning the queen's cousin, Mary Queen of Scots, and her plans to murder her husband, marry the Earl of Bothwell and abdicate in order to place her son James in a favourable position with Elizabeth. In this light, argues Bevington, Horestes' revenge on his mother may serve to justify, for an uneasy Elizabeth, the proposals for the execution of Mary put forward by Elizabeth's ministers.

James E Phillips argues that Horestes should not be read as an allegory for events in Scotland, as Bevington claims, but that Pickering presents the "fundamental question of political theory and practice"

(230).⁸ Phillips further states that Pickering presented an example for the Queen of rightful deposition:

he was attempting to demonstrate [. . .] the circumstances under which one queen might properly be deposed without violating the principle of royal sovereignty (230).

Horestes' desire for revenge against his mother is continuously proved legitimate in the play; first divinely and morally, by the Vice disguised as a messenger from the gods, then legally by king Idomeus, and finally politically by his regal relatives and the other nobles. The Vice's role in Horestes' revenge is crucial to understanding the tragedy because of the fact that Horestes never knows his true identity. Pickering sets the moral, legal and political voices in the play in contrast to Nature, who remains resolutely against Horestes' decision to kill his mother.

In the first scene, Horestes questions his fate and wonders if it is right and honourable to revenge his father's death according to the gods:

Oh godes therefore sith you be iust, vnto whose poure & wyll,
 All thing in heauen, and earth also, obaye and sarue vntyll.
 Declare to me your gracious mind, shall I reuenged be,
 Of good Kynge Agamemnones death, ye godes declare to me
 Or shall I let the, adulltres dame, styll wallow in her sin,

⁸ Phillips' argument for reading the play with allusion to Mary is problematic because he insists that Horestes has divine approval to murder his mother. He fails to acknowledge that the audience are made aware that his divine approval is a fantasy because it comes from the mouth of a Vice, although Horestes is not made aware of this. Thus Pickering's appeal to the reformation debate about divine approval for deposing a tyrant is reversed - Horestes does not have divine approval for his actions and the audience would not assume that he did.

Oh godes of war, gide me a right, when I shall war begyn
(Horestes, 212-217).

Here Horestes' words reveal that despite his concern with divine approval, he has already decided to seek revenge against his mother. Here he asks for assistance when he goes to war with his mother, not if he goes to war.

The Vice, whom we later learn is Revenge, answers Horestes' call to the gods of war but does not reveal his true identity. Revenge tells the eager Horestes that if war is the way he wishes to revenge Agamenmon's death then he shall guide his steps: "in the hast you armour take, your fathers fose to slaye / And I as gyde with you shall go, to gyde you on the way" (Horestes, 221-2). The Vice says that the gods sent him to Horestes to reveal how to revenge his father's death and Horestes identifies him (incorrectly) as a messenger of the gods. This initial misunderstanding of his new companion's identity leads Horestes to believe that his actions are justly ordained.

Horestes senses a paradox in the Vice's conviction and questions him about his real identity. The Vice answers that he is a celestial being, his name is Courage and he came with permission from Mars to aid Horestes. Satisfied with the spirit's words, Horestes accepts his "divine" help. If the Vice disclosed his real identity, Horestes, who questions the Vice exhaustively, would not have the first vote of approval that he requires to proceed with his revenge. Since the Vice's approval is couched in divine terms, Horestes believes he is morally right to seek revenge.

Despite all of this verbal interaction between Horestes and Revenge about his decision, the vice is superfluous to Horestes' actions.

He was intending to kill his mother before he has the Vice's approval but his inclusion in the drama serves to highlight the presence of the force of evil in the protagonists' actions.

The second vote of approval Horestes requires to sanction his revenge is legal approval from king Idomeus. The king admires Horestes because he is Agamenmon's son, and also a future leader of Greece. He says that he will allow Horestes what he desires provided it is within the law: "What thing is that if we suppose, it lafull for to be, / On prynces faith witout delaye, it shall be given the" (Horestes, 288-9). Horestes uses language of kingship to phrase his request and refers to his royal lineage with reference to his father, whose grace was defiled, in order to appeal to the king's sense of duty:

O gratious king this thing it is, I let your grace to know
 That long I have request to vew, my fathers kingley place,
 And eke for to revenge the wrong done to my fathers grace.
 Is myne intent wherefore o king, graunt that w[ith]out
 delaye,

My earytage and honor eke, atchyue agayne I maye

(Horestes, 300-304. My emphasis).

In reply, Idomeus does not make an impulsive decision when Horestes explains his intent but refers the question to his counsellor. Here the king, wise enough to seek advice from his counsellors before acting, refrains from immediate action against another king.

Based on the advise of his counsellor, the king eventually grants Horestes legal permission to enact his revenge against his mother. Idomeus even offers a small army to assist him. This is crucial to our

understanding of Horestes' morality: by presenting his revenge as a legal action, approved by the king and his counsel, Horestes' revenge is placed in a frame of lawful, justified resistance advocated by some Protestant reformers. Although the audience should understand Horestes' revenge in this frame of constitutional resistance, the Vice is still present and his comments (to the audience) make it uneasy to see his revenge in this lawful perspective.

Another complexity introduced by trying to justify revenge in the play is the presence of Nature, who keeps reminding Horestes that to kill his own mother is atrocious. In response to Nature's protestations, Horestes says that Clytemnestra's offences are against God and because God loves his people, Clytemnestra's must be punished. Horestes' belief that it is his moral duty to punish his mother clouds his overall moral vision of the deed he intends.

Horestes' preparations for his revenge place the tragedy firmly within various discourses of Renaissance and Reformation resistance theory: First he seeks lawful approval from his king, the gods' representative on earth, and, with the king's approval, he defends his actions in the name of obedience to the gods. Horestes' example draws the contemporary theories of resistance into question, showing that despite following all the legal and religious guidelines for resistance, his actions still defy Nature (made explicit when Nature actually abandons Horestes).

When Clytemnestra is dead, Horestes has successfully justified his actions to the nobles and even married Menelaus' daughter Hermione. Recognising a positive aspect in Horestes' actions, the nobles praise him for purging the realm of wars and enmity: "Most regall Prynce we now are voyd, of mortall wars vexatiō / And through your grace we ar ioyned, in

loue w[ith] euery nation" (1339-40). The nobility are pleased with events and they even pray that Horestes will travel to Elysium, or heaven, when he dies as a reward for purging the realm.

Despite his active rebellion, Horestes is received as a hero, in contrast to Jocasta's Antigone who must leave Thebes for defiance of Creon's will. The commons also offer their gratitude for their new king and praise him for his care of the commonwealth: "Peace, welth, ioye, and felycitie, o kinge it is we haue, / And what thing is their y[et] which, subiects ought more to craue" (1351-1355). Because he brought prosperity to his subjects, Horestes may be seen as a king who is firstly concerned with the commonwealth above his own profit.

Nature is the only voice in the tragedy to counter Horestes' actions. The play presents a case for constitutional resistance that contradicts Nature, yet falls within the legal boundaries of resistance. There is never really a divine approval for Horestes' rebellion since it comes from the mouth of a Vice. But since the king is the voice of the law and God, his sanctioning of Horestes' actions may be seen to offer legal and moral approval. Idomeus' approval for Horestes actions demonstrates that resistance to unlawful rule is legitimate when legal and divine approval are offered. But Nature's absolute disagreement with Horestes actions, even after the human characters in the play have praised him, complicates such a clear-cut understanding of the tragedy.

John Puckering was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1559 and called to the Bar in 1567. The general consensus about Queen Mary among the men at Lincoln's Inn in the 1560s was that she should be vehemently punished, even executed: "Lincoln's Inn, where Puckering completed his legal training in 1567, had been a focal point of international controversy

over Mary Stuart as recently as [1566]" (Phillips 242). Phillips notes that Mary Stewart even lodged a complaint with her cousin the Queen about certain remarks about her at Lincoln's Inn.

In 1586 the lawyer John Puckering advised the Queen Elizabeth that her cousin Mary ought to be reprimanded for her treasonous behaviour. Puckering told Elizabeth that Mary presented a danger to her and the true religion and as God's ordained magistrate on earth, Elizabeth was dutifully bound to execute justice against her cousin.

Pickering's tragedy Horestes shares the concern with tyrannous magistrates that Puckering was involved with in the 1560s. Pickering's protagonist uses the accepted formula for resistance theory to prove that the gods ordain his actions against Clytemnestra in order to persuade the king and other nobles of his cause. Similarly, John Puckering told his queen that sovereigns that fail to execute God's justice will be punished:

God deprived of their kingdoms, for sparing those wicked Princes, whome God had delivered into their handes of purpose to be slaine by them, as ministers of his eternal and divine justice (qtd. in Phillips 243).

The tragedy goes further than simply professing a stance on disobedience to tyrannous magistrates by the inclusion of the Vice. Although he plays no active role in bringing Horestes to murder Clytemnestra, his presence indicates a malevolent influence at work. The fact that Nature is forced in the end to abandon Horestes highlights the fallibility in taking a stance on God's word: Horestes accepts the advice

of the Vice because he thinks it comes from the gods, despite the fact that what he proposes is so ungodly.

Part II: Civil Disobedience

c) Gorboduc

Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville's Gorboduc has always attracted the attention of Renaissance scholars more than any other extant early Elizabethan drama. Scholars oscillate between a strict topical reading of the play and a non-topical reading. Recently, in light of a manuscript that was discovered in the 1990s containing an eye-witness report of the first performance of the drama, critics contest the relevance of a possible marriage between Elizabeth and Robert Dudley.⁹

⁹ In the manuscript the author gives a detailed account of the performance of Gorboduc in the Inner Temple and he specifies some features of the performance which are not evident in the printed version. The most important new information that the Beale MS specifies is the explanation of the second dumb show:

Then came in a king to whome was geven a clere glasse, and a golden cupp of golde covered, full of poison, the glasse he caste under his fote and brake hyt, the poison he drank of, after came in mourners. The shadowes were declared by the Chorus first to signify unytie, the second howe that men refused the certen and tooke the uncertene, wherby was ment that yt was better for the Quene to marye with the Lord Robert knowen then with the King of Sweden (cited in Walker 210-11).

What the Beale MS indicates in this passage is that the breaking of the glass cup was interpreted by the Chorus as both an allegory for the dangers of accepting flattery and also for accepting the unknown before the known. For Greg Walker, this is a clear indication that the play was first performed in the specific context of the possible marriage between the queen and Robert Dudley. Walker insists that the Beale MS offers what he calls an emphatic refutation to critics who argue against a strict topical reading of Gorboduc (Walker 218). He takes issue with Bevington's caution that such a strict topical reading of the play is reductive and argues instead that this only serves to place the drama within its political and cultural context in which it was produced (Walker 218). Walker is right in suggesting we look at the play in its political and cultural context, but as Bevington (1968) has rightly pointed out, the play survives without this strict topical reading applied to because it addresses other contemporary cultural and political issues. Mike Pincombe takes issue with Walker's claims that the first performance of Gorboduc actually made a political intervention on behalf of Robert Dudley. In his recently published article, "Robert Dudley, Gorboduc, and 'The Masque of Beauty and Desire': A Reconsideration of the Evidence for Political Intervention" (2003),

Most recently Dermot Cavanagh's reading of Sackville and Norton's drama offers an innovative new reading of the play with emphasis on the language of counsel. Cavanagh's study of Gorboduc, included in his recent book Language and Politics in the Sixteenth-Century History Play (2003), is innovative because of its convincing departure from the importance of topical allusion in Sackville and Norton's tragedy. By placing the play in a tradition of reshaping England's consciousness of historical process, Cavanagh shows how Gorboduc calls attention to a generational and philosophical change in the nation's leadership (Cavanagh 36). Sackville and Norton use historical drama to a moralistic purpose, and through the language of counsel the authors explore the limits of worldly power:

The capacity of speech to destroy (and to order) society is a central aspect of [Sackville and Norton's] historical concerns, but again the capacity to distinguish between these forms of language and to extinguish (or sustain) their use is far from assured (Cavanagh 37).

In trying to determine whether a king or magistrate could legitimately be resisted, the reformers focused on the perilous consequences of disobeying God's command. The problems of judgment in Gorboduc are not limited to "the experience of the succession crisis" (37) but extend to Renaissance discussions on tyranny and obedience.

Gorboduc is a problematic example because he is not actually a tyrant; his leadership is weak rather than tyrannous. He is potentially

Pincombe investigates the evidence offered in support of Walker's thesis. He shows how Walker's claims find support in Marie Axton's misleading reading of the Inner Temple dramas of the 1561/2 festivities in terms of Robert Dudley's marital aspirations.

tyrannous because of his obstinacy but Sackville and Norton limit Gorboduc's potential for tyranny by making him weak. The tragedy does not present a straightforward approach to tyranny and obedience because there was not a single approach for how to determine if a magistrate is tyrannous, or who should be allowed to resist a tyrant, if anyone should.

Gorboduc's first mistake is to reject the advice of his wisest counsellor Eubulus. The first dumb show presents an allegory for this by showing us that the king rejects the simple glass cup in favour of the aesthetically pleasing cup that will kill him with poison. The preceding Chorus also offers an interpretation on how Gorboduc's actions will cause the ruin of his house by mentioning the importance of unity and obedience to the natural order of hereditary rule: "Eche chaunge of course unioynts the whole estate / And yeldes it thrall to ruyne by debate" (Gorboduc, I Chorus, 5-6). Already, the different perspectives offered in the first Chorus and dumb show suggest that the authors evidently had an agenda which stretched beyond the limits of a succession play.

Franco Moretti reads Gorboduc's obstinacy as a sign of tyranny. He states that Gorboduc's refusal to even respond to his counsellors signifies his tyranny right from the start of the play:

Precisely what makes Gorboduc a sovereign - universality and self-determination - also proclaims him, in accordance with a paradigm that remains unchanged through the development of English tragedy, a tyrant (Moretti 45).

Gorboduc does not need to engage with his counsellors because he is the king, Moretti continues, "He is a king not because he can reason and persuade, but simply by virtue of the fact that he decides" (46).

At the beginning of the play Gorboduc seeks counsel from his "faithful" advisors. Here he is portrayed as a noble king but his decision to divide his kingdom despite their advice highlights his naïveté: "I see no cause to draw my minde / To feare the nature of my loving sonnes" (Gorboduc I.ii.337-338). The king seems to have made this decision out of love for his children and the desire that they should both have equal share in his kingdom.¹⁰

The first act presents the audience with various interpretations and suggestions as to where the blame will lie when the kingdom falls to ruin. The play invites the audience to witness the pitfalls of deficient counsel and in doing so gives us examples of advisors who complicate the process of making political decisions (see Cavanagh 50-2). Ferrex and Porrex both listen to their advisors, in contrast to Gorboduc, yet both make bad decisions. Ferrex accepts the advice of his wisest counsellor Dordan, who tells the young prince that rebellion against his brother will only lead to his ruin and shame:

Let me, my lorde, disclose unto your Grace
 This hainous tale, what mischief it containes: -
 Your fathers death, your brothers, and your owne,
 Your present murder and eternall shame.
 Heare me, O king, and suffer not to sinke

¹⁰ Cf. Jasper Heywood's translation of Seneca's similar story of what happens when the natural order is broken and a kingdom is divided between brothers which appeared around the same time that Gorboduc was presented at the Inns. Seneca's play Thyestes was also infused with numerous other factors that led to the tragedy at the end and it is also governed by the fate that was pre-ordained for the progeny of Tantalus.

So high a treason in your princely brest!

(Gorboduc, II.i.164-169).

Ferrex takes Dordan's advice and dismisses Hermon's suggestion of open rebellion but still prepares himself for battle in the event that Porrex attack him.

In the dumb show before the fourth act, the political events of the play are brought into a Hellish frame of reference by the onstage appearance of three furies. Alecto, Tisiphone, and Megæra rise up from Hell driving a king and queen as their chariot with whips and snakes. The dumb show mentions rulers from mythical history who have association with killing their children; Tantalus, Medea, Athamas, Ino, Cambises, and Althea.¹¹ The dumb show suggests the unnatural events to follow in Gorboduc's life: "Hereby was signified the unnaturall murders to follow, that is to say, Porrex slaine by his owne mother, and of King Gorboduc and Queene Videna, killed by their owne subjects" (Gorboduc Dumb Show IV).¹²

At this point the play turns in the direction of revenge tragedy, because Videna is seeking justice for her favourite son's murder by the

¹¹ The dumb show states that all of these figures have an association with killing their children. While the allusion to Thomas Preston's Cambises is inviting, it is not, as far as I can determine, significant, or intentional. Sackville and Norton may have remembered the earlier play dealt with a tyrant and inadvertently identified Cambises, who, like Atreus, kills his own nephews, with unnatural murderers like Tantalus.

¹² James Emmanuel Berg reads this interlude as participating in the early modern discussions of feudalism and the household; or between polis and oikos, state and household: "as [the Furies] appear in the fourth dumb show, decorated with flames and burning torches and goading the royals of Euripedean and Senecan tragedies. Such figures haunt every subversion of order in the play, from the inflammatory flattery of Ferrex and Porrex by their fawning courtiers to the popular rebellion at the end of the play, which is comprehended as part of the perpetual cycle of household retribution begun with the snubbing of Videna" (Berg, 207).

slaughter of her younger son. The Chorus comment on this and draw our attention to the nature of this type of behaviour:

Whan greedy lust in royall seate to reigne
 Hath reft all care of goddes and eke of men,
 And cruell hart, wrath, treason, and disdaine
 Within ambitious brest are lodged, then
 Beholde how mischiefe wide her-selfe displayes,
 And with the brothers hand the brother slayes
 [.]
 The mightie God even moveth from his place,
 With wrath to wreke. Then sendes he forth with spede
 The dreadfull Furies, daughters of the night,
 With serpentes girt, carying the whip of ire,
 With heare of stinging snakes, and shining bright
 With flames and bloud, and with a brand of fire
 (Gorboduc IV Chorus, 1-14).

Here the Chorus emphasise how unbridled ambition causes desecration by affecting actions and emotions in the kingdom and within the family.¹³

The Chorus also links the brothers' greedy lust with the furies from Hell. In this early play, the tyrannous actions of the brothers leads to an act of divine vengeance - the furies are called upon to wreak punishments on the earth. Norton and Sackville's Fury scene predicts Videna's murder of her son and serves to link the greedy motives of the brothers with the Hellish sprits.

¹³ For further reading into this relationship between the family and the state see Berg 210-226.

The dumb show before the last act signifies how the kingdom of Great Britain fell into civil war for many years after *Gorboduc* died without a successor. In their distress, the people believed *Gorboduc* killed *Porrex* and so they rebelled against the king and queen, killing them both. This act explores the consequences of rebellion and disobedience by explaining the state of the country in chaotic terms. It is complicated further because *Gorboduc* is not a typical tyrant like *Cambises*, he just shows bad leadership.

In the final act, *Gorboduc* presents the consequences of rebellion and disobedience and promotes a theory of non-resistance against tyrannous regimes. Although the authorship of the dumb shows is still disputed, both *Sackville* and *Norton* have ties to the discussions about tyrants that echo the tone of *Gorboduc*. *Sackville's* contributions to *A Mirror for Magistrates* and their emphasis on the link between tyrants and Hell have already been discussed in chapter one.

The case for *Norton's* authorship of this scene is made more compelling by the proximity of *Gorboduc*, for the Christmas revels in 1561/2, and his translation of *Calvin's* latest *Institutes*, which was printed in the spring of 1561. This was the edition *Calvin* issued in August 1559 confirming his Pauline stance that all resistance to a lawful magistrate should be condemned. However, *Eric Rasmussen's* look at the past tense of the dumb shows concludes, "The dumb shows which appear in both quarto texts [. . .] have no direct link with the *Norton* and *Sackville* manuscripts but are memorial reconstructions" (418). *Rasmussen* argues that one of the players, identified as a "yong man" by the printer *William Griffith* when he accepted a pirated copy of the text in 1565, reconstructed the dumb shows from memory and this is why they are in the past tense (418).

At the start of the last act, the dukes at court discuss the consequences of Gorboduc's recent tyranny, as it is identified by Clotyn, Duke of Cornwall:

Did ever age bring forth such tirants harts?
 The brother hath bereft the brothers life;
 The mother she hath died her cruell handes
 In bloud of her owne sonne; and now at last
 The people, loe! forgetting trouth and love,
 Contemning quite both law and loyall hart,
 Even they have slaine their souveraigne lord and queene
 (Gorboduc V.i.1-7).

The dukes reflect on the events Clotyn refers to and debate whether or not the people should be punished. They are divided amongst themselves and their deliberations echo the discussions of resistance theory in England at the time (discussed in chapter three).

Clotyn's speech attests to the problems inherent in the discussions of resistance theory. First he draws attention to the tyranny of the royal line and the cruel nature of the brothers and the queen. But then he changes the focus to the people who, he states, have forgotten truth and love. The motivation for rebellion against Gorboduc and Videna is weak in Gorboduc, perhaps a reflection of the weak leadership of Gorboduc, so Fergus' planned invasion is a practical response and can be read as a type of divine punishment for the citizens' disobedience.

The tragedy's stance on rebellion is firmly identified in the dumb show that precedes the final act:

Hereby was signified tumults, rebellions, armes and civill warres to follow: as fell in the realme of Great Brittainne, which by the space of fiftie yeares and more continued in civill warre between the nobilitie after the death of King Gorboduc and of his issue, for want of certayne limitacion in sucession of the crowne, till the time of Dunwallo Molmutius, who reduced the land to monarchie (Dumb Show V).

The information provided in the dumb shows allows the audience to make judgements about the moral slant, or the political lessons, the authors are aiming for in the play's discussions of tyranny and obedience. Here, the audience understands that the authors are condemning both bad leadership, in the example of Gorboduc, and rebellion by showing that the realm was in ruin for fifty years following the fall of Gorboduc.

For the dukes in the play though, this question of rightful resistance is not so clear-cut as the dumb-show makes out. Mandud, Duke of Loegriss, is outraged at the suggestion that the people go unpunished; Gwenard, Duke of Cumberland, is equally appalled and says that even though Videna's actions were abominable, subjects should not raise a sword against their ruler.

Eubulus, the wise secretary to the king, sums up the argument against rebellion and concludes that obedience to the ruler is necessary at all times:

Eke fully with the duke my minde agrees,
 [That no cause serves wherby the subject maye
 Call to accompt the doynge of his prince,
 Muche lesse in bloode by sworde to worke revenge,

No more then maye the hande cut of the heade.
 In acte nor speache, no, not in secrete thoughte,
 The subject maye rebel against his lorde,
 Or judge of him that sittes in Caesars seate,
 With grudging minde to damne those he mislikes.]
 Though kinges forget to governe as the ought,
 Yet subjects must obey as they are bounde

(Gorboduc V.i.41-51).

Eubulus is the spokesman here for obedience and against rebellion;¹⁴ Bevington calls him the "explicator of the ultimate political lesson to be learned" (Bevington 1968, 144). In the last two lines Eubulus equates the disobedience of the subjects with treason and details how recent events will undoubtedly lead to ruin and civil war.

When John Daye republished Sackville and Norton's Gorboduc in 1570 he explained that the authors were unhappy with Griffiths' edition and wanted the public to have access to the authentic copy "set forth without addition or alteration" (qtd. in Graves 92). What this tells us is that Sackville and Norton were writing for at least two audiences; the queen and the public. The message aimed at the queen has always been the primary focus of criticism on the tragedy. But in light of Reformation resistance theory, the message to the public sphere emerges with equal importance.

¹⁴ Although in the first act, as Cavanagh points out, it is Philander who draws attention to the importance of obedience to legitimate rule: "Philander plots a dialectical relationship between obedience and rule. As with Arostus, he insists it is the king's responsibility to inculcate in his children an ethic of restraint" (Cavanagh, 41). Philander tells the king: "When fathers cease to know that they should rule, / The children cease to know they should obey; [. . .] See them obey, so shall you see them rule: / Who-so obeyeth not with humblenesse / Will rule with outrage and with insolence" (Gorboduc I.ii.207-8, 228-230).

In the 1570 authorised version of the play, lines 42-9 of V.i are omitted from the text. When Gorboduc was reissued, Thomas Norton was in the process of publishing, with John Daye, a collection of his works including numerous tracts in response to the northern rebellion in 1569: All such treatises as have been lately published by Thomas Norton. This edition included six political diatribes against the northern rebels, among other anti-Catholic pamphlets, he composed Ferrex and Porrex [Gorboduc] (Graves 92).

In Gorboduc, condemnation is not solely linked to the rebels; it includes the king and the nobles. The argument against rebellion and disobedience to the ruler in the play goes so far as to link rebellion with damnation by bringing in the Furies in the dumb show. Norton probably cut these lines to help justify the rebellion against Elizabeth's cousin Mary, now an English prisoner.¹⁵

Eubulus' prophecy echoes the Reformation argument against rebellion because he advises men that God will punish anyone who rebels against a sovereign. In the 1574 sermon "An Exhortacion concernyng Good Ordre and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates" (reprinted from 1559), the author states,

let us all marke diligently that it is not lawfull for inferiors and subjectes in any case to resist the superior powers, for .S. Paules wordes be playne, that whosoever resisteth shall get to themselves dampnacioun: for whosoever resisteth, resisteth the ordinaunce of God (cited in Bond, 164).

¹⁵ Cf. Phillips' discussion of Horestes' concern with the topical allusion to Mary's imprisonment 230-9.

The author also states that if men rebel against kings and magistrates then God will send plagues and sickness: "Let us feare the terrible punishment of almightie God against traitors or rebellious persones by the example [of rebels in Scripture]" (167).

In the next scene Gorboduc's wise counsellor relates news of a great rebellion among the people. After Eubulus describes the chaos and ruin caused by the people's rebellion, the noble dukes offer a warning:

Mandud - [. . .] those trayterous hartes that dare rebell,
 Let them beholde the wide and hugie fieldes
 With bloud and bodies spread of rebelles slayne,
 The lofty trees clothed with the corpses dead
 That strangled with the corde do hang theron!

Arostus - A just reward! such as all times before
 Have ever lotted to those wretched folks (60-66).

The dukes finally agree that the slain rebels deserve their fate because it is traitorous to rebel.

The dukes' response to the chaos in the kingdom matches the sinister tone of the "Homily" when the author describes the character of rebels. Rebels, states the author, are the worst type of men:

For who else be they that are most inclined to rebellion, but such hautie spirites? From whom springeth suche foule ruine of realmes? Is not rebellion the greatest of all mischeefes? And who are most redie to the greatest mischeefes, but the worst men? Rebelles, therefore, the worst of all subjectes, are most redie to rebellion, as beyng the worst of all vices

and furthest from the dutie of a good subject" ("Homily", 213).

With the realm in ruin and fighting among the subjects in the kingdom, the dukes are unable to stop the downward spiral of the nation. Their advice to the king and his sons was wasted and now the nation will suffer accordingly.

To further emphasise the importance of non-resistance, the play ends with the news that Fergus, yet another ambitious nobleman, has exploited the chaotic state of the kingdom with plans to gain the throne for himself. The moral of the play is summed up in Eubulus' final speech:

Hereto it commes when kinges will not consent
To grave advise, but followe wilfull will.

[. . . .]

These mischiefes spring when rebels will arise
To work revenge and judge their princes fact.
This, this ensues when noble-men do faile
In loyall trouth, and subjectes will be kinges

(Gorboduc, V.ii.234-245).

Here, Eubulus' lines allocate the blame for the misfortunes in England to everyone: the king is guilty because he did not listen to good advice; the rebels are guilty for rising up against the king; and the nobles are guilty for failing to maintain order.

Sackville and Norton's blank-verse tragedy illustrates a lesson in kingship and obedience: when subjects behave like kings and kings behave like tyrants then a realm can be destroyed. The fourth dumb show links

rebellion with the three Furies from Hell by offering an explanation to the audience for the events that lead to the total ruin of Gorboduc's kingdom.

b) Jocasta

In another collaborative play, Jocasta (1566), the authors, George Gascoigne and Francis Kinwelmershe, address the question of obedience to a tyrant. The authors use Ludovico Dolce's Renaissance imitation of Euripedes' tragedy as a study in obedience and resistance. In turning Creon into a legitimate king, rather than Dolce's tyrant, the authors condemn tyranny and rebellion while extolling humanitarian qualities over political obligation. In trying to determine how to read Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's tragedy, Jocasta's interaction with her sons about tyranny and rebellion are crucial for understanding the emphasis on resistance that she advocates. Like Thyestes, the action in Jocasta is framed by a curse from Hell and links the damnable acts of the brothers within this frame.

In Euripedes' original tragedy, Creon is both grief-stricken by the news of his son's death offstage, yet proud of his son's sacrifice. In the Renaissance versions, Creon finds out about his son's death onstage, thus giving him a motive for seizing power in Thebes, and he is motivated by ideas of revenge. The Renaissance authors vilified Creon so that instead of glory being gifted to him as in Euripedes, he is seen to greedily desire that glory. In the context of the Reformers' debates on resistance to tyranny this reading of Jocasta focuses on the concepts of obedience to a tyrannous sovereign and Christian duty present in the play.

David Bevington cites Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's play as evidence for an Elizabethan anxiety concerning tyranny that is evident in Preston's Cambises:

Jocasta reveal[s], in the translator's marginalia and prefatory material, a preoccupation with defining the "tyranny" of Creon and the laudable resistance of Antigone, in seeming disregard for the play's original theme of conflict between a religious code and the needs of a secure state (Bevington Tudor Drama, 164).

Bevington's remarks are somewhat over-zealous and suggest his own agenda to place the play in the category of what he calls, "tyrant plays". The play does certainly fit into this category but Bevington does not account for the Italian influence of Ludovico Dolce. Furthermore, there is minimal evidence in the play for Antigone's actions being rewarded; despite her steadfastness she still loses out in the end by being banished along with her father.

Bruce R. Smith explores the combined affect of sensation and sentimentousness that occupies the play both verbally and visually. The way that the Renaissance authors (including Dolce) depart from Euripedes, which makes the play "modern" is in emphasising the moral justice of the situation. In contrast Euripedes emphasised the irony and the incongruity between human suffering and the ineluctable plans of the gods. Like Smith, Robert S. Miola is also concerned with the way the

Elizabethan imitators altered the Greek play.¹⁶ He focuses on the process of Christianising the ancient pagan text.

Jocasta begins, like Gorboduc, with an explanatory prologue that details the events of the play alongside the dumb show that introduces a primary theme of the play: ambition. In the first scene Jocasta repeats the story of her past from the birth of her son Oedipus, the murder of her husband and later marriage to Oedipus and his eventual discovery of his identity, to the current situation whereby her sons (by Oedipus) are cursed and divided:

There buried in the depthe of dungeon darke,
 (Alas) [Oedipus] lead his discontented life,
 Accursing still his stony harted sonnes,
 And wishing all th' infernall sprites of Hell,
 To breathe such poysned hate into their brestes,
 As eche with other fall to bloody warres,
 And so with pricking poynt of piercing blade,
 To rippe their bowels out, that eche of them
 With others bloud might stayne his giltie hands,
 And bothe at once by stroke of speedie death
 Be foorthwith throwne into the Stigian lake

(Gascoigne Jocasta, 250-1).

Jocasta frames the play in the context of a Hellish curse on her family when she says that from his dark dungeon, a proto-Hell-on-earth, Oedipus

¹⁶ See Robert S. Miola, "Euripides at Gray's Inn: Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's Jocasta". The Female Tragic Hero in English Renaissance Drama, 33-50; and Bruce R. Smith, Ancient Scripts & Modern Experience on the English Stage 1500-1700, "Tragedy".

curses his ill-begotten sons with hate. In turn, the brothers divide their rule of Thebes by year, not by land like Ferrex and Porrex were meant to share their kingdom, but instead in the same way as Atreus and Thyestes fatally, and unwillingly, shared their realm. The infernal spirits invoked by Oedipus remind the audience of the Furies brought on stage in the dumb-shows in Gorboduc and although they are not physically present here, mention of them foretells the infernal malice that will affect Polynices and Eteocles.

Polynices, the banished brother, like Horestes, appeals to another king, Adrastus, king of Argos, for permission to rebel against his brother Eteocles in Thebes. Polynices is granted assistance by the foreign king, thus legitimising rebellion in his eyes because Adrastus is a king. But Jocasta sees a problem in both her sons' decisions and constantly implores them to reconsider for the benefit of the realm. Eteocles replies that he enjoys his powerful position and has no desire to share it with his brother:

Then thinke you now, that I can give consent
To yeld a part of my possession,
Wherin I live and lead the monarchie (271).

Eteocles' desire to rule alone despite his mother's pleas and advice recalls both Cambises' refusal to heed the advice of his brother and the counsellor Praxaspes and Gorboduc's stubborn "wilful will" against the advice of his counsellors.

At one stage Jocasta offers her obstinate son Eteocles a warning about ambition and evil desire. She compares him to a tyrant:

If so thou nill O sonne, O cruell sonne,
 In whose high brest may justice builde hir boure
 When princes harts wide open lye to wrong?
 Why likes thee so the tipe of tyrannie
 With others losse to gather greedy gaine? (273).

The authors' gloss clarifies Jocasta's connection between the tyrant and his people: "If the head be evill the body cannot be good" and looks back to the advice in the Prologue of Cambises when Preston cited the philosopher Seneca, "The honest exercise of kings, men wil insue the same" (12). When Jocasta tells her son that his actions are tyrannous and evil she places emphasis on the hellish nature of his actions, as indicated by the frame of a curse on the sons of Oedipus.

At the beginning of Jocasta, the Argument revealed that the gods are angry for the wicked crimes of Laius and the incest of Oedipus. As punishment, the gods cause the fatal strife between Eteocles and Polynices and replace them with Creon, "the [figure] of tyranny" (Gascoigne Jocasta, Argument 244). Creon's tyranny is later commented on by his concerned niece Antigone before he ever appears on stage. When she is speaking with her brothers' advisor Bailo, Antigone admits her distrust of her uncle:

Besides all this, a certaine jelousie,
 Lately conceyved (I know not whence it spring)
 Of Creon, my mothers brother, appaules me much,
 Him doubt I more than any danger else (257).

The Renaissance imitators still recalled Euripedes' emphasis on Creon's tyranny but Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe never show him behave as a tyrant. Instead the Elizabethan authors depart from their source material and only allude to Creon's tyranny and make Creon the only suitable candidate to govern Thebes.

According to the English reformers Ponet and Goodman, if a prince, such as Eteocles, fails to protect his people and works for his own personal glory instead, then that ruler reduces himself to the status of an ordinary citizen and ought to be punished accordingly. Both English reformers based their arguments on the contention that not only are all rulers ordained by God but also, that rulers are ordained in order to uphold goodness, not evil. The discussions between Jocasta and her sons is crucial to our understanding of the play because she casts Eteocles as morally culpable for the ruin that befalls Thebes by emphasising his desire for personal satisfaction over the concerns of the people.

Although Jocasta's condemnation of Eteocles casts him in the perpetrator-role, it does not necessarily cast Polynices as a victim. Jocasta asks her rebel-son what glory he can hope to achieve by attacking his own country:

What spoyles? what Palmes? what signe of vi[ct]orie
 Canst thou set up to have thy cuntrye woonne?
 What title worthie of immortall fame,
 Shall blased be in honor of thy name? (Gascoigne 274).

The Chorus at the end of the first act stress the lesson Jocasta tries to teach Polynices about his actions against Thebes:

Yet Polynices, with signe of lesse disdaine,
 Against this land hath brought from countries farre,
 A forraine power, to end this cruell jarre,
 Forgetting quite the dutie, love, and zeale,
 He ought to beare unto this common weale (260).

By introducing the foreign threat, Polynices is as guilty as his tyrannous brother Eteocles and both sons are cast in culpable roles.

But Polynices is not actually a ruler. He should be in charge of Thebes at the time of the dispute but his brother never yielded his power to him. The Chorus condemn him because when he asks for assistance from the Greeks he introduces a foreign threat to Thebes and in doing so should not be regarded as a lawful magistrate. The converse of this is that he has approached a lawful magistrate to counter the tyranny of his brother and in doing so legitimises his rebellion.

In his defence of private-law resistance theory Ponet stated that rulers who introduce a foreign threat to their country overstep the boundaries of their office: "If [a prince] goes about to betray his country and to bring the people under a foreign power, he is a traitor, and as a traitor ought to suffer" (Ponet "Response", 9). Therefore, Ponet argues, the ruler should no longer be regarded as a lawful magistrate and be deposed from office as a traitor. However, if a magistrate is deemed to be tyrannous or ungodly, Ponet and Goodman both concluded that private citizens should use forcible resistance against that magistrate.

At the beginning of the play the Argument stated that the gods caused the strife between the brothers because of the wicked crimes of Laius and the incest of Oedipus: "To scourge the cryme of wicked Laius, / And wrecke the foule Incest of Oedipus, / The angry Gods styrred up

theyr sonnes" (1-3). The Chorus at the end of the second act invokes the wrathful god of war:

O Fierce and furious Mars, whose harmefull harte,
 Rejoyceth most to shed the giltlesse blood
 [.]
 Father of warre and death, that dost remove
 With wrathfull wrecke from wofull mothers breast,
 The trustie pledges of their tender love

(Gascoigne 282).

In this invocation to Mars, the Chorus blame the god of war for replacing fraternal love with wrath. Following this the Chorus accuse the gods for creating a mirror of Hell on earth by causing the brothers' discord:

Wherwith thou raisest from the depth of Hell,
 The wrathfull sprites of all the furies there,
 Who when they wake, doe wander every where,
 And never rest to range about the coastes,
 Tenriche that pit with spoile of damned ghostes (282).

After blaming Oedipus (for the curse), then Mars, the Chorus' excitatio reproaches the furies for coming up from Hell to increase their kingdom ("[to enrich] that pit").¹⁷ Gascoigne's trope (he is identified at the end as

¹⁷ On how much of this invocation to Mars can be attributed to the Elizabethan imitator, rather than Euripedes or Dolce, Cunliffe states that all the material that diverges from the Greek source can be found in Dolce. On the invocation to Mars Cunliffe comments, "Gascoigne has totally deserted the rich imagery of Euripedes, yet has found means to form an original ode, which is by no means destitute of pathos or imagination" (Early, lxxxiv). He goes on to credit the English imitators with the "smoothness of the English rendering".

the author of this passage) looks ahead to the villainy of Marlowe's bombastic conqueror Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, who boasts to the Soldan, "Hell and Elysium swarm with ghosts of men / That I have sent from sundry foughten fields / To spread my fame through hell and up to heaven" (I Tamburlaine V.i.466-7).

Gascoigne's Chorus concludes with a prayer to God to end this misery in the city:

And thou great God, that doest all things decree,

[. . . .]

Regard not [Oedipus'] offence but heare our cries,

And spedily redresse our miseries

For what can we poore wofull wretches doe

But crave thy aide, and onely cleave therto?

(Gascoigne 283).

With their call to Mars and prayer to God, the Chorus place the tragedy of Thebes within a providential framework but make a distinction between the angry gods' involvement in the tragedy and their prayer for divine assistance. The Chorus beg for God to relieve them from their misery, "[we] crave thy aide" (Gascoigne 283). Even though the force of the infernal gods is destroying Thebes, the Chorus advocate passive resistance in the form of prayer to defeat evil tyranny (as suggested in the "Homily").

In the "Homily", the author argues that God ordains both evil princes and good princes and consequently to rebel against any prince only provokes God to punish the people more. Instead of rebellion, prayer will rouse God to improve the evil prince: "let us according to the counsell of

the Holy Scriptures pray for the Prince, for his continuance and increase in goodnesse, yf he be good, and for his amendment yf he be evill" ("Homily", 215).

Now that both of Oedipus' sons are cast in the roles of villains: one a rebel and the other a tyrant, the authors try to vilify Creon who uses the internal chaos in Thebes to his advantage. Creon's defining moment is morally ambiguous though; his refusal to sacrifice his son for the benefit of the commonwealth casts him as an enemy to Thebes but, at the same time, stresses his moral character. The prophet Tyresias reveals that the recovery of the commonwealth from the gods' anger relies on the human sacrifice of Creon's son Meneceus and the removal of Oedipus from Thebes.

But Creon refuses despite Tyreseias' pleas that the pain of one will lead to the benefit of many: "For c[omon] weale, were well, that one man waile" (Gascoigne 288). In his steadfast determination to execute his own free will in this situation Creon, again like Gorboduc's "wilful will", is cast as a tyrant. In contrast, Meneceus understands that his personal sacrifice is a political duty and an honour: "Ne can I purchase more prayse worthy death / Than for my countries wealth to lose my breath" (Gascoigne 290).

Creon insists that his son leave the city so that he will be safe because he does not think men should necessarily follow prophecies as the word of Jove (292). The Chorus complicate this so that it casts Creon's desire to fulfil his personal will against his desire to benefit the commonwealth:

Will might duke Creon driven by destinie,
(If true it be that olde Tyresias saith)

Redeme our citie from this miserie,
 By his consent unto Meneceus death,
 Who of himselfe wold faine have lost his breth:
 But every man is loth for to fulfill
 The heavenly hest that pleaseth not his will (294).

In the passage cited above, the Chorus interpret Creon's actions according to a crucial "if", thus making it entirely ambiguous how the audience should regard Creon. Creon's challenge against Tyresias' prophecy as the word of Jove contrasts with Horestes, who believes the malicious advice of a Vice figure and proceeds to kill his mother.

The concluding lines of the Chorus serve to highlight the political lesson of resistance:

That publique weale must needes to ruine go
 Where private profite is preferred so.
 Yet mightie God, thy only aide we crave,
 This towne from siege, and us from sorowe save (294).

In light of Creon's unwillingness to sacrifice his son, the Chorus say that the only way to save the city Thebes is through prayer. This is simply a repetition of Jocasta's earlier choice, "pray unto the Gods / For our redresse" (277), and an earlier Chorus, "O mightie Gods [. . .] set desired peace / Betwene the hearts of these two friendly foes" (275). Both the Chorus and Jocasta are mouthpieces for passive resistance by their insistence to pray to God for divine aid.¹⁸

¹⁸ See also e.g., 278, 282-3, 294, 300, 307.

Meneceus, like his father, is strong-willed, but unlike his father, he considers the commonwealth before his personal comfort. Before leaving the city, Meneceus kills himself with his sword and a messenger tells his father his dying words: "(sith Jove will have it so) / To save your lives, I may receive my death" (304). In light of his son's sacrifice and Tyresias' prophecy, Creon accepts that it is his destiny to rule Thebes.

In the closing scenes of the play, Creon learns that all the possible candidates for the throne, his sister Jocasta and nephews Eteocles and Polynices, are dead. He approaches Oedipus and Antigone with news that he was named as the heir before Eteocles died, that Antigone will marry Haemon and that Oedipus must leave the city walls so that the curse on Thebes will be removed:

Tyresias he that knoweth things to come,
By trustie tokens hath foretolde the towne,
That while thou didst within the walles remayne,
It should be plagued still with penurie (318).

Here Creon finally attempts to fulfil the role of king by addressing the safety of the commonwealth by banishing Oedipus. He is now cast as a suitable king; he is neither a rebel like Polynices nor is he a tyrant like Eteocles because he is legitimised: His rule came to him only by the unfortunate events between his nephews and therefore, in the eyes of the law, he is a legitimate ruler.

The final stages of the play complicate any sense of legitimacy that has been established through the contrast between Oedipus' rebellious and tyrannous sons and the obedient Creon. On one hand Creon must banish Oedipus for the safety of Thebes and, to some extent, he is right

to forbid funeral rights to Polynices because he brought the threat a foreign power to the nation. The crucial quality that points to Creon as a suitable king for Thebes is that he listens to Antigone's response and in the end offers her banishment instead. His ability to make decisions in light of his subjects' requests distances him from the mistakes of Cambises and Gorboduc and consequently cast Creon, the tyrant, as the adequate king.¹⁹ Even Oedipus praises the new ruler in Thebes: "Deare citizens, beholde your Lord and King / That Thebes set in quiet government" (324).

At the end of this play all of the rebels are either dead or banished and the obedient subjects are rewarded. The Chorus and the Epilogue offer the tragedy of Thebes as a warning against ambition, which the author of the "Homily" identifies as one of the two main causes of rebellion: "the principall and most usuall causes [of rebellion], [are] ambition and ignoraunce" ("Homily", 236).

The "Homily" further identifies the two sorts of men who instigate rebellion that relate to this reading of Jocasta: "so are there specially two sortes of men in whom these vices do raigne, by whom the devyll, the aucthour of all evil, doth chiefly stirre up all disobedience and rebellion" ("Homily", 236). In the end, Eteocles and Polynices have been linked to the furies from Hell in the explanatory dumb shows and in their actions; one as a tyrant and the other as a rebel.

Ironically, it is Creon who is cast as a legitimate king despite Jocasta's and Antignone's fears about his character and the identification of him as a tyrant in the Argument. The tragedy shows

¹⁹ See Cavanagh's argument that Sackville and Norton were interested in the importance of opening issues up to debate in the political arena in order to carefully consider all sides before making a decision, and hence the importance of counsel in Gorboduc, 45-52. For the relationship between the discourse of counsel and virtue see 52-7.

that Creon wants to rule well but he is, like Gorboduc, mortal and fallible. When faced with the decision to save his own son for the benefit of the realm or allow Thebes to suffer the curse of Oedipus, he chooses the course best for himself. But this conflict of interest is not as clear-cut as the Reformation resistance treatises make out: sometimes a decision that may not benefit the commonwealth is still commendable in its humanitarian value.

The discussions of tyranny and obedience were complex and under constant revision; when once it was morally wrong to resist a tyrant it later became morally wrong to endure the reign of a tyrant. Creon is a complex character; although he is identified as a tyrant at the start of the play, he proves to the audience and the people of Thebes that he is not a tyrant, but a legitimate king. The drama presents one way of looking at tyranny and rebellion while the glosses, and Antigone's comments, offer a different perspective.

The concern with rebellion and obedience in tragedies performed in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign is evidence of the extent to which the threat of damnation influenced culture and politics. In the prose writings on the same subject, polemicists often introduced a threat of damnation to emphasise their point: In "An Exhortacion concerning Good Ordre and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates", printed in 1559 and 1574, the author states, "that whosoever resisteth shall get to themselfes dampnacioun" (cited in Bond, 164).

Thomas Preston's Cambises was performed for the queen at the beginning of her rule showing, especially in the example of Praxaspes, without doubt that it is prudent for all subjects to be obedient at all times. Looking at the varying degrees of resistance theory in each of the tragedies discussed in this chapter it is evident that Elizabethans, as

you would expect, struggled to adopt a consistent approach to dealing with a tyrant. Throughout the 1560s the orthodox line on resistance theory was repeatedly adjusted but with none of the anxieties resolved, yielding a feeling of "unsurety" and tension about the origin of evil and sin.

The discussions on resistance and obedience alternated between supporting a theory of resistance and totally condemning resistance in favour of complete obedience at all times. For dramatists and polemicists alike, Hell's role and the threat of damnation became central to these discussions. Preston invokes a Vice and Shame to highlight Cambises' wickedness which grows when he drinks from his cup of vice. Pickering reversed Preston's situation and complicated it further by showing resistance to tyranny as a moral and political duty regardless of the harsh costs. Pickering uses the Vice in order to slant the audience's perception of Horestes' actions differently from how the participants in the play understand them. Horestes' actions are excused in the world of the play but the audience must negotiate for itself how to accept the influence of the Vice.

In presenting these two contrary ways of understanding Horestes' actions, Pickering shows the contradictions inherent in any theory of resistance. In Gorboduc, the authors show the pitfalls of a tyrannous regime and the consequences of disobedience. Sackville and Norton introduce the furies into their tragedy and link the destruction that follows from Ferrex and Porrex's tyranny and rebellion with the forces of Hell.

But Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe complicate the question of obedience even further with their glosses that point to Creon as a tyrant yet also an obedient subject: Creon's obedience is rewarded when he

refrains from participating in the struggle between one tyrant and one rebel for the throne in Thebes. The authors use the tragedy to comment on the difficulty in trying to determine whether an official king or magistrate may be considered a tyrant. Ponet and Goodman eventually devised a list of criteria to support deposing a tyrant from office in defence of the private-law argument for resistance. This was based on different biblical passages and history, but even between the two English Reformers the criteria altered. Jocasta presents the possible pitfalls in trying to determine whether a magistrate may be considered a tyrant and further if it is lawful to resist that magistrate.

The tragedies from the 1560s offer insight into Elizabethan thinking about tyranny and resistance and each one supplies another link to the development of the relationship between Hell and the tyrant on the Elizabethan stage. The contrast between the stance on resistance in Jocasta and Horestes is striking: Horestes and Creon are both rewarded in the end for completely opposing forms of obedience. Horestes obeys the gods and his king by killing his tyrant mother Clytemnestra and in doing so contradicts Nature. Creon passively watches the events in the political arena, only expressing his condemnation of them on a verbal level, and refuses to act until he is handed the throne peacefully and all the rebels are punished for their transgressions.

In the 1570s when "An Exhortacion concerning Good Ordre and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates", and the "Homily" were reprinted, just after the rebellions in the North, there is a clear relationship between Hell and disobedience for the Elizabethan public. Since texts like the "Homily" and the "Exhortacion" are aimed at ordinary citizens, and not the ecclesiastical ministers and magistrates, very little is mentioned about the punishments bad rulers are dealt. The tragedies do

not offer any further insight into this question but the dramatists explore the ambiguities presented by the different arguments. Some dramatists link the tyrants' behaviour on earth with Hell and suggest that there might be an infernal influence at work, but this link is not fully engaged with at this early stage in English tragic drama.

In calling on the infernal Furies in the tragedies to indicate the Hellish nature of the tyrant's deeds, the playwrights in the 1560s nurtured the idea that tyranny is somehow linked with Hell. But they were not clear what this relationship was. In the following chapters we will see how this relationship developed in English tragedy leading up to Shakespeare's Richard III.

Part III

Mirrors of Hell in Kyd and Marlowe

Part III
Hell on the Elizabethan stage in Kyd and Marlowe

My thesis aims to demonstrate how by the 1590s there is a clear, and commonplace relationship between Hell and tyranny which developed after the Reformation. This shift reflects the changing attitudes to Hell and Purgatory, discussions on resistance and obedience, and various other political currents that dominated Elizabethan culture.

In George Peele's tragedy The Battle of Alcazar, printed in 1594 but possibly written and performed as early as 1588, three furies and Nemesis appear onstage to indicate infernal events about to occur. The presenter, who serves a similar purpose to Kyd's Andrea and the spirit Revenge, introduces the infernal spirits as the architects of tragedies:

Now warre begins his rage and ruthlesse raine,
And Nemesis with bloudie whip in hand,
Thunders for vengeance on this Negro moore.
Nor may the silence of the speechlesse night,
Divine Architects of murthers and misdeeds,
Of tragedies, and tragicke tyrannies,
Hide or containe this barbarous crueltie
Of this usuper to his progenie.

Three ghosts crying Vindicta (308-15).

This extract from Peele's lengthy passage on the relationship between the infernal realm and earthly events, demonstrates the extent of the anxieties about Hell's influence over earthly actions explored in this thesis.

Equally, the 1591 reissue of the tragedy Gismond of Salerne is a testament to the impact of the discussions involving the threat that Hell's forces can penetrate earthly actions and events because of the direct link between Hell and human characters. This is equally evident when Faustus conjures the forces of Hell at the beginning of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus. Faustus asks Lucifer, Beelzebub and Demogorgon to send Mephistopheles up to the earth: "propitiamus vos, ut appareat / et surgat Mephistopheles!" "we ask your favour, so that Mephistopheles may appear and rise!" (I.iii.19-20). When he finally appears Faustus asks the infernal spirit how he is able to leave Hell. Mephistopheles says that he has not left:

Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it.
 Think'st thou that I, who saw the face of God
 And tasted the eternal joys of heaven,
 Am not tormented with ten thousand hells
 In being deprived of everlasting bliss? (78-82).

Mephistopheles' claim that he is still in Hell when he is with Faustus on earth indicates that wherever the devils are is Hell. Marlowe's tragedy actually brings the forces of Hell on to the earth. The onstage appearance of an actual devil, Mephistopheles, makes the connection between earthly sin and Hell absolutely clear in Marlowe's tragedy. But this relationship is complicated when the devil is replaced by wicked human characters.

In the tragedies discussed in the final part of this thesis, the connection between the forces of Hell and human actions on earth is so acute that Hell may be seen to actually order events on earth. Thomas

Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy and Marlowe's Tamburlaine are overtly concerned with Hell's influence over men on earth. The tragedies raise questions about divine providence and places infernal events on earth in a hellish frame, in the vein of Heywood's *Seneca*.

Chapter Five

Hellish Revenge: Hieronimo's Revenge in The Spanish Tragedy

When Jasper Heywood supplemented Seneca's tragedy with Thyestes' closing curse on Atreus he emphasised the endless cycle of tragedy. In chapter three I discussed Heywood's additions to two of Seneca's tragedies to show how they impose a representation of how Hell influences human actions on earth. In Seneca's tragedy Thyestes, the brothers' crimes are imagined as part of an infernal plan, especially in the way Seneca stages a Fury at the beginning of the play with her threats to the house of Tantalus and Heywood closes the play with Thyestes' cries to Dis.

Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy similarly uses an allegorical spirit to frame the action in the Spanish court within an infernal plan. Kyd's play differs from the Senecan model because Revenge is a non-Fury and an idle figure: the spirit does not threaten Hieronimo from Hell, as the Fury threatens Tantalus, but simply watches the action on earth with his human companion Don Andrea. This works to move Hell from the realm of the underworld to the Spanish court on earth in the way that Hieronimo summons the infernal forces to his aid in bringing about his revenge.

This chapter explores how Kyd's complication of the justice system in both Hell and Spain confounds the world of The Spanish Tragedy and draws a clear connection between events in the Spanish court and Hell. Kyd dramatically brings Hell to earth in the parallels between the infernal court of Pluto, where judgement is arbitrary, and the earthly court of Spain, where justice is also arbitrary. The final part of this chapter looks at The Spanish Tragedy in context and compares the way the

anonymous tragedy Soliman and Perseda and Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy treat the consequences of revenge.

Eugene D. Hill responded to past criticism (namely Howard Baker's analysis) that attempted to dismiss the Senecan element of The Spanish Tragedy in favour of a stronger Virgilian reading of the material. Hill sought to re-establish the Senecan perspective by bringing to light Kyd's negotiation of Senecan and Virgilian forms and themes. He argues that Kyd uses Virgilian material, which throws hints about a translatio imperii, to unlock "the emotional riches of Seneca's tragedies" (165).

But Frank Ardolino dismisses Hill's argument for using English nationalism in the tragedy to defend Hieronimo's revenge and instead insists on the importance of both a classical and apocalyptic code of harsh retribution alongside the perspective of Christian mercy that leaves vengeance to God. Ardolino's analysis still restricts Kyd's play to topical events though; he claims that the tragedy should be read as a mystery (as indicated by the use of the word just three times in the play) with a historical subtext of the Anglo-Spanish conflict.¹

However, the Spanish context of The Spanish Tragedy and the biblical discussions of revenge are background material to this reading of

¹ Most recently expounded in his book, Apocalypse and Armada in Kyd's Spanish Tragedy, (1995). In this collection of his earlier essays on The Spanish Tragedy, Ardolino explains how Kyd's employment of the word "mystery" parallels thematic motifs of prophecy, judgement and redemption. He places emphasis on the hidden meanings within the play and suggest that The Spanish Tragedy joins the classical code of justice with an unforgiving Christian ethos of divine vengeance like that enunciated in the books of Daniel and Revelation. He suggests that Kyd wrote an apocalyptic play that presents, in a mysterious subtext, the overthrow of the Antichrist, which was identified as Babylon/Spain, by England in 1588. He concludes that English nationalism decreed that the English were destined to fulfil the prophecies of Revelation, and in this context Hieronimo's actions could be justified to an Elizabethan audience. Ardolino's speculations rely too heavily on the value of hidden meanings in Kyd's play to account for the popularity and influence of the tragedy on the Elizabethan audience, and a later Jacobean audience. His reading limits the tragedy's scope by failing to recognise the wider concern with damnation and Hell.

the tragedy. Kyd's overarching theme is justice, as rightly recognised by critics such as Steven Justice, Philip Edwards and G.K. Hunter.² Kyd's use of topical events "merely" highlights the paradoxes inherent in justice systems (both legal and divine). By stripping away the topical events and situations that form the superficial plot, the pessimistic underbelly of the text comes to the fore: Kyd's endless tragedy and how the search for actual justice is futile in a world where events are preordained. This is strongly confirmed in the final lines of the play:

Then haste we down to meet thy friends and foes,
 To place thy friends in ease, the rest in woes;
 For here though death hath end their misery,
 I'll there begin their endless tragedy

(The Spanish Tragedy IV.v.45-48).

Seneca Tragicus penetrates Kyd's play to its core in its exploration of endless tragedy, and the ceaseless questioning of evil and unnecessary suffering in a world of a benevolent God.

The play is not completely devoid of justice though, as G.K. Hunter and Philip Edwards have argued: "Kyd's play is a denial of God's care for man", says Edwards (123, cf. Hunter "Ironies", 259-60). For Hieronimo is shown to be a just magistrate when he sentences Pedringano to death for the murder of Serberine. Hieronimo only seeks revenge when he is denied justice from the legal court, which is corrupt anyway. Equally, all

² See Philip Edwards, "Thrusting Elysium into Hell: The Originality of The Spanish Tragedy"; G. K. Hunter, "Seneca and the Elizabethans: A Case-Study in 'Influence' and English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare"; and Steven Justice, "Spain, Tragedy, and The Spanish Tragedy".

Hieronimo's pleas for justice from the Heavens go unanswered and remain closed to the world of the play.

Because Revenge is constantly onstage and may be seen to stand between Hieronimo and the Heavens, the audience's understanding of the revenge plot is complicated. Kyd's play explores the paradox created when matters of justice are interfered with; by complicating salvation so that fates are predetermined irrespective of merit or sin, Kyd recreates a world of arbitrary judgment that comments on contemporary discussions of eternal judgement and salvation in Elizabethan England.

I. Obscured Justice: The Cause of Ire

In Kyd's play there are a number of characters at any given moment seeking either revenge or reward, and sometimes both, but Hieronimo's story takes centre stage. When the legal systems in the Spanish court fail him - because of royal interference - Hieronimo takes it upon himself to find "justice" for Horatio's murder. Kyd uses the constant onstage presence of the spirit Revenge to suggest that Hieronimo's actions might be infernally motivated.

In the end when Don Andrea sentences everyone according to his own fancy (using Proserpine's methods as his example), it is clear how matters of justice in the play have been obscured. When rulers interfere with justice, or when judges fail to do their duty, justice is unattainable. In Hell, the task of judgement is transferred from the three appointed judges Minos, Aeacus, and Rhadamanth to the two regents Pluto and Proserpine. But this is a subversion of the system and the rulers of the underworld treat eternal judgement like a game. This is mirrored in the play when Hieronimo struggles to find justice for his son's murder and the earthly courts fail him.

When Hieronimo undertakes the task himself he uses the stage as his arena for personal revenge. Hieronimo's example is complicated by the fact that he is the official magistrate for the Spanish court. Since he is unable to bring Lorenzo or Balthazar to trial in the official legal manner he must resort to private revenge. The game-like aspect of this is cloaked around the play that Hieronimo stages at the court in the final act.

Despite framing the play on Don Andrea's descent into Hell with the Induction, the title for Kyd's tragedy excludes Don Andrea from notable mention. Instead the title indicates that the main tragic action concerns Horatio, Bel-imperia and Hieronimo:

The Spanish Tragedy
Containing the Lamentable end
Of Don Horatio and Bel-imperia:
With the pitiful Death
Of old Hieronimo (t.p.)³

The introduction of the ghost of Don Andrea and Revenge at the start of the play merely serves to place Hell into the frame of the narrative. By bringing Hell onstage at the start of the play, and in keeping Revenge and

³ There is an undated copy of Kyd's text in the British Library with a similarly qualified title: "The Spanish Tragedie containing the lamentable end of Don Horatio and Bel-imperia with the pittiful death of olde Hieronimo. Newly corrected and amended of such grosse faults as passed in the first impression at London" (cited in Boas, xxvi). In his edition of Kyd's works, Frederick Boas argues that although the undated copy is a second edition it represents an earlier "purer" copy: "when we find that that the 1599 Quarto agrees much more frequently with that of 1594 than with the undated Quarto, we may conclude that the last named represents the earlier, as it undoubtedly does the purer text" (xxvii).

Andrea's ghost present throughout the action of the play, Kyd suggests a link between the events in the Spanish court and the infernal realm.

Kyd's Induction also establishes the key problem of judgement that presides over all the action in the tragedy towards Hieronimo's final denouement. The first problem is highlighted by the fact that Andrea was unjudged at death: "When I was slain, my soul descended straight / To pass the flowing stream of Acheron" (18-19). Andrea finds Minos, Aecus and Rhadamanth past Charon's ferry port and past Hell's guard Cerberus amidst thousands of souls where he must finally be judged.

After discussing the merits of his life the judges are unable to place Andrea in either everlasting pain or eternal bliss. Because they cannot agree they decide to send Andrea to Pluto's court for judgement: "Minos, the mildest censor of the three, / Made this device to end the difference. / 'Send him, [. . .] to our infernal king'" (50-2). But from the evidence the judges base their decision on, Andrea's example is not exceptionally complex.

The three judges mentioned in Kyd's underworld appear in numerous accounts of the classical underworld because of their expert ability to judge the dead. In making them struggle with the straightforward case of Don Andrea, Kyd highlights the problems inherent in judgement within a system that has only two extremes, "everlasting time / Under green myrtle trees and cypress shades" or "lasting pain" (I.i.43-49). In the Purgatorial accounts, such as the vision of William Stranton discussed in the Introduction, problems of judgement were not so complex: all souls were judged after death and if they did not repent before death then they were sent to a specific place to purge their sins before the day of doom.

The gravity with which the judges weighed Andrea's case is lost when the infernal regents pass judgement. This leads to the larger problem of what happens when the justice system is interfered with by playful royals. The earthly court of Spain, where Hieronimo struggles with judgement and justice mirrors this problem in Pluto and Proserpine's infernal court but has fatal consequences in Spain.

When he approaches Pluto's court Andrea shows his passport to the infernal deities and awaits his eternal judgement:

I trod the middle path,
Which brought me to the fair Elysian green,
In midst whereof there stands a stately tower,
The walls of brass, the gates of adamant.
Here finding Pluto with his Proserpine,
I showed my passport humbled on my knee (72-77).

His patience and passivity during his ordeal in Pluto's court contrasts with the arbitrary attitude of the infernal rulers Pluto and Proserpine regarding his eternal fate: Andrea takes the situation with seriousness and humility. Proserpine smiles before she even hears Andrea's merits: "fair Proserpine began to smile, / And begged that only she might give my doom" (78-9). Her smile pleases Pluto who seals her request with a kiss and with no further discussion she summons Revenge:⁴

⁴ Virgil places Revenge in the empty halls of Dis, in the throat of Hell, "in faucibus Orci", alongside Grief and the Furies (*Aeneid* VI 273). In *The Aeneid* these figures are harmless to Aeneas as he passes since they are not living substances. Kyd does not include reassurance to his traveller that the spirits cannot harm the living in the way Virgil's Sybil comforts Aeneas. This reinforces the ambiguity about whether or not the characters in the play are influenced by the presence of Revenge onstage.

Forthwith, Revenge, she rounded thee in th'ear,
 And bade thee lead me through the gates of horn,
 Where dreams have passage in the silent night.
 No sooner had she spoke but we were here,
 I wot not how, in twinkling of an eye (81-85).

Andrea's retelling of his journey moves from a discussion about the past to the present, bringing himself and the audience into the frame of the play. As he and Revenge arrive in the Spanish court, the audience arrive with them and has the same knowledge as Andrea about what is about to happen.

In The Rewarde of Wickednesse and in A Mirror for Magistrates, the fates of the sinners were determined before death and so this mishap of justice was not possible. But in the earlier account of Saint Patrick's Purgatory, discussed in the introduction, judgement was determined at death; the abbess who arrives for judgement actively tries to persuade the judges of her righteousness in order to avoid eternal punishment. Here in Kyd's tragedy, the seriousness of judgement is subverted: Andrea makes no attempt to save his soul and the judges treat the matter as a game. Andrea's passivity is representative of his insignificance in determining his own fate as it is entirely down to Proserpine's whim.

The de casibus origins of Andrea's story emerge when he says, "I was a courtier in the Spanish court [. . .] Till life to death made passage through my wounds" (I.i.4-17). He claims that he served his country dutifully and going off to battle in Portugal, lost his life. Steven Justice reads Andrea's words as a plea for revenge, if only because he lost his love and his life. Justice argues, "Andrea wants revenge quite simply

because he has lost Bel-imperia and his life, and can know only earthly satisfaction for the loss of earthly goods" (Justice 278).

The only evidence for Justice's assertion about Andrea's hidden meaning lies in the fact that in The Spanish Tragedy, "revenge is a way of life [. . .] The desire for revenge motivates every major action in the play" (278). But crucially, Andrea never asks for revenge; Proserpine simply assigns Revenge to Andrea on a whim, and up until the final moments of the play Andrea remains unsure about why he has returned to the Spanish court with Revenge. "Come we for this from depth underground", Andrea asks at the end of the first act, and at the end of the second, "Brought'st thou me hither to increase my pain?"

Only Revenge is privy to Proserpine's "doom" and he leads Andrea back to the court of Spain through one of the twin gates of sleep. Revenge chooses the gate of horn, "Where dreams have passage in the silent night" (83).⁵ In the Induction, Kyd departs from the traditional purposes for a dream vision on two important points. Firstly, Andrea travels through the gate of dreams, but he is a ghost and already dead so it is superfluous for him to witness a mirror for good behaviour. And secondly, Andrea travels from the underworld back to earth - usually narrators claim to travel to Hell (or even Purgatory) in order to learn about the punishments suffered by sinners.

Revenge reveals that he already knows what is going to happen in Spain when he and Andrea return to the Spanish court:

⁵ For Virgil the gate of horn will reveal true visions while the gate of ivory shows false dreams. David West's prose translation reads: "There are two gates of sleep: one is called the Gate of Horn and it is an easy exit for true shades; the other is made all in gleaming white ivory, but through it the powers of the underworld send false dreams up towards the heavens" (VI: 161).

Then know, Andrea, that thou art arrived
 Where thou shalt see the author of thy death,
 Don Balthazar the prince of Portingale,
 Deprived of life by Bel-imperia (86-89).

The spirit's words reveal that the events in Spain they are about to witness have already been decided. Although Revenge seems to already know what is going to happen he beckons his guest, "Here sit we down to see the mystery, / And serve for Chorus in this tragedy" (90-1). Andrea needs constant reminding that the events he witnesses have a secret meaning, at one point he even reprimands Revenge because events seem to torment him more than the fact that he is still unjudged.

Frank Ardolino explores Kyd's use of the word "mystery" at three significant points in the play; firstly in Revenge's words to Andrea in lines 90-1 quoted above; when Hieronimo presents a masque at the royal banquet, "Hieronimo, this masque contents mine eye, / Although I sound not well the mystery" (I.iv.138-9); and finally in the dumb show Revenge presents to Andrea: "Awake, Revenge, reveal this mystery"(III.iv.29). Ardolino explains how Kyd's employment of the word "mystery" parallels thematic motifs of prophecy, judgement and redemption in the play.⁶

⁶In chapter 7, "The 'Annus Mirabilis' of 1588: Apocalypse and Armada" 121-141, Ardolino suggests that Kyd meant the audience to link the mystery with the overthrow of the Antichrist. He argues that the Antichrist must be Spain and Kyd's tragedy alludes to the Spanish Armada in 1588. But Ardolino fails to convince me that Kyd's allusions to topical situations necessarily means he wrote the tragedy after the English defeat of the Spanish in 1588. All of the topical events and situations that form Ardolino's argument are still applicable if the play was written before the Armada. His argument concludes, "the central political subtext involves the defeat of Spain in 1588. As a nationalistic ritual, The Spanish Tragedy has revealed to its "initiated" audiences the mystery of the process of destiny which led to the English victory over Spain" (166). There is no reason that Kyd should want to simply allude to the defeat of the Spanish in

However there is something more important going on in Kyd's tragedy: the mystery Revenge mentions at the beginning. Hieronimo's search for justice in the Spanish court, and his eventual turn towards personal revenge, highlight the weaknesses in political systems which seem arbitrary and lack order. This is mirrored in Don Andrea's experience in Hades when Proserpine sentences him on a whim and he is allowed to make the eternal judgements at the end of the play.

Hieronimo's revenge is framed as justice in a world where order is missing and both earthly and infernal courts make arbitrary judgements. Kyd's comments on the whimsical nature of justice questions some of the doctrines of the different strains of Protestantism. The tragedy places emphasis on doctrines of predestination and fate and by the example of Don Andrea reveals anxieties about the elimination of a purgatorial space for exceptions to the question of salvation or damnation. In a world where salvation and damnation are predetermined, the slow route to Heaven (Purgatory) is superfluous, but without it, eternal decisions may not accurately reflect a person's moral character.

Kyd keeps the audience attentive to what the mystery of the tragedy could be by introducing various different revenge plots. The three main revenge plots involve Bel-imperia, Balthazar and Hieronimo. Firstly Don Andrea (may) want revenge for his death but the only evidence for this comes at the end of the first act when Horatio explains how Andrea was slain by Balthazar: "young Don Balthazar with ruthless rage, / Taking advantage of his foe's distress, / Did finish what his halberdiers begun, And left not till Andrea's life was done" (I.iv.23-26). According to Horatio then, Andrea was slain unfairly when he was already

a mysterious way, only available to an elite audience, rather than celebrate this victory openly.

wounded - but this is not outside of martial practice. When she hears this, Bel-imperia vows to seek revenge on Balthazar by taking Horatio as her lover and ignoring the Portuguese prince's advances. She offers Balthazar only her "just disdain" (71). In reality, the first revenge plot is introduced when Bel-imperia hears how her lover was killed.

The second revenge scenario occurs when Balthazar learns that Bel-imperia loves Horatio. He takes this as a personal insult and vows his own revenge on Horatio: "I must take revenge or die myself, / For love resisted grows impatient" (II.ii.116-7). Lorenzo offers to assist Balthazar and they plan to murder Horatio with Pedringano and Serberine.

The third revenge plot occurs after Hieronimo finds the body of his murdered son Horatio hanging in his arbour. Hieronimo's revenge takes centre stage and as the tragedy unfolds the revenge theme is verbally linked with Hell. As Hieronimo struggles to find justice in the earthly court and becomes more and more frustrated he invokes the infernal world for assistance.

Geoffrey Aggeler argues that the central crux in The Spanish Tragedy is the,

discrepancy between the orthodox Christian beliefs expressed by the living characters with regards to the process of divine justice and what is revealed in the judgement scenes which frame the main plot (319).

He rightly recognises that the king of Spain sets the moral Christian framework for the tragedy when he calls out to Divine Providence after they defeat the Portuguese: "Then blest be heaven, and guider of the

heavens, / From whose fair influence such justice flows" (I.ii.10-11). But Hieronimo turns away from such a view when his pleas for divine justice fall on deaf ears.

Despite the emphasis on divine intervention in the tragedy, Philip Edwards comments on the gods' lack of concern for the human characters in Kyd's tragedy:

[b]eneath all the violence and the outrage and the impetuous rhetoric there is a sombre silence which is the only response made to the never-ending questions about evil and suffering [. . .] But no explaining voice is privileged (123).

Any evidence of justice is absent from the world of the play, and Edwards goes as far as to argue that The Spanish Tragedy, "sets up a rather horrifying and totally un-Christian cosmic machinery" (131).

Aggeler reads the spirituality in the play along infernal lines, stating that Hieronimo sees himself as a scourge when he accepts his damned role:

Hieronimo's awareness of the damnable nature of the course he has chosen [. . .] the crucial soliloquy beginning "Vindicta mihi!" and concluding with the same decision to revenge (III.xiii.1-44) [. . .] [His speech] reveals the speaker's growing awareness of the inadequacy of the conventional views of human experience represented by these alternatives (326-7).

Furthermore Aggeler notes, "[Hieronimo] has abandoned his office along with everything it signifies and has surrendered himself to what he sees as a damned role" (327).

Kyd uses a Senecan frame to explore the effect of this lack of justice on human lives. These problems reflect the English inheritance of the Lutheran concern with Divine justice, but more particularly, Luther's own re-evaluation of the passage in Psalm 30, "Deliver me in my righteousness". Luther argued for the duplicitous nature of God's will: part of His will is what is revealed in the Word, and the another part is deus absconditus, which is incomprehensible to men.

Skinner paraphrases this Lutheran doctrine: "The will of the hidden God is omnipotent, ordaining everything that happens in the world. But it is also beyond our understanding" (5). Not only can men never hope to know God's plan but, more importantly, Luther argued in The Bondage of the Will that all of mankind's actions are an expression of our inherent sinfulness and nothing could ever justify men in the eyes of God and help ensure salvation (hence the bondage of our will to Satan). Divine mercy only comes to those who are tormented by the fear of death and acknowledge their own sinfulness (Luther, Bondage 175-200).

The Lutherans recognised the pessimism and despair inherent in thinking about man's bondage to sin. The debates countered such pessimism by insisting on the greatness of God's mercy; the only way a sinner can hope to achieve salvation is to have a completely passive faith in God's mercy:

It is enough to know simply that there is a certain inscrutable will in God, and to what, why, and how far it wills, that is something we have no right whatever to inquire into,

hanker after, care about, or meddle with, but only to fear and adore (Luther Bondage, 201).

The Lutheran emphasis on the mystery of God's will for man sheds some light on The Spanish Tragedy's puzzling lack of justice. Hieronimo struggles with the concept of divine justice because he thinks that he should recognise it in the form of earthly punishment for Horatio's murderers. Since Hieronimo is Spain's leading magistrate and he does not understand divine judgement, the play questions how anyone can understand this mystery.

At the end of Kyd's play Hieronimo is granted salvation on account of his own works, despite the fact that he committed the sin murder. Christian eschatology is inverted in The Spanish Tragedy; the supernal gods take no action in the events in the Spanish court, but the infernal deities are happy to use the human characters in their personal game. Edwards notes, "If something recognizable as justice gets done in the working out of Hieronimo's revenge, it is not to the credit of the gods. The gods of Kyd's play are supremely unconcerned with justice of any kind" (Edwards 122). Even at the end, there is a distinct lack of justice in the world of the play; Hieronimo is saved despite killing everyone and Andrea gets to go to Elysium with Bel-imperia because he is passing judgment.

The onstage presence of Revenge and Andrea serves two purposes,⁷ firstly they remind the theatre audience of a hellish presence

⁷ These purposes are not relevant to the main plot of Kyd's tragedy. David Bevington thinks that the introduction from Hades only serves to establish the mood of the play. He states that elements described in Hades serve are included to establish the mood: "The consequences of human action can be dire in this depiction of the afterlife: lovers and brave warriors sport in the Elysian Fields, while perjurers and usurers are scalded in

of Revenge so that on a superficial level Kyd links Hell (or at least Revenge) with events of the play. The second purpose in their onstage presence is explained when Revenge says, "Here sit we down to see the mystery, / And serve for Chorus in this tragedy" (90-1). Here Ardolino argues for the importance of Kyd's use of the word "mystery". He plainly states, "[t]he key to understanding the political and eschatological meanings of The Spanish Tragedy lies in Kyd's use of the word mystery to define the play" (Ardolino 12). In Revenge's identification of the main stage play (i.e. the events in the Spanish Court that are performed for the theatre audience and the onstage audience) as a mystery, he highlights that there is a hidden meaning to the events onstage.

a) The Excitatio of the Furies from Hell

In Seneca's essay "On Providence" the philosopher explained that the world does not work arbitrarily but that all events are governed by a higher power, " Even those phenomena which seem irregular and undetermined [. . .] do not happen without a reason" (I.2-4). The tragedy Thyestes adds an infernal aspect to the protagonist's fate through the introduction of a curse over the house of Tantalus and the final call for infernal punishment.

In The Spanish Tragedy, Kyd combines ideas of divine providence with the appearance of the infernal deities and the presence of Revenge, to indicate a hellish influence over events. But, the course of the dramatic action in the play serves to reveal an undisclosed, yet preordained, plan over events in Spain. Both Thyestes and Hieronimo

boiling lead or choked with melting gold under the watchful eye of Furies with their whips of steel. The afterlife is thus a place of Dantesque justice and retribution. It is a pagan afterlife, presided over by Pluto and Proserpina; it rewards courtly virtues like valour and devoted service in love" (Bevington, Introduction 5).

arrive at their telos because it is a fated telos; but how they arrive is a mystery and depends on the path they choose. Kyd makes the contention that Hieronimo may not have a choice and is pushed in an infernal direction by the forces of Hell and the sheer obstinacy of the heavens.

Some Elizabethan tragedies, such as Gorboduc and Gismond of Salerne, stage a Fury (usually Megaera) who prophesises wicked behaviour. The Elizabethan anxieties caused by the "unsurety" in theology and religious doctrine are revealed in the tragedies that problematise the issue of fate and free-will by including Hell's influence in a Christian framework. The two anonymous tragedies Soliman and Perseda⁸ and The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune were staged around the same time as Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy and they also apply this dramatic device in order to indicate a hellish, yet preordained, influence in the action of the play-proper. A preordained plan that stems from Hell is problematic for two key reasons; it means that either God is the author of evil, or God does not control all human events.

In The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune (1582), the Fury Tisiphone rises up from Hell and establishes discord among the supernal deities. She introduces herself in threatening terms:

Tysiphone the daughter of eternall night,
Bred in the bottome of the deepest pit of hell:
Brought up in blood and cheri[shed] with scravling snakes,
tormenting therwithall the damned soules of them,

⁸ Some critics, such as Frederick Boas, insist that this tragedy be placed in Kyd's oeuvre but the evidence for this is minimal and depends primarily on the fact that Hieronimo's revenge tragedy is also called "Soliman and Perseda".

Heer upon earth that carelesse live of [Jupiter's]
 commaundment (20-24).

The Fury brings Jupiter a message from his brother in Hell (Pluto) that Venus must cease her condemnation of Lady Fortune, Pluto's daughter (suggesting a link between Hell and Fortune).

Jupiter sends Tisiphone, "the messenger of discorde and debate" (48), back to Hell to fetch Fortune. In order to get back to Hell, the fury beckons the earth to open up and swallow her: "Give place thou aire, open thou earth, gape hollow hell belowe, / and unto all that live and breathe, I with a worlde of woe" (61-2). In the tragedy, the earth opens up for the Fury so that the spirit can travel from the space of Hell (below the stage) up to earth (on the stage) and back again.

When Lady Fortune appears, she and Venus complain to Jupiter that the other goddess interferes with her work. Jupiter says to settle the dispute they must turn to the deeds of men,

By examples this may best be learnde,
 In elder ages led within your lawes.

therefore a while hereof I meane to pause.

And bring in Mercury in open view,

the Ghostes of them that Love and Fortune slue (201-5).

Mercury then commands Charon and Cerberus to call forth the souls who can report the deeds of Fortune and Love but there are so many that Jupiter says that he has a different type of contest for the goddesses. To demonstrate her sovereignty Venus must increase the joy of a Prince and his lover (Hermione and Fidelity) and Fortune's task is to destroy their

pleasures and pastimes: "she that most can please them or dispight, / [Jupiter] will confirme to be of greatest might" (265-6).

In the end neither goddess claims total dominance over the events of the human characters in the play. Instead Venus and Fortune are united in friendship and agree to work together rather than set discord among men: "Fortune and love makes all amendes. / Let us rejoyce then for the same, / And sing hye praises of their name" (1855-7). Although the play began with a Fury rising up from Hell, the action turns comic, rather than tragic. When Fortune and Venus cannot claim to control the human events in the play and agree to share the stage, they disclose a fundamental truth about their involvement: although they can influence the paths humans take, ultimately human fates are subject to the greater force of Jupiter, the "greatest might".

Likewise, in Seneca's tragedy Thyestes, Megæra does not actively influence Atreus or Thyestes and in The Spanish Tragedy Revenge does not influence Hieronimo because the events of the human characters have been predetermined. In the tragedies from the 1560s discussed in chapter four, sinfulness was attributed to an active evil influence, like a vice. And in chapter one's discussion of A Mirror for Magistrates I showed how the authors attributed a variety of causes for damnation, although sometimes Fortune is blamed. But in the 1580s, when Kyd's tragedy was first performed, the doctrine of predestination and ideas about Divine Providence dominated the Elizabethan culture and becomes evident in the literature throughout the following twenty years. The period's anxiety with the Calvinist doctrine of predestination is poignantly

evident in Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, performed within the same year as Kyd's tragedy.⁹

The next section of this chapter focuses on how the fates of the three main characters; Horatio, Bel-imperia and Hieronimo, cast light on the mystery that Revenge refers to at the start of the play. In Kyd's play Hieronimo and Bel-imperia both seek revenge and murder their enemies yet they end up in eternal bliss. In the anonymous tragedy, that shares a title with Hieronimo's playlet, both Soliman and Perseda are sent to "eternal night" for their roles in revenge plots. The last section looks at the differences between the final judgements in both tragedies.

b) Horatio's Murder

Horatio's first appearance in the tragedy is when he and Lorenzo (who is the king's nephew) present their Portuguese prisoner, prince Balthazar, before the king of Spain. Horatio, merely a magistrate's son, is immediately relegated to a secondary place in the Spanish court when the King beckons, "Welcome, Don Balthazar, welcome, nephew, / And thou, Horatio, thou art welcome too" (I.ii.132-3). Despite Horatio's claim that he captured the prisoner he is practically ignored by the king.

When Horatio and Lorenzo argue their cases for why they deserve credit for the prince's capture, Horatio's claim is considerably stronger than Lorenzo's yet the king grants his nephew a far greater reward. In fact, Horatio must make do without a reward because the king grants him the ransom for the prince, which has yet to be agreed, and Horatio is murdered before the ransom amount is determined and delivered.

⁹ For a discussion of Doctor Faustus in relation to Calvinist doctrines see Greg, Damnation 97-107.

Before the king explains his final judgement in the Spanish court, he asks if Horatio and Lorenzo would be content with his decision: "Will both abide the censure of my doom?" (175). The king uses Proserpine's word "doom", creating a verbal link with the queen's whimsical judgement of Andrea in the first scene. He then makes a special decision in favour of his nephew when he offers his judgement and explains, "nephew, thou shalt have the prince in guard, / For thine estate best fitteth such a guest; / Horatio's house were small for all his train" (185-7). This disregard of merit in favour of rank is not just a problem in earthly matters in Spain but corresponds to Proserpine's arbitrary judgement of Andrea in the Induction.

In the first scenes of the first act, Kyd establishes a precedent for reading the court: both the infernal court of Pluto and Proserpine and the earthly court of Spain lack a fair judicial system. In both courts merit is dismissed and judgement is corrupted by the passing fancy of a royal person (first Proserpine and then the King of Spain). The danger of the courts in the universe of The Spanish Tragedy is brought sharply into focus in the next act when Bel-imperia is betrayed by her own brother despite her attempts to keep away from the court. When she arranges to confirm her love to Horatio in his father's arbour, Bel-imperia warns, "The court were dangerous, [the bower] is safe" (II.ii.44).

Bel-imperia is of course wrong in her judgement about the safety of the arbour. Lorenzo and Balthazar overhear Bel-imperia's conversation with Horatio and arrange to murder him in Hieronimo's arbour. When Pedringano leaves his watch over the young lovers to go and fetch Lorenzo and Balthazar, Bel-imperia senses that something is amiss, "my heart foretells me some mischance" (II.iv.15). But Horatio tries to calm her:

fair fortune is our friend,
 And heavens have shut up day to pleasure us.
 The stars, thou seest, hold back their twinkling shine,
 And Luna hides herself to pleasure us (II.iv.16-19).

Horatio's belief in this "reversed" conceit about Fortune is troubling; usually the signs Horatio recognises are associated with looming danger. Despite this Bel-imperia is comforted and submits to Horatio's wooing in the arbour.

Horatio's misjudgement of why the stars hide is another inversion of Senecan material; Thyestes reads the darkened cosmos as an indication of a human transgression. Horatio fails to link the darkened sky with dark events but the emphasis on Hell in the play, especially the onstage presence of Revenge, provide the audience with enough clues to recognise the significance. Seneca's protagonist knew enough of his universe to understand that it reacts to horror. Thyestes sensed the evil crime his brother committed when the skies darken and he exclaims:

What meaneth this? yet more and more
 of backwarde beaten skye
 The compasse falles: and thicker myst
 the worlde doth overlye
 Then blackest darkenes, and the night
 in night it selfe dothe hyde.
 All starrs be fledde (Heywood Thyestes, 2441-47).

Thyestes understands that the heavens have been made sick by some wicked human deed: "The gods are fled" he comments (2499). In Kyd's

rearticulation of the Senecan material, it is not the victim of the predicted crime (Horatio) who senses evil but the witness Bel-imperia. But her overwhelming fear just before Horatio is murdered does not prevent Horatio's murder.

In calling on this Senecan motif in the arbour Kyd matches the heavens' closure on Bel-imperia and Horatio to the way the heavens shut over the damned brothers Atreus and Thyestes. Eugene D. Hill describes Seneca's plays as enacting the "bursting forth of malign forces from the underworld", and he says that in a typical Senecan play, "hell claims earth and devastates a kingdom" (Hill "Spanish Tragedy", 146).

The relationship between Horatio's murderers and Atreus is further supported by a rhetorical link. Lorenzo's grisly comment that by loving Bel-imperia Horatio was elevated to a higher position (i.e. the noose) imitates the Atrean-riddles at the end of Thyestes. Lorenzo says, "Although his life were still ambitious proud, / Yet is he at the highest now he is dead" (60-1). Atreus makes similarly ambiguous comments to his brother that doubly admit his guilt and conceal it: "what ever parte / yet of thy children all / Remaynes, here shalt thou have: and what / remayneth not, thou host" (2519-22).

When Hieronimo finds his son's dead body he manages to control his emotional composure in the situation by first removing Horatio's body from the noose and informing his wife Isabella about their shared tragedy. Isabella asks, "where's the author of this endless woe?" (II.v.39). Hieronimo responds, "To know the author were some ease of grief, / For in revenge my heart would find relief" (40-1). Isabella knows that this tragedy will never end: her husband, like Thyestes, cannot conceive this important reality and vows to seek his revenge.

Hieronimo says that he will seek out Horatio's murderers and find his revenge, "Then will I joy amidst my discontent; / Till then my sorrow never shall be spent" (55-6). But Isabella, here the voice of reason and orthodoxy, tells him not to worry because the heavens are just and will bring the foul deed to light: "The heavens are just; murder cannot be hid" (57). Hieronimo, like Thyestes, naively trusts in the justice of the heavens only to be disappointed eventually and turn to Hell for revenge.

At the end of this act Andrea is confused by what he has witnessed and asks Revenge if he was brought back to Spain as punishment: "Brought'st thou me hither to increase my pain?" (II.vi.1). Earlier Revenge promised Andrea to inflict "mortal hate" in the breasts of his enemies, but he has just witnessed his best friend's murder and maltreatment of his lover Bel-imperia at the hands of his enemy. This victory for Balthazar and Lorenzo perturbs the ghost who is himself feeling the influence of the spirit. Revenge tells him to be patient and he will be satisfied when Balthazar gets what he deserves: "Be still, and ere I lead thee from this place / I'll show thee Balthazar in heavy case" (10-11).

II. Tragedia Cothurnata

When Hieronimo appears on stage in the next act he is markedly different in his determination to avenge his son's murder. Instead of seeking justice from the heavens, he begins to look towards Hell for his revenge. The heavens are out of his reach and remain closed to the Spanish court:

O sacred heavens, if this unhallowed deed,
If this inhuman and barbarous attempt,

If this incomparable murder thus
 Of mine, but now no more, my son
 Shall unrevealed and unrevengèd pass,
 How should we term your dealings to be just,
 If you unjustly deal with those that in your justice trust?
 (III.ii.5-11).

Hieronimo wonders how he can accept his son's unjust death when the heavens have done nothing to bring his murderers to justice. The magistrate's dismay questions the Elizabethan argument that ordinary citizens should endure earthly injustices because God will eventually punish the wicked and reward the obedient.

More importantly, Kyd examines the rationality of the Lutheran maxim that if men can recognise justice on earth then it cannot be divine (see above 171-2). Justice for Horatio's murder is consistently out-of-reach from Hieronimo, thus driving him towards his hellish revenge. Hieronimo asks what type of justice this passive acceptance to injustice can possibly achieve and furthermore, how long can a man wait for divine justice?

a) Justice or Revenge?

Immediately after begging for justice from the heavens Hieronimo recognises that he is instead pulled in the direction of earthly revenge by the forces of Hell:

The night, sad secretary to my moans,
 With direful visions wake my vexèd soul,
 And with the wounds of my distressful son

Solicit me for notice of his death.
 The ugly fiends do sally forth of hell,
 And frame my steps to unfrequented paths,
 And fear my heart with fierce inflamèd thoughts (12-18).

He is torn between his moral duty to the laws of God and Spain to seek justice from the courts and his personal grief as a father seeking revenge for his son's unexplained murder:

The cloudy day my discontents records,
 Early begins to register my dreams
 And drive me forth to seek the murderer.
 Eyes, life, world, heavens, hell, night, and day,
 See, search, show, send, some man, some mean (19-23).

In his confusion about where to find justice Hieronimo begs for any assistance, or any evidence, of who is responsible for Horatio's death. He is gradually recognising that he will never attain justice because it is not available in his world.

At the end of the third act Andrea wakes Revenge and expresses his outrage that the god should fall asleep. But instead of naming Revenge, Andrea calls to the spirits of Hell before returning to the Spanish court:

Awake Erichtho! Cerberus, awake!
 Solicit Pluto, gentle Proserpine;
 To combat, Acheron and Erebus!

For ne'er by Styx and Phlegethon in hell¹⁰
 Nor ferried Charon to the fiery lakes
 Such fearful sights as poor Andrea sees! (III.xv.1-6).

The change in Andrea is difficult to ignore; at the end of the first act he was confused about why he returned to the Spanish court with Revenge, "Come we for this from the depth of underground" (I.v.1). At the end of the second act Andrea still does not understand the purpose of their journey but he is inquisitive, not ireful, "Brought'st thou me hither to increase my pain?" (II.vi.1). But at the end of the third act Andrea's cold blood is boiling as he summons the elements of Hell to his aid. He imitates the cries of Heywood's Thyestes when he summons the fiends of Hell:

O kyng of Dytis dungeon darke,
 and grisly ghosts of hell,
 [.]
 Break up thou soyle from botome deepe,
 and geve thou roome to hell,
 That night, where day, that ghosts, were gods
 were woont to raigne, may dwell.
 Why gapste thou not? Why do you not
 O gates of hell unfolde? (Thyestes, 2689-2782).¹¹

¹⁰ There is a line missing from the text here. David Bevington suspects that it read something like, "Was I distressed with outrage sore as this".

¹¹ Compare also Cambises' call to Murder and Cruelty to assist him during part of his reign of terror or Faustus' thinking that he controls Mephistopheles: "I charge thee wait upon me whilst I live, / To do whatever Faustus shall command" (I.iii.37-8). Mephistopheles of course tells Faustus that his conjuring occasioned his presence, rather than commanded it: "That was the cause, but yet per accidens! / For when we hear one rack the name of God, / Abjure the Scriptures and his Saviour Christ, / We fly

Both Thyestes and Andrea feel that they can command the infernal powers; Andrea even commands Revenge to pay more attention, "Awake, Revenge, for thou art ill-advised / To sleep; awake! What, thou art warned to watch!" (III.xv.10-11). Andrea now understands the events in Spain according to a plan for his ultimate revenge but he sees that this path is obstructed: "Hieronimo with Lorenzo is joined in league / And intercepts our passage to revenge" (15-16).

Revenge tells Andrea to be patient because although he sleeps he still influences events in the Spanish court but then he asks Andrea to consider what it means to be subject to destiny:

Content thyself, Andrea; though I sleep,
 Yet is my mood soliciting their souls.
 [.]
 Behold, Andrea, for an instance how
 Revenge hath slept, and then imagine thou
 What `tis to be subject to destiny (2-28).

In the dumb show that follows Andrea interprets the bloody revenge of Hymen to indicate that the infernal deities do not tolerate a lover's woe. In consequence, the onstage audience and the theatre audience immediately interpret the events as Proserpine's gift of revenge to Andrea for losing his secret lover.

However, Revenge's words about destiny suggest that there is a different preordained plan from Andrea's personal revenge in motion at

in hope to get his glorious soul / Nor will we come unless he use such means / Whereby he is in danger to be damned" (47-52).

the Spanish court that leads Hieronimo to his actions. During the third act Hieronimo's desire for bloody revenge increases as his belief in heavenly justice diminishes. The onstage audience (Revenge and Andrea) attempt to convince the theatre audience that Hieronimo is being solicited by Revenge. Hieronimo now understands telos as the fulfilment of personal revenge, which, he is beginning to recognise, is his destiny. While his ire could stem from Revenge, it is adjunct to the powerful drive of destiny and possibly unavoidable.

Revenge's mention of destiny pulls the theological spectrum of the play closer to a Calvinist world where all events, including matters of eternal judgement, are preordained. The tragedy wavers between the world of the Induction, where judgment is arbitrary and determined at death, and the Protestant worlds of Calvinism with the possibility that fates are predetermined and Lutheranism, with emphases on faith and Scripture as the basis for salvation. Hieronimo's lost faith in divine justice and turn to personal revenge reveals his inherent sinfulness. But because judgment, in the world of the play, is arbitrary and Andrea is allowed to judge the dead, Hieronimo can still be offered salvation at the end of the play.

When Bel-imperia's blood-written letter falls to Hieronimo from above he interprets this as heavenly assistance despite the letter's request for revenge: "Revenge thyself on Balthazar and [Lorenzo]" (IV.i.28). Since the letter is so obscure about why Bel-imperia should accuse her own brother, and because it fails to mention that Horatio was murdered because he loved Bel-imperia, Hieronimo is distant and cautious. He vows not to take personal revenge but to investigate the circumstances further and find justice legally through his office of magistrate:

Dear was the life of my belovèd son,
 And of his death behoves me be revenged;
 Then hazard not thine own, Hieronimo,
 But live t' effect of thy resolution (44-7).

In the passage cited above, Hieronimo determines to proceed with caution in his search for Horatio's murderers. This casts him in a sympathetic role when he eventually turns to hellish revenge because he showed himself to be a just magistrate (by punishing Pedringano) and because he attempts to find justice. The heavens are closed off to him for reasons that are not made evident in the play - since he has not proven himself a villain, his exclusion from the heavens seems arbitrary and unfair.

When Hieronimo is called upon to judge and sentence Pedringano for the murder of Serberine, Kyd emphasises his trueness to his office as magistrate. Hieronimo tells the Deputy, "only I to all men just must be" (III.vi.9). So the theatre audience recognises that it was not Horatio's actual murder that caused Hieronimo to seek bloodthirsty revenge. Hieronimo asks the accused to repent and confess his crimes before his execution but his sentence, "Blood with blood" (35) stems from a strong Catholic Old Law philosophy.¹² The important thing here is that it is not Hieronimo's personal grief that leads him to sentence death,

¹² Steven Justice discusses Hieronimo's duty to Old Law philosophy (271-88). Justice argues that the political polemics of the 1580s and the religious vocabulary indicates that judgment in the play falls on the type of society rather than on Hieronimo. This type of society shows that tragedy is the result of a way of life: "a dramatic character can make only those choices that the dramatic society around him offers" (272). According to Justice, Hieronimo's Spain limits justice and only allows Hieronimo revenge because of the Catholic duty to Old Law philosophy. Kyd was born in 1558 and to assume that he was familiar with Old Law philosophy enough to make it a focal point of his tragedy is doubtful.

"The fault's approvèd and confessed, / And by our law he is condemned to die" (39-40). The law is Spain's law - Catholic law.

So, both the royal court of Spain and the infernal court of Pluto appear to reflect a Catholic dispensation: in Spain there is the court's duty to the Old Law philosophy of "[b]lood with blood" and in the infernal court the official judges determine eternal fate by measuring the merits and crimes of the individual. Yet crucially, the Calvinist doctrine of predestination - or Divine Providence - is the overriding force of the tragedy, and this is indicated when Revenge shares his knowledge of what is about to happen in Spain: "Then know, Andrea [. . .]" (I.i.86-9).

After administering justice for Serberine's murder by sentencing Pedringano to death by hanging, Hieronimo struggles with the forces of good and evil again when he tries to determine how to find justice for Horatio's murder. In his turn towards revenge, instead of justice, Kyd's Hieronimo mimics Preston's Cambises' turn to tyranny after administering justice to the wicked judge Sisamnes. Hieronimo truly struggles with his decision to turn to wicked revenge rather than justice and acknowledges that one is a hellish route that may bring his own damnation. Still though, he is unable to avoid the path towards revenge. Unlike Horatio, Hieronimo recognises that nature reacts to his decision for revenge:

The blust'ring winds, conspiring with my words,
 At my lament have moved the leafless trees,
 Disrobed the meadows of their flowered green,
 Made mountains marsh with spring-tides of my tears
 (III.viii.5-8).

The only force listening to his cries is Hell, his words have "broken through the brazen gates of hell" (9). In a world where everyone is subject to destiny, Hieronimo can only choose his fated path regardless of how he tries to avoid it.

Unaware of his preordained path, Hieronimo continues to verbally hammer at the gates of heaven in his search for justice,

Yet still tormented is my tortured soul
With broken sight and restless passions,
That wingèd mount, and, hovering in the air,
Beat at the windows of the brightest heaven (10-13).

Hieronimo's destructive language reflects the inaccessibility of the heavens; he has to conquer them in order to gain access. Despite his honest attempts to seek justice, the heavens remain closed to him. His solicitations for justice and revenge counter each other and heaven remains "impregnable" (17).

Even when Hieronimo receives a letter from Bel-imperia that explains Pedringano's involvement in Horatio's murder he still decides to look for justice despite his ire, "I will go plain me to my lord the King, / And cry aloud for justice through the court" (69-70). But even now, there is evidence that Hieronimo is unconvinced that he will be able to find justice. He says he will "either purchase just by entreats / Or tire them all with my revenging threats" (72-3).

Hieronimo is already thinking of Lorenzo and Balthazar's eternal punishment in Hell when he crosses two Portuguese looking for their prince. He tells the men to find Lorenzo's house down "a path on your left-hand side" (III.xi.12). These directions recall Andrea's description

of the left-hand path towards deepest hell and the fiery pits where sinners are punished:

The left-hand path, declining fearfully,
 Was ready downfall to the deepest hell,
 Where bloody Furies shakes their whips of steel,
 And poor Ixion turns an endless wheel
 [.]
 Where usurers are choked with melting gold,
 And wantons are embraced with ugly snakes,
 And murderers groan with never-killing wounds,
 And perjured wights scalded in boiling lead,
 And all foul sins with torments overwhelmed (I.i.63-71).

Hieronimo's directions to Lorenzo's house forge a link between travelling towards deepest Hell and finding Lorenzo, as if they are the same path. Hieronimo's depiction of the path is an inversion of Andrea's journey down the middle path to receive his judgement because Hieronimo has already passed judgement on Lorenzo and appoints him to deepest Hell:

Not far from thence, where murderers have built
 A habitation for their cursèd souls,
 There, in a brazen cauldron fixed by Jove
 In his fell wrath upon a sulphur flame,
 Yourselves shall find Lorenzo bathing him
 In boiling lead and blood of innocents (III.xi.24-29).

The two Portuguese men are unaware of Hieronimo's meaning and pass him off as a lunatic. They do, however, follow his directions: "Come, let's away to seek my lord the duke" (34).

Hieronimo does not give up his commitment to finding justice until after his pleas are rejected by the heavens and he sees that the king's vision is clouded by his familial relationship to Lorenzo and his political relationship to Balthazar. When he asks, "What accident hath happed Hieronimo?" (III.xii.83), Lorenzo fails to mention that Horatio was murdered and Hieronimo is grieving. Instead he blames the old man's lunacy on desire: "he is with extreme pride, / Conceived of young Horatio his son, / And covetous of having to himself / The ransom of the young prince Balthazar" (85-88). And although Hieronimo has not (at least in the time of the play) behaved in any manner to suggest that he desires the ransom himself, the Spanish king believes Lorenzo: "This is the love that fathers bear their sons. / But gentle brother, go give to him this gold" (91-2).

The king's gross misunderstanding of Hieronimo's motives restricts him from hearing what the magistrate has to say. And just as Atreus's limited perspective of his brother's character lead to the villainous acts of revenge against Thyestes, here Hieronimo's turn to revenge is further propelled by the king's misjudgement.

When the king rejects Hieronimo's pleas for justice as a mark of lunacy Hieronimo's search for justice is poignantly cut short. Realising that he will be unable to penetrate the heavens or the earthly court with his cries for justice Hieronimo decisively turns to revenge. When he cries "Vindicta mihi!" (III.xiii.1) he relinquishes his duty as magistrate and falls into the domain of private citizen. He is therefore, according to the English resistance theory of private-law doctrine, able to seek private

revenge without compromising his duty to God (as a magistrate) or the laws of Spain. He still risks God's wrath when he dies and his own judgement might still be looming. Kyd complicates this on two levels; firstly in the world of The Spanish Tragedy even eternal judgement is arbitrary and secondly the play is governed by a pre-ordained plan so Hieronimo's fate is already decided.

b) Hieronimo's Revenge

Before enacting his revenge, Hieronimo weighs the evidence in favour of his patient submission to the will of the heavens. First he contemplates, "Then stay, Hieronimo, attend their will, / For mortal men may not appoint their time" (III.xiii.4-5), and then he turns to the prospect of seeking earthly revenge, "Strike, and strike home where wrong is offered thee, / For evils unto ills conductors be" (7-8). He chooses revenge in the end, "And to conclude, I will revenge [Horatio's] death!" (20).

When Hieronimo hears poor petitioners seeking justice for the murder of Don Bazulto's son, he contemplates his own revenge, calling on Hell and firmly denouncing his office as magistrate. He claims that since justice on earth cannot be found for his case, he will call the fiends from Hell:

Though on this earth justice will not be found,
I'll down to hell, and in this passion
Knock at the dismal gates of Pluto's court,
Getting by force, as once Alcides did,
A troop of Furies and tormenting hags
To torture Don Lorenzo and the rest (108-113).

When the old man who has lost his son questions Hieronimo about his "troubled speech" (144), Hieronimo calls to the infernal judges. He asks why Proserpine has no pity for him - wondering like Thyestes, why the chthonic powers fail to intervene in this case of gross injustice.

The old man is unaware of Hieronimo's loss and tells him, "I am not your young son" (152). Hieronimo then concludes that the old man must be one of the furies sent to reprimand him for failing to seek vengeance for Horatio's murder:

What, not my son? Thou, then, a fury art,
Sent from the empty kingdom of black night
To summon me to make appearance
Before grim Minos and just Rhadamanth
To plague Hieronimo, that is remiss
And seeks not vengeance for Horatio's death (153-8).

Hieronimo is now fully committed to his hellish revenge in a fanatical way; this is made obvious by the way he tries to command the chthonic forces to his aid to seek vengeance for Horatio's murder.

When Hieronimo presents his playlet "Soliman and Perseda" to the court his mood is considerably altered from when he first learnt of his son's death. This is apparent in the soliloquy that Hieronimo speaks before his revenge play, and anticipates the outcome of his tragedy. He reflects his new attitude towards heavenly justice compared to his new motivation, revenge:

Bethink thyself, Hieronimo.
Recall thy wits, recount thy former wrongs

Thou hast received by murder of thy son,
 And lastly, not least, how Isabel,
 Once his mother and thy dearest wife,
 All woe-begone for him, hath slain herself.
 The plot is laid of dire revenge.
 On then, Hieronimo, pursue revenge,
 For nothing want but acting of revenge
 (IV.iii.21-29).

Hieronimo has been affected by the awful deeds against his kin and it certainly appears as though revenge has solicited his soul in this passage. The emphasis on the word "revenge" at the end of three consecutive lines is meant to impart on the audience Hieronimo's firm resolution for revenge as the final tragic action of the play begins. The performance of Hieronimo's play works to bring about his revenge but also further complicates the ideas of justice and revenge that occupy Kyd's play.

When Hieronimo decides to stage a dramatic tragedy to enact his revenge, he imitates, and indeed inverts, Proserpine's approach to judgement in the induction. The infernal queen treated Andrea's judgement as a game and with a laugh appointed Revenge to show Andrea the events in Spain. Hieronimo, Horatio and Bel-imperia were the key actors in Proserpine's tragedy and now Hieronimo treats the nobles with the seriousness due to matters of judgement that the chthonic deities did not.

But finding Spain lacking justice, as in the infernal court of Pluto, Hieronimo creates a mirror of Hell on earth by having their punishments acted out onstage for the court. Hieronimo's playlet, "Soliman and Perseda", delivers the guilty nobles to infernal punishments at the hands

of Hieronimo, playing the role of a God whom he thinks is absent from the Spanish court: "And princes, now behold Hieronimo, / Author and actor in this tragedy" (IV.iv.146-7).

The anonymous tragedy Soliman and Perseda shares its title with Hieronimo's revenge playlet in The Spanish Tragedy. A close textual reading of the roles of the deities in the anonymous play helps to unlock some of the mystery in Kyd's tragedy. In the contemporaneous tragedy three deities vie for responsibility over the actions of the human characters in the play. In the end none can claim control over the events because they are worked out according to a divine plan. The futility of the argument between Love, Fortune and Death in light of the powerful forces of fate and predestination is indicative of Hieronimo's plight over justice in The Spanish Tragedy.

III. Soliman and Perseda and Andrea's Final Judgements

In the anonymous tragedy Soliman and Perseda the desire for revenge is not seen to develop in the revengers (as it does in Hieronimo), but rather it is an inborn feature of their personalities. There is no evidence, or even the suggestion in the play that Death, Love or Fortune are working within the characters' souls in the way Kyd uses the onstage presence of Revenge to indicate malevolent influence: the characters in Soliman and Perseda do not call on Love, Fortune or Death to assist them in their individual plights even though the deities seem to influence the human character.

In the choruses Love, Fortune and Death compete to determine who was responsible for the actions in the play but none are certain of even their own involvement. But, when Erastus kills Ferdinando in Act II, he recognises the spirits' involvement in his personal tragedy:

Ah, fickle and blind guidresse of the world,
 What pleasure hast thou in my miserie?
 Wast not enough when I had lost the Chaine,
 Thou didst bereave me of my dearest love;
 But now when I should repossesse the same,
 To cross me with this haplesse accedent?
 Ah, if but time and place would give me leave,
 Great ease it were for me to purge my selfe,
 And to acuse fell Fortune, Love, and Death;
 For all these three conspire my tragedie (II.i.252-261).

As with Hieronimo, though, it is difficult to judge Erastus because his fall is brought about by a series of accidents rather than by internal malice.

The only indication the audience has that anyone in the play is punished for their transgressions is in the final chorus when Death dismisses Love and Fortune (for they are only suitable in comedies, says Death). The triumphant spirit reveals that each person whom he affected shall have to wait for his car and travel down to "deepest hell" with him:

By wasting all I conquer all the world,
 And now, to end our difference at last,
 In this last act note but the deedes of Death.
 Where is Erastus now, but in my triumph?
 Where are the murtherers, but in my triumph?
 Where Judge and witnesses, but in my triumph?
 Wheres falce Lucina, but in my triumph?
 Wheres faire Perseda, but in my triumph?

Wheres Basilisco, but in my triumph?
 Wheres faithful Piston, but in my triumph?
 Wheres valiant Brusor, but in my triumph?
 And wheres great Soliman, but in my triumph?
 Their loves and fortunes ended with their lives,
 And they must waite upon the Carre of Death.
 Packe, Love and Fortune, play in Commedies;
 For powerfull Death best fitteth Tragedies (V.v.14-29).

When Death reveals that he must fetch his car from Hell he calls on a long-standing motif well-suited to tragedy for the dance of death. At the end of Soliman and Perseda Death says,

I, now will Death, in his most haughtie pride,
 Fetch his imperial Carre from deepest hell,
 And ride in triumph through the wicked world (34-36).

From Petrarch's Triumphs, translated into English in 1549 by Henry Parker, English literature inherited the idea of a dance of Death. Petrarch's text details the triumphs of love, chastity, death, fame, time and divinity. In the "Tryumphe of [. . .] of fearful death" Petrarch explains that earthly elements are only temporary but Death is eternal. He says that in death people are stripped of their earthly riches and marched as equals:

And lo euen there present all sodenly
 Full of dead bodyes theyr great place dyd lye

In such a number that them for to rehearse

[.]

Innumerable deade of all mankynde

There were those that men happy dyd call

Kynges Emperours and Bysshoppes all

Now be they poore as poore as beggers be stones

[.]

Gone is all theyr glory and theyr freshe luste

A foole is he that to such thinges doth truste (G3r & G3v).

In Tottel's Miscellany there is description of a "Dance of Death" in a song that offers a comparison. The unknown author says death is a journey and so creates the impression that people need to travel to death but he also stresses the fact that everyone will meet death:

Since death shall sure, tyll all the world be wast.

What meaneth man to drede death then so sore?

[.]

The daunce of death, which all must runne on row:

Though how, or when, the lord alone doth know

(Tottel's Miscellany 125).

The play Soliman and Perseda ends with a repetition of the idea that "death shall dure, tyll all the world be wast" quoted above.

Death continues to elaborate on his role in human affairs:

Sparing none but sacred Cynthias friend,

Whom Death did feare before her life began:

For holy fates have graven it in their tables
 That Death shall die, if he attempt her end,
 Whose life is heavens delight, and Cynthias friend
 [Elizabeth] (37-41).

It is necessary to separate the wicked world mentioned in the earlier lines from those whom the holy fates have already spared. The world in Soliman and Perseda is overtly Protestant and the fates of the characters are independent of their actions in the tragedy. Death's revelations at the end of the tragedy reveal that the events of the play were predetermined, as indicated by fact that none of the deities actually know who was responsible and have to guess.

In The Spanish Tragedy Kyd uses the final judgement of the figures involved and the onstage presence of Revenge alongside a universe governed by Divine Providence to question the juxtaposition of Protestant regimes and traditional Catholic heritage. The differences between Kyd's use of Revenge and the spirits Love, Death and Fortune in Soliman and Perseda reflect the varying interpretations of revenge in Elizabethan England, and also look to the different interpretations of Biblical passages concerning revenge.

From Deuteronomy, Elizabethans understood that God reserved the right to punish those who had offended Him: "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense" (Deuteronomy 32:35). Reformers argued that the pervasiveness of evil "rendered retribution necessary, and the intent of Matthew 5:39 ['resist not evil'] was, accordingly, not to let criminals off scot-free but rather to discourage Christians from seeking retribution for un-Christian reasons" (Broude, 51). These Biblical passages suggest that revenge was regarded as something reserved to

the heavens, since Elizabethans understood that only God had the right to enact revenge.

Thus, in The Spanish Tragedy Hieronimo's cries for revenge may be answered by Revenge since he is an agent of Proserpine in the same way that on earth kings and magistrates were God's agents on earth. His revenge is also justified, to some extent, because the kings and magistrates were elected to enact justice on God's behalf.¹³

The problem with trying to identify the theological perspective of The Spanish Tragedy is that the theological world of the play mirrors the "unsurety" in Kyd's England. The pagan setting of The Spanish Tragedy is brought into a Protestant framework when Revenge excludes Purgatory from the afterlife. He tells Andrea the two possible fates of his friends and foes: "To place thy friends in ease, the rest in woes; / For here though death hath end their misery, / I'll there begin their endless tragedy" (IV.v.46-8). This is complicated further by the obvious Catholic implications by setting the tragedy in Spain.

Hieronimo's fate however, presents more difficulties, since he called on the ugly fiends of Hell to aid him in his revenge yet he is rewarded in the end while his victims are punished with eternal damnation. Kyd's Revenge should not be regarded as a demon but as an impartial agent of the king and queen of Kyd's underworld since he does not act in any physical recruitment on earth. In the universe of The Spanish Tragedy judgement is not revealed until after death, despite various indications that there is a preordained plan to the events. Kyd's underworld, like Virgil's, works so that the soul is judged after death

¹³ Although, as I have already stated, this is complicated when Hieronimo actually resigns from office of magistrate and proceeds with his revenge.

according to the way the person lived: there are specific places for lovers, martialists, usurers, wantons, murderers and perjurers.¹⁴

In the end the eternal judgements of the characters is left to Andrea's whim; he is allowed to punish and reward according to his fancy. Andrea begs Revenge, "Then, sweet Revenge, do this at my request: / Let me be judge" (IV.v.29-30). Andrea, like the tyrant Alexander Phaereus mentioned by Sidney, is moved at the spectacle of tragedy in the Spanish court. After watching a tragedy on stage that made him weep, Alexander Phaereus continued to behave like a tyrant because, in Sidney's words, tragedy makes "tyrants manifest their tyrannical humours" (Sidney 98). The sweet revenge Andrea seeks is parallel for the sweet violence of tragedy that made Alexander weep: Andrea is excited by the spectacle of Hieronimo's revenge and wants to commandeer others' fates in the same way.

Andrea's reaction subverts Alexander's weeping and he is rather pleased at the spectacle, "Ay, these were spectacles to please my soul", he says to Revenge. In allowing Andrea to pass judgement and copy the playful methods of Proserpine, Kyd draws the audience's attention to the conflicting theologies in the world of the play. Andrea takes pleasure in judging his friends and foes and he even attempts to relieve some of the archetypal sinners from their punishments in Hell:

Let loose poor Tityus from the vulture's gripe,
And let Don Cyprian supply his room;
Place Don Lorenzo on Ixion's wheel,

¹⁴ In his absolute glee at the tragic ends of his foes Andrea forgets that he has still not been judged; the gate of horn, where Proserpine sends him to watch this tragedy, is not identified by Kyd, or by his source Virgil, as a final resting place for the dead.

And let the lover's endless pains surcease
 (Juno forgets old wrath and grants him ease);
 Hang Balthazar about Chimeara's neck,
 And let him there bewail his bloody love,
 Repining at our joys that are above;
 Let Serberine go roll the fatal stone,
 And take from Sisyphus his endless moan;
 False Pedringano, for his treachery,
 Let him be dragged through boiling Acheron,
 And there live, dying still in endless flames,
 Blaspheming gods and all their holy names (IV.v.31-44).

Here Andrea wishes that Proserpine will allow him to spend eternity with his friends in Elysian fields and this list controversially includes Horatio, Isabella, Bel-imperia and Hieronimo.

The inconsistencies in the final judgments attest further to the problems in a world where religious doctrine is conflicting and unclear. Andrea's list of the damned includes Don Cyprian (the Duke of Castile), whose only obvious crime is his familial relationship with the Spanish king and Lorenzo. When Hieronimo was seeking justice in the royal court, the Duke of Castile attempted to make peace between Lorenzo and Hieronimo by making them shake hands. He was of course ignorant of the fact that Lorenzo murdered Horatio. Unless we read Cyprian's interference with Hieronimo's search for justice as a sign that he actively prohibits Divine justice when he restricts Hieronimo from continuing against Lorenzo, then his inclusion with Hieronimo's enemies in Hell lacks any sense of divine justice or revenge

Thomas Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy explores the complexities of justice in private revenge by drawing on Senecan material to frame the main revenge plot. In the end, Hieronimo, with whom the audience's sympathy lies, commits atrocious acts of revenge in the Spanish court. His example shows that in a world where judgment is predetermined there can be no justice for earthly crimes. But because he is judged by Andrea, Hieronimo is rewarded in the end: "lead Hieronimo where Orpheus plays, / Adding sweet pleasure to eternal days" (IV.v.23-4).

The combination of varying religious doctrines concerning eternal judgement and salvation that Elizabethans had to negotiate between created a world that could at times seem entirely unfair to the human condition. The discussions of resistance and obedience under tyranny included very serious threats of damnation that seemed arbitrary because they lacked consistency (see chapter three). Kyd's tragedy realises this problem on stage through Hieronimo's personal struggle with doctrines of justice and revenge. His internal struggle with these notions eventually leads Hieronimo, an ordinary man, to bring Hell to earth because he cannot find evidence of justice for the murder of his son in a world corrupted by royal interference.

In the next chapter Kyd's contemporary, and rival, Christopher Marlowe takes further this exploration of how conflicting doctrines affect ordinary men in his study of tyranny in Tamburlaine. The common thread that Marlowe and Kyd spin has more to do with matters related to spiritual confidence: Hieronimo is driven towards his bloody revenge because his confidence in divine vengeance, or justice, fails him; the inactivity from the heavens causes Hieronimo to turn to infernal revenge. Marlowe's bombastic hero believes he is above divine laws and so he transgresses human and spiritual laws to fulfil his own ambitions.

Chapter Six

'Vile Monster, born of some infernal hag,
And sent from Hell to tyrannise on earth'

The idea that Hell sends, or appoints, infernal agents to torment Christians on earth is made most threateningly in Christopher Marlowe's two-part tragedy Tamburlaine. The protagonist is not seen to turn to tyranny or wickedness, in the way Cambises or Hieronimo do, but instead he is imagined as an evil being right from the start of the dramatic action. From the earlier chapters in this thesis it should be clear how the discussions about tyranny and obedience facilitated the fear that God could appoint a scourge from Hell to tyrannise on earth. Marlowe's Tamburlaine draws on these fears by making the protagonist celebrate his infernal heritage. He further emphasises the futility in trying to defeat such evil tyranny by allowing Tamburlaine a natural death and eliminating the moralising tone of his sources.

This chapter aims to show how Marlowe departs from his primary historical sources (Mexia and Perondinus mentioned below) in his retelling of the life of Tamburlaine in the mode of tragedy. What I aim to demonstrate is how Marlowe employed the heavily ironic tone of Lucan's epic, The Civil War, in his characterisation of tyranny, obedience and rebellion in Tamburlaine. By applying Lucanic irony to the paradoxical discussions of tyranny and obedience that permeated late-Tudor culture, Marlowe's tragedy subverts the de casibus form and raises questions about divine providence: Tamburlaine's world mirrors Hell in both the torments his victims suffer and in the endless cycle of tragedy he creates in the East.

Marlowe enhances the historical figure of Tamburlaine for dramatic purposes and creates a more ruthless, more wrathful, and more sinister version of his sources' conquering Scythian. The Prologue invites the audience, "View but his picture in this tragic glass / And then applaud his fortunes as you please" (I Tamburlaine Prologue 7-8). The mirror Marlowe invites us to witness in Tamburlaine reverberates with the pessimistic tone of Lucan's epic by recognising the futility of virtue in a world governed by destiny. Tamburlaine lays waste to the East, kills his own child, and lives unpunished until death. The instances where Marlowe diverges from his sources serve to distance his tragedy from the historical material and participate in the creation of an unconventional type of mirror where the protagonist behaves like a tyrant but is rewarded like a god.

Marlowe cleverly applied Lucanic material to the history of Tamburlaine in dramatic form and embellished it with Elizabethan doctrines of divine providence. The Elizabethan playwright modernises Lucan's pessimistic world-view by applying it to Protestant Christianity: in making Tamburlaine claim divine ordinance and allowing him a natural death, Marlowe makes a comparison between the Augustinian God, who pre-ordains all eternal destinies irrespective of merit, and the bloody tyrant Tamburlaine, who assigns limitless sufferings to innocents irrespective of merit (most poignantly demonstrated in the slaughter of the innocent virgins of Damascus). Men and women are unable to resist Tamburlaine in the tragedy because they must obey the ordinance that men will obey all of God's appointed magistrates; he is, like Seneca's Hell and Kyd's *Revenge*, a force too powerful to contend with.

a. Tamburlaine's Command over Evil

Criticism on Christopher Marlowe's two-part tragedy Tamburlaine has consistently focused on placing the drama between a vernacular morality tradition and reading the drama as a "neo-classical" history play, as Rebecca Bushnell calls it, in the vein of Thomas Preston's Cambises.¹

Mark Thornton Burnett recognises the way Tamburlaine engages with Elizabethan attitudes towards vagrancy in its presentation of an arch-villain: "The Marlovian hero exploits possibilities of social mobility at a time when authorities were stressing the need for obedience and hierarchical stability" (Burnett "Vagabond", 321). Burnett traces Marlowe's topic to contemporary discussions of obedience and rebellion and demonstrates how Elizabethan society contradicted the religious interpretation of obedience stated in Tudor homilies and treatises: "The 'Homily on Obedience' (1559) offers a wholly inaccurate and inadequate picture of Elizabethan society" (309). Burnett reads Marlowe's Tamburlaine closer to the exaggerated claim of W.K. Jordan: "The most immediate and pressing concern of the government [. . .] for something more than a century (ca. 1520-1640) was with the problem of vagrancy" (qtd. in Burnett 309).

Rebecca Bushnell has recently argued that Tudor neoclassical and morality tyrant plays were associated with an "unstable rhetoric and imagery with contemporary speculum literature" and that the theatre's conventions shaped and influenced that rhetoric and imagery (83).

¹ Bevington notes that Marlowe was telling the secular story of Tamburlaine's life and deeds, but that he turned to the morality tradition for form (like Preston): "In one view Tamburlaine is a calculatedly amoral drama, and in the other it is an edifying example of the inevitable downfall awaiting all ruthless villains" (212). Irving Ribner argued that Marlowe's drama is, "the first great Elizabethan history play", linking Marlowe's dramatic thrust in the same vein as Polybius: "Both [. . .] portray history as a series of episodes, each of which served to augment the greatness of a complete and initially established central force" (Ribner History, 266: my emphasis).

Furthermore she argues that statecraft discourses and tyrant-drama share a language which is transferred according to the generic conventions of the work:

While the neoclassical plays were meant to be performed, their theatrical conventions did emphasise language over enactment: the histrionic Vice and other allegorical figures were absent, and the constraints on representation were accompanied by an obsession with rhetoric and diction (83).

In shifting from theatrical display to rhetorical display, dramas that imitate the classical form reveal the politics of their own discourse. The tragedy does not require a Vice, a devil, or a hellish spirit because there is already a commanding voice for evil in Tamburlaine.

But Bushnell does not recognise Marlowe's protagonist Tamburlaine as a tyrant. She argues instead that the dramatist explores issues of ambition in his tragedies:

Tamburlaine I and II obsessively repeat the scene of the conqueror's consumption of any obstacle he encounters in quenching his "thirst of reign" [. . .] In The Jew of Malta [. . .] Barabas understands only need and not its fulfilment [. . .] In the logic of representing ambition in these plays, the conclusion is not morally motivated (117).

So, Bushnell argues, Marlowe shows the contradictions implicit in ambition and questions traditional types of tyranny by showing how possession of the crown actually confounds the goals of ambition. Therefore, argues

Bushnell, Marlowe's protagonists cannot be qualified as tyrants. But Gordon Braden uses the same principles to identify Seneca's protagonists as tyrants. He says that the Senecan tyrant understands his own ability to command praise of himself: "quod nolunt velint". The Roman experience is embedded with an awareness of how when power is brought into imperial completeness then the rules are changed (Braden 31-3).

Bushnell contrasts Marlowe's technique with the tyrant plays of Shakespeare and Jonson, who link ambition with sexual desire. Shakespeare and Jonson's tyrant plays show how statecraft rhetoric worked to shape the image of both sovereign and tyrant: "in these plays we see how to create a political image through the rhetoric which defines authority by moral character and gender identity" (118).

The primary problem with Bushnell's reading of Tamburlaine (and The Jew of Malta) lies in her conclusion that at the end of the play the Scythian conqueror ceases to desire power: "Tamburlaine himself never stays to rule the people of the lands he conquers; his goal is to augment his power" (Bushnell 117). But Tamburlaine does not stay to rule because his desire for power extends beyond the boundaries of his martial successes; even as sickness overwhelms him, Tamburlaine wishes to conquer the heavens:

Techelles and the rest, come take your swords
 And threaten him whose hand afflicts my soul:
 Come let us march against the powers of heaven
 And set black streamers in the firmament
 To signify the slaughter of the gods -

(II Tamburlaine V.iii.46-50).

Tamburlaine's desire for power extends indefinitely; he even vows to wage war with the heavens after death and asks his son to carry on his work on earth:

But I perceive my martial strength is spent:
 In vain I strive and rail against those powers
 That mean t'invest me in a higher throne,
 As much too high for this disdainful earth.
 Give me a map, then let me see how much
 Is left for me to conquer all the world,
 That these my boys may finish all my wants

(II Tamburlaine V.iii.119-25).

His desire for deification works against a traditional de casibus moral reading of Tamburlaine's end: In his final moments before death he does not lament his wicked ways or fear the consequences of his actions. Contrary to Bushnell's understanding of Tamburlaine's desires, the conquering tyrant actually thinks that he will be rewarded with a "higher throne" after death.

In the first act Tamburlaine attempts to persuade Theridamas, Usumcasane and Techelles that he is unconquerable:

I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains,
 And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about,
 And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere
 Than Tamburlaine be slain or overcome

(I Tamburlaine I.ii.173-6).

In his Atrean will-to-power, his insatiable appetite for destruction, and his willingness to shed blood, including familial blood, Marlowe's Tamburlaine parallels Lucan's Caesar.

Marlowe's tragedy does not seek to stress a moral lesson in the example of Tamburlaine but has more to do with the plight of ordinary men in the face of unstoppable tyranny. When Theridamas meets him for the first time in the tragedy, he comments on Tamburlaine's hellish qualities:

His looks do menace heaven and dare the gods;
His fiery eyes are fixed upon the earth,
As if he now devised some stratagem,
Or meant to pierce Avernus' darksome vaults
And pull the triple-headed dog from hell (I.ii.156-160).

Despite recognising Tamburlaine's relationship to Hell Theridamas is persuaded by his rhetoric and promises to serve the Scythian tyrant: "Won with thy words and conquered with thy looks, / I yield myself, my men and horse to thee" (227-8).

Tamburlaine repeats the claims that he is a scourge of God to assert his own power and emphasise his fearlessness. In part I he tells his allies, "I that am termed the scourge and wrath of God, / The only fear and terror of the world" (III.iii.44-5). Tamburlaine envisions both a world at war succumbing to his domination and also the heavens and hell consumed by the phenomenon that is Tamburlaine.

He further imagines that the deities Jove and Mars debate over his role on earth: "The god of war resigns his room to me, / Meaning to make me general of the world: / Jove, viewing me in arms, looks pale and

wan, / Feeling my power should pull him from his throne" (V.i.51-454).

Then he pictures his fame spreading through the underworld:

Millions of souls sit on the banks of Styx,
 Waiting the back return of Charon's boat;
 Hell and Elysium swarm with ghosts of men
 That I have sent from sundry foughten fields
 To spread my fame through hell and up to heaven (464-8).

For Tamburlaine, the whole world, including the underworld, is a battlefield where he is glorious and respected as a scourge of God: "Thus am I right the scourge of highest Jove, / And see the figure of my dignity / By which I hold my name and majesty" (II Tamburlaine IV.iii.24-6). Tamburlaine's God is not loving and forgiving but full of wrath, and his role on earth, as a scourge, is like the role of devils in Hell. He reiterates this again in the final act when he claims, "There is a God full of revenging wrath, / From whom the thunder and the lightning breaks, / Whose scourge I am" (II Tamburlaine V.i.182-4).

As a scourge, Tamburlaine contends that he is honoured in Hell because, like Robinson's Bonner, he furnishes Hell's kitchen: "Should I but touch the rusty gates of hell, / The triple-headed Cerberus would howl / And wake black Jove to crouch and kneel to me" (II Tamburlaine V.i.96-8). By making Tamburlaine claim that he actively recruits on behalf of Hell, Marlowe creates a representation, or a mirror, of how the forces of Hell penetrate earthly actions.

Crucially though, Tamburlaine's actions are never actively punished in the play. Marlowe's drama problematises Protestant doctrine by presenting a mirror of tyranny where the tyrant is never punished and

never loses his faith. Tamburlaine proclaims his own divinity even as he is about to die:

Villains, these terrors and these tyrannies
 (If tyrannies war's justice ye repute)
 I execute, enjoined me from above,
 To scourge the pride of such as Heaven abhors -
 Nor am I made arch-monarch of the world,
 Crowned and invested by the hand of Jove,
 For deeds of bounty or nobility:
 But since I exercise a greater name,
 The scourge of God and terror of the world,
 I must apply myself in those terms,
 In war, in blood, in death, in cruelty

(II Tamburlaine IV.i.146-156).

Marlowe's Tamburlaine repeats the claims of Mexia's Tamburlaine when he embraces his ungodly role. He even offers an ironic interpretation of the doctrine of salvation by faith alone; he never suffers a fall from power because he never loses faith in himself. Because Tamburlaine does not suffer an earthly fall, his example offers no moral lesson. But Marlowe identified the text as a mirror in the prologue. Tamburlaine's actions create a replica-Hell on earth and damnation is not very far removed from the world he creates. The mirror presented is a mirror of Hell which is created by the tension surrounding the discussions about tyranny and resistance.²

² Possibly Marlowe was also thinking of the Babington Conspiracy to dethrone the monarch and the discussions of executing Elizabeth's cousin Mary in 1587 (Gill Art, 331).

In Tamburlaine, Marlowe departs from the aims and motives of his historical sources concerning tyranny and punishment. He looks instead to Lucan's ironic portrait of Neronian Rome and the conqueror Caesar. In doing so, Marlowe's de casibus drama subverts the popular mirror literature and asks the audience to judge for themselves from the evidence what type of lesson Tamburlaine offers.

II. The Horrors of Civil War

a. Lucan's Lofty Verse

Lucan's epic Pharsalia³, or Civil War, details the horrors of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar (49-45 BCE). He imagines the most terrible aspects of civil war and magnifies their intensity, sometimes through invention. Lucan repeats the emphasis on the horrors of a civil war with an analogy between the events that occurred after Caesar crossed the Rubicon in 49 BCE and events "worse than civil wars". Marlowe's translation of the first lines of Lucan's epic reads,

Wars worse then civill on Thessalian playnes,
 And outrage strangling law and people strong,
 We sing, whose conquering swords their own breasts launcht
 Armies alied, the kingdoms league uprooted,
 Th' affrighted worlds force bent on publique spoile,
 Trumpets and drums, like deadly threatning other,

³ Lucan was unable to complete his epic and there is not enough evidence available to determine what title, if any, Lucan gave to his text. Some scholars (Frederick Ahl included) argue that it was called Pharsalia based on a passage in Book IX together with a reference from Statius, who referred to the work as, "the Pharsalian wars". But other critics, such as Susan Braund, sees no evidence for this and supports the claims that the title, On the Civil War, better reflects the numerous horrors of civil warfare in Rome.

Eagles alike displaide, darts answering darts

(Marlowe Lucan, 1-7).⁴

The nature of Lucan's theme, a severe condemnation of civil war, corresponds to the form and style of his poem: he rejects the flowing and melodious treatment of Virgil's lofty and heroic epic and chooses a style more suitable to his topic, "the grim portrayal of the horrors perpetrated by citizens against their fellow-citizens" (Braund xlvi).

Susan Braund states that the horrific subject matter of Lucan's epic is matched by the author's "prosaic diction" and straightforward language (Braund xlvi). In contrast to Virgil, Lucan's poem sounds base and irregular. There is notably little narration in Lucan's poem and he prefers to include speeches, apostrophes and mini-narratives of emotive episodes. He does this because the story was already familiar to his audience and he did not wish to simply add to the corpus of narratives on the civil war but to make his reader think differently about the civil war: "his purpose is to arrest the flow of expectations, to make us stop and dwell upon the actual horror of civil war" (xlix).

In a blank verse English translation, as well as in Latin, Lucan's poem is strikingly difficult to read because of its jagged style. His blunt statements of fact without any attempt at poetic embellishment subvert traditional forms of poetry. This goes some way to explaining why early modern translators had difficulty with Lucan's epic and a full English translation was not available when Marlowe approached the text, although Lucan's merits were discussed by earlier Tudor writers.

⁴ Unless otherwise indicated, all translations from book I of Lucan's epic will be Marlowe's.

Sir Thomas Elyot praised Lucan in The Booke Named the Governour (1531) by recommending Lucan after Homer, Virgil and Ovid as a "noble poet" for gentlemen's children to study:

The two noble poets Silius, and Lucan, be very expedient to be learned; for the one setteth out the emulation in qualities and prowess of two noble and valiant captains, one enemy to the other. That is to say, Silius writeth of Scipio the Roman, and Hannibal Duke of Carthage; Lucan declareth a semblable matter but much more lamentable, forasmuch as the wars were civil, and as it were, in the bowels of the Romans, that is to say, under the standards of Julius Caesar and Pompey
(Elyot 32-3).

In his recommendation of Lucan, Elyot's praise links Lucan's text with tragedy when he says that the subject matter is "lamentable". He still keeps Lucan in the frame of epic by mentioning him alongside Virgil and Homer. This definitional link was lost with the Elizabethan amalgamation of forms of history writing with tragedy.

During Elizabeth's reign, both Barnabe Googe and George Turberville attempted to translate Lucan's epic before Marlowe; Googe around 1560 and Turberville in 1576. In the preface to his translation of Marcellus Palingenius' The Zodiak of Life, Googe explains how he decided to embark on the translation of Palingenius. With not a little self-confidence, Googe recalls how all nine Muses appeared to him with offers of fame. The Muse Melpomene spoke first and tried to convince Googe to translate Lucan:

'Stand up, young man,' quoth she, 'dispatch,

and take thy pen in hand,
 'Write thou the Civil wars and broil
 in ancient Latins' land.
 'Reduce to English sense.' she said,
 'the lofty Lucans' verse,
 'The cruel chance and doleful end
 of Caesar's state rehearse.' (Googe 49-56).

Googe's discussion with Melpomene reveals how he considered Lucan's work about the history of the Civil War in terms of tragedy. Due to the close connections between history and tragedy in the Renaissance (see chapter one for discussion of the de casibus tradition), it is unlikely that Googe limited the perspective in tragic terms. Instead, Googe's invocation indicates he perceived the text in a de casibus frame.

Googe's reference to the muse Melpomene shows that he considered the Roman civil war as a de casibus story (55-6) and his comments evidence the close link between epic, tragedy and history in the Tudor period.

George Turberville claims to have experienced a similar type of meeting with the Muses when he considered translating Lucan's Civil War. The Muses appeal to Turberville and turn his focus away from Lucan towards writing the histories included in his Tragical Tales. In his preface Turberville claims that while working laboriously on his translation of Lucan he, "gazde so long upon [the] booke", that he fell asleep (Turberville 5). Once asleep he says that he was visited by one of the Muses: "the Muse, / That to intreat of warlike wights / and dreadfull armes doth use" (6). Turberville's adjective "warlike" suggests he was

thinking of epic, yet he names the traditional muse of tragedy, Melpomene.

Melpomene chastises Turberville for even attempting to translate Lucan's "loftie" verse and recommends that he try his hand at topics more suitable to his ability. The Muse begs, "Let loftie Lucans verse alone / a deed of deepe devise. / A stately stile, a perrelesse pen, / a worke of weightie pryce" (7). She offers Sackville as a more suitable candidate to undertake the task, "Lord Buckhurst is the best", and refers Turberville to Clio, the Muse of history, "This matter were more meet for [Sackville] / and farre unfit for thee: / My sister Clio, with thy kinde, / doth best of all agree" (7-8). By offering Sackville, who was associated primarily with tragedy, Turberville's preface indicates how Elizabethans considered Lucan's work in terms of tragedy, history and epic.⁵ The problems Googe and Turberville encountered when translating Lucan stem from their attempts to limit, or categorise Lucan's difficult text.

Christopher Marlowe, well-versed in epic, tragedy and history, from his reading at Cambridge, approached Lucan with a wider perspective than Googe and Turberville. Roma Gill states, "Marlowe recognised the grim topicality of De Bello Civili and responded to this, just as he responded to Lucan's formal rhetoric, in his act of translation" (Gill Art, 331). Marlowe abandoned the approach of scholars trying to translate Lucan into "lofty" verse and instead found the "mighty line" - in

⁵ In The Defence of Poesy Sidney names Lucan as an example for historical poetry. He says, "The second kind [of mimetic poetry] is of them that deal with matters philosophical: either moral, as Tyrtaeus, Phocylides, and Cato; or natural, as Lucretius and Virgil's *Georgics*; or astronomical, as Manilius and Pontanus; or historical, as Lucan, which who mislike, the fault is in their judgments quite out of taste, and not in the sweet food of sweetly uttered knowledge" (86). R.W.Malsen's note for this passage emphasises the sixteenth-century debate about Lucan's (and Empedocles and Lucretius') part in the discussions of whether or not poetry was defined as the writing of verse or the creation of fiction (145-6).

Googe's preface Calliope identifies the Muses as ladies of Jove's mighty line: "Ladies all / of Jove his mighty line" (93-4).

Elizabethans would have also encountered references to Lucan in Quintilian's very influential Institutio oratoria [Oratorical Training].⁶ In the tenth book the Institutio, Quintilian states, "Lucan is ardent, passionate, particularly distinguished for his sententiae, and if I may say what I think, more to be imitated by orators than by poets" (Quintilian, X.I.90). George Kennedy comments that for Quintilian, "Lucan is a problem: as a poet he is not approved, but as a rhetorician he is. Whether Quintilian is thinking chiefly of style or subject is not said" (Kennedy 110).

Critics have scarcely mentioned Marlowe's translation of Lucan despite the similarities between Lucan's poem and Marlowe's oeuvre; preferring instead to focus on the dramatic tragedies and Hero and Leander. James Shapiro and Roman Gill both comment on how Marlowe's translation of the first book of Lucan's epic recognises the suitability of the content and the poem's oratorical qualities for Marlowe:

There is no question, from the point of view of metrical practice, that [Pharsalia] shares the major features of Marlowe's inimitable mighty line. In its broader contours, Marlowe's verse observes his usual - and idiosyncratic - rules governing the relation of stress and syntax to an underlying metrical pattern (Shapiro 318).

⁶In his study of the impact of humanist training in rhetoric and argument, Peter Mack identifies Quintilian as one of the primary examples for rhetorical learning: "At Cambridge [. . .] the set texts were Quintilian, Hermogenes, or any other book of Cicero's speeches [. . .] Quintilian's Institutio oratoria, Cicero's De oratore and Aristotle's Rhetoric are [. . .] found very often" (51-2).

Shapiro discusses how Marlowe's complex treatment of "poetic closure" (i.e. matching the syllables to metrical positions) is innovative and uniquely Marlovian. Marlowe captures the sharp sting of the subject-matter in what Gill calls his "bright, but erratic, metaphor" (Gill Art, 331).

Shapiro's reading of Marlowe's translation of Lucan focuses on metre and rhythm and leads him to link the playwright's composition of Edward II and the poem Hero and Leander with the same period as Marlowe's translation of Lucan (Shapiro uses the dates 1592-3 when the playhouses in London were closed due to the plague). Shapiro's dating seems as much down to his estimation that Marlowe had little to do during the years when London's theatres were closed as it does to Marlowe's interests at the time. There is, after all, little in common besides the typical "Marlovian enjambment" that Shapiro recognises in both texts to link Hero and Leander with Marlowe's translation of the first book of Lucan's epic. Why Shapiro has overlooked the more obvious connection between Lucan's epic and Marlowe's epic drama Tamburlaine is unclear.

Roma Gill places Marlowe's translation of Lucan at the beginning of his career:

To begin one's literary career by translating the classics into one's vernacular is a very respectable apprenticeship and was so especially when Marlowe first tried to fit another man's thoughts into his iambic pentameter (401).

Strangely, Shapiro uses the same reasoning about vernacular translations of classical texts to argue that Marlowe's translation of Lucan comes towards the end of his short literary career.

Roma Gill's earlier reading of Marlowe's Lucan locates Marlowe's translation alongside the sixteenth-century commentary by Sulpitius. She also makes a key connection that has gone surprisingly unnoticed in studies of Tamburlaine:

Not surprisingly, it is the Marlowe of Tamburlaine who comes most readily to mind in reading the Pharsalia - the dramatist whose peculiar ability was not so much for the minor felicity as for the panoramic view. The hordes that swarm to the conqueror when all Asia and all Africa are in arms with Tamburlaine are foreshadowed in the Pharsalia when, with the same cinematic technique, Marlowe describes the allies flocking to join Caesar's army (Gill 402).

Lucan provided Marlowe with material for both a horrible and bloody tragedy and an example for powerful oration at a time of renewed interest in Lucan.

The influence of Lucan's epic on Elizabethan tragedy has been largely overlooked in Renaissance studies in light of Samuel Daniel's strong Lucanic borrowing in The Civil Wars (1595). Emrys Jones' book, The Origins of Shakespeare (1977), cites some examples from Shakespeare's plays that echo Lucan's epic (see Jones Appendix B, 273-277). Jones says that there are enough "decorous Lucanic touches" in Shakespeare 2 Henry VI, including an inaccurate quote from Lucan's epic, "[to] suggest that Shakespeare knew enough of the flavour of Lucan's

poetry to wish to imitate it" (274). But although critics recognise Lucanic influence in some Shakespearean drama, he cites J.A.K. Thomson's evaluation: "the influence of Lucan on Elizabethan style is seriously underestimated" (276).

Jones further states that in the speech on the fall of Troy which Hamlet asks the Player to recite (II.ii.448-514), Shakespeare was consciously imitating Lucan. Taking his lead from Thomson's suggestion that Lucan is behind the passage in Hamlet, Jones prompts further research into the context of Lucan imitation when he intimates, "we need to go beyond saying that Shakespeare was merely 'influenced' by Lucan: he was doing something much more purposeful and deliberate" (276).

b) Furor and False Gods

Seneca, Lucan's uncle and tutor to Nero, signalled a shift in thinking about tragedy by focusing on the soul and revealing states of mind (best shown through Seneca's use of the aside). The force of furor was central to Seneca's exploration of human psychology and he linked this insatiable madness with tragedy by making furor the cause of ruin.

Lucan brings this idea of furor as a force of unreason that cannot be controlled into his epic on the civil war right from the start of the text: "Quis furor, o cives, quae tanta licentia ferri?" (Lucan 8). Susan Braund translates, "What madness was this, O citizens? What this excessive freedom / with the sword " (I.8-9). The emphasis on the "madness" of civil war, and his decision to use the word "furor", places the topic of civil war, and Pharsalia, within the realm of tragedy.

After Lucan briefly recounts what a serious crime the wars were, he interrupts with a brief apostrophe to the emperor Nero, which both

serves to include ironic praise of his patron and also mock the role of the gods in men's affairs:

But if for Nero (then unborne) the fates
 Would find no other meanes, (and gods not sleightly
 Purchase immortal thrones; nor Jove joide heaven
 Untill the cruell Giants war was done)
 We plaine not heavens, but gladly beare these evils
 For Neros sake: Pharsalia grone with slaughter;
 And Carthage soules be gluttred with our blouds;
 At Munda let the dreadfull battailes joyne;
 Adde, Caesar, to these illes Perusian famine;
 The Mutin toyles; the fleet at Leuca suncke;
 And cruel field, nere burning Aetna fought:
 Yet Room is much bound to these civile armes,
 Which made thee Emperor (Marlowe Lucan, 33-45).

This address to Nero should not be read out of context; it is important that just thirty lines earlier Lucan explained that the epic addresses the madness of civil war. So when he says that Roman blood was shed and the people were divided all for Nero, there is an undercurrent of strong distaste for the emperor.

Although Lucan deifies Nero, the gods blatantly exercise no control in his epic and they remain noticeably absent from the work, except for Fortune. Instead of the traditional roles of different deities in epic, Lucan reduces the supernatural to the realms of oracle, dream visions and necromancy. Lucan's epic is a subversion of traditional epic in its depiction of Roman history without a hero and without a positive telos

(such as the founding of Rome), and it is even dedicated to a tyrannous emperor - itself a subversion of Virgil's dedication to Augustus.

Frederick Ahl says that in Pharsalia, "the elevation of humans to divine estate will be man's vengeance on the gods for their indifference to human affairs" (Ahl 8). Far from legitimising the emperor's motives and actions then, the references to divine machinery only serve to highlight political corruption. In his depiction of Tamburlaine, Marlowe draws on this historical and literary paradox that one man, seemingly driven by hellish deities and furies, can bring total depravity to ordinary people on a mass scale.

Coupled with the false deification of the emperor, Lucan's apotheosis of Nero in Pharsalia is ambiguous and often ludicrous. Near the start of the poem, Lucan's advice to Nero on how he should pick his seat among the gods borders on sedition:

But neither chuse the north t'erect thy seat;
Nor yet the adverse reking southerne pole,
Whence thou shouldst view thy Room with squinting beams.
If any one part of vast heaven thou swayest,
The burdened axes with thy force will bend;

(Marlowe Lucan, 53-57).

Here the poet suggests that if Nero took a seat in heaven it would disrupt the balance of heaven. Lucan's comments highlight Nero's physical weight but also offer contrary flattery: he is not a true god because the heavens would feel his weight.

Lucan's emphasis on Nero as Caesar makes the important the point that he behaves not like a princeps but like a dictator. It is this

important aspect of Lucan's text that relates significantly to Marlowe's theatrical dictator Tamburlaine: All the horrors and bloodshed in Marlowe's two-part tragedy are caused by just one man. When Lucan praises Nero as a deity and asks for inspiration for his poetry, saying that he does not need real gods because he has Nero, Marlowe translates,

Thou Cæsar at this instant art my God,
Thee if I invoke, I shall not need
To crave Apolloes ayde, or Bacchus helpe;
Thy power inspires the Muze that sings this war (63-6).

In Marlowe's tragedy Tamburlaine places himself in control of the supernatural, "I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains, / And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about" (I Tamburlaine I.ii.173-4). He appeals to Theridamas, Usumcasane and Techelles to join him by offering them immortality and deification: "we will walk upon the lofty cliffs, / [. . . .] And by those steps that he hath scaled the heavens / May we become immortal like the gods" (187-200).

Following the Scythian shepherd's persuasive speech, the Persians dismiss the gods: "Not Hermes, prolocutor to the gods, / Could use persuasions more pathological" (209-10), and Tamburlaine encourages them, "Nor are Apollo's oracles more true / Than thou shalt find my vaunts substantial" (211-12). Finally all the Persians submit to Tamburlaine's persuasions and offer their allegiance: "Won with thy words and conquered with thy looks, / I yield myself, my men and horse to thee" (227-8). The way that Lucan portrays the Romans' eagerness to abandon their deities in favour of Caesar corresponds to the way Tamburlaine

convinces the Persians that they too can equal the gods and therefore have no need to pay allegiance to them.

Lucan's epic addresses civil war, which he argues is worse than other types of war because it divides a nation and the loss of lives is not compensated for by an increase in power or empire. This is suggested first in the line, "Will ye wage war, for which you shall not triumph?" (Marlowe Lucan, 13).⁷ Lucan warns his Roman readers, "Roome, if thou take delight in impious warre, / First conquer all the earth, then turne thy force / Against thy selfe: as yet thou wants not foes" (22-24). He then laments that the loss of life in the civil wars served no purpose. The most distressing aspect of the war was that it led to a conflict between the people: "These plagues arise from wreake of cvill power" (33).

When Lucan explains how Rome was brought to civil war because of a rivalry between two illustrious leaders, "there will be no loyalty between associates in tyranny / and no power will tolerate a partner" (Lucan, I.92-3), Marlowe concisely summarises: "Dominion cannot suffer partnership" (Marlowe Lucan, 125). The historical evidence of Tamburlaine's life, in the historical accounts that Marlowe had access to provided the playwright with an example of tyranny similar to the exemplar of tyranny in Pharsalia: both Lucan and Marlowe examine the nature of monarchy through a subversion of accepted doctrines and cultural beliefs.

For Marlowe, Tamburlaine's extreme tyranny over men is just one symptom of the world where resistance to tyranny is forbidden and where men believe that all magistrates are ordained by God; even self-appointed ones. With all the talk of damnation to those who resist tyranny, and for those who do not resist tyranny, the Elizabethan political

⁷ A triumphal march, or triumphs, could only be gained by a victory over a foreign enemy.

and religious tracts overlooked the impact of tyranny on innocent men and women. Marlowe's tragedy brings the humanitarian cost of tyranny to the centre by examining the effects of a fearless tyrant on earth.

II. "Daring God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlan"

Vivien Thomas and William Tydeman confirm the popularity of the legendary life and actions of Tamburlaine in Europe throughout the fifteenth century, stating,

for Renaissance authors the cataclysmic phenomenon which was Tamburlaine supplied a graphic case-history through which to validate the legitimacy of relentless aspiration, deplore the vagaries of Fortune's favours, or regret the ruthlessness inseparable from outstanding martial prowess (Thomas and Tydeman 70).

As a student at Cambridge, Marlowe may have read the accounts of Tamburlaine in their original language or in an English translation. Critics vary little in pinpointing which primary historical sources Marlowe consulted and generally accept the nineteenth-century scholarly conclusions of C.H. Herford and A. Wagner (1883), who recognised the relevance of two particular source texts from Spain and Italy. The Spanish collection, by Pedro Mexía, Silva de Varia Leci3n (1540), was available in two English adaptations by 1586:⁸ first in Sir Thomas

⁸ It is possible that Marlowe also consulted the Florentine text in Latin. Thomas and Tydeman note that there were frequent allusions to Perondinus' work in vernacular accounts in the 1580s that determining precisely how Marlowe gained access to this is uncertain. For a detailed history of the Tamburlaine legend in written account in Europe see Thomas and Tydeman 69-75.

Fortescue's The Forest or Collection of Histories (1571) and later in George Whetstone's The English Mirror (1586). The Italian author's text, Magni Tamerlanis Scythiarum Imperatoris Vita was written in 1553 in Latin.

Both Whetstone and Fortescue's English accounts of Tamburlaine include Tamburlaine's own assertion of his divinely ordered role.

Fortescue's Tamburlaine declares,

Thou supposest me to be a man, but thou too much abasest me, for none other am I but the wrath and vengeance of God, and ruin of the world. Thou supposest that I am a man, but thou art deceived, for I am none other than the ire of God, and the destruction of the world. (qtd. in Thomas and Tydeman 93).

Fortescue's account emphasises the role of Tamburlaine as a mirror for bad kings when he mentions the idea of cruel kings as ministers of God and their consequent damnable fates. This is a qualification that Marlowe excludes from his dramatic purposes and instead allows the audience free interpretation: "View but his picture in this tragic glass / And then applaud his fortunes as you please".

In the passage cited above Tamburlaine forces the reader to acknowledge that he is not just a man but the "ire of God".

Tamburlaine's assertion of his own infernal qualities is juxtaposed with the author's moralising about the nature of tyranny. Fortescue warns,

all such cruel and incarnate devils are instruments wherewith God chastiseth sin, as also with the same approveth and trieth the just, and yet they notwithstanding are not hence held for just, ne shall they escape thy heavy judgement of God. For necessary is it that example of ill happen, but woe be unto him by whom it happeneth. Further in this life God assuredly at some time doth punish them, besides that in another world, Hell and damnation is certainly allotted (qtd. in Thomas and Tydeman 82- 83).

The historical accounts in which Marlowe discovered his bombastic conqueror claiming to be the living manifestation of God's ire are firmly rooted in a de casibus tradition that stresses how evil deeds are punished in the end. The histories show how good fortune may be taken away at any moment in the example of Bajazeth and Tamburlaine's falls and their assumed damnation.

For the authors of the historical sources, Tamburlaine's rise to power parallels Bajazeth's fall from grace:

we may learn not so much to affy [trust] in riches, or in the pomp of this world, for as much as he that yesterday was prince and lord of all the world almost, is this day fallen into such extreme misery that he liveth worse than a dog, fellow to them in company, and that by the means of him that was sometimes a poor shepherd or if you rather will, as some report a mean soldier, who after we see aspired to such honour that in his time none was found that durst or could abide him, the other that descended of noble race or lineage

constrained to live an abject, in most loathsome and vile servitude. This tragedy might suffice to withdraw men from this transitory pomp and honour, acquainting themselves with Heaven and with heavenly things only (cited in Thomas and Tydeman 87).

Here, both Bajazeth and Tamburlaine are set up as examples of the same vice: since Bajazeth acted according to his ambition and eager desire to increase his kingdom, he lost everything to Tamburlaine. Now that Tamburlaine is enacting the same process of conquering nations to increase his power, he too will fall. The authors' application of the word "tragedy" to describe the material about Tamburlaine's life is further evidence of the close link between history and tragedy for the Tudor period and makes the material ideally suited to de casibus drama.

But Marlowe's two-part drama departs from this tradition and Tamburlaine is never actively punished for his crimes, nor is his damnation assumed. Because Marlowe's Tamburlaine does not fall from grace during his lifetime, he does not provide an example to promote good behaviour for kings and magistrates, as the sources suggest. Instead his rise to fame and glory is not prevented except by natural death, which comes to everyone.

III. Reading Lucan as an Analogue for Tamburlaine

a) Caesar and Tamburlaine

In Lucan's epic, Caesar is depicted as bloodthirsty, fierce and hungry for war:

[Caesar] had not only
a general's name and reputation, but never-resting

energy; his only shame was conquering without war;
 fierce, indomitable, wherever hope and indignation called
 he moved to action, never shrank from defiling his sword,
 he flowed up his own successes, pressed hard upon the
 deity's
 favour, driving back all obstacles to his high
 ambitions and rejoicing to create his path by destruction.
 Just so flashes out the thunderbolt shot forth by the winds
 through clouds (Lucan I.143-151)

For Lucan, Caesar represented an evil genius who brought the end of the Republic (Ahl 58). In The Civil War, Caesar abandons peace to follow Fortune when he crosses the Rubicon (Lucan I.183-227), and it is Fortune who guides the Roman through his exploits and battles.

Tamburlaine also calls on a divine power and is similarly driven by his ambition to conquer the world and remove libertas from the people whom he conquers. Seneca's Atreus likewise wishes to "conquer" his brother; his motto is, "aut perdet aut peribit" "either destroy or be destroyed" (Seneca Thyestes, II.202).⁹ Atreus, like Tamburlaine, cannot be moved by pity or love and Thyestes understood that to counter the tyrant is futile: "the gods shal al of this revengers be / And unto them for vengeance due my vowes the render shall" (Heywood Thyestes, V.3.142-3). Zenocrate¹⁰ and Calyphas are reduced, like Thyestes, to silent acceptance of the tyrant's power.

⁹ The LOEB translation reads, "Slay or be slain will he".

¹⁰ For Zenocrate's role as first an opposition to Tamburlaine and then her submission to him in Tamburlaine see Whitfield, 91-97.

Marlowe's Tamburlaine and Lucan's Caesar are both driven by ambition, an Atrean will-to-power¹¹, and a willingness to shed blood. Both protagonists claim divine approval for their actions; Caesar identifying himself within Fortune's favour and Tamburlaine calling himself the "scourge of God". Aside from sardonically deifying the emperor Nero, Lucan dismisses the gods in Pharsalia. Through the example of Caesar, Lucan shows how, "the elevation of humans to divine estate will be man's vengeance on the gods for their indifference to human affairs" (Ahl, 8). Lucan points to the paradox in celebrating the victory of Caesar by deifying him in Rome, and also his descendants, when so much Roman blood was lost for his cause.

b) Loyal Zenocrate

The first time Tamburlaine appears in Marlowe's play he is accompanied by the Egyptian Zenocrate, whom he captured as she travelled towards Memphis. She appeals to the "mighty Turk" for safe passage to Africa (I.I.ii.7-16). Mexía does not mention a female counterpart for Tamburlaine although he does mention the tyrant's two incompetent sons.

The only historical account that mentions Tamburlaine's wife is an account from Persia, the Mulfazāt Timūry, a document that is arguably the memoirs of Tamburlaine (Thomas and Tydeman 77). The only real similarity between this account of Tamburlaine's wife, who was called Arzū Melk Aghā, and Marlowe's Zenocrate is that both she and Zenocrate

¹¹ Nietzsche's phrase "will to power" describes the inborn drive in living creatures towards domination and exploitation: " 'Exploitation' does not belong to a depraved, or imperfect and primitive society: it belongs to the nature of the living being as a primary organic function; it is a consequence of the intrinsic Will to Power, which is precisely the Will to Life [. . .] as a reality it is the fundamental fact of all history" (Nietzsche "Beyond Good and Evil", 72-3).

are captured as spoils from battle. However, it is unlikely that Marlowe had access to this work, or that he was able to read this account.

The inclusion of Zenocrate is possibly a Marlovian invention although Thomas and Tydeman speculate that Marlowe may have learned of Tamburlaine's wife from fifteenth-century Greek histories of Byzantium. Conrad Clauserus translated Laonicus Chalcocondylas' Greek history into Latin in 1556 (De Origine et rebus gestis Turcorum), but even this is far from a source for Zenocrate. The only similarity between Marlowe's Zenocrate and the wife in Clauserus' translation is that both women influence their husband's political decisions.¹²

What is more likely is that Marlowe's occupation with Virgil's Dido influenced his decision to include a loyal wife for Tamburlaine. In transposing the historical material into an epic-drama, Marlowe complicated the characterisation of a terrible tyrant just as Virgil complicated the heroism of Aeneas by including the Dido episode in Books II and IV. Aeneas' affair with Dido delays him in his quest to found Rome and leads to Dido's suicide. Marlowe dramatised this episode from Virgil's Aeneid, books II and IV in the early tragedy Dido, Queen of Carthage, which he may have composed while still at Cambridge in 1586. Marlowe's Tamburlaine similarly falls in love with a North African woman and the inclusion of the Egyptian empress serves to humanise the "terror to the world" by introducing romantic love to the source material.

¹² In contrast to Zenocrates' contempt for the imprisoned Bajazeth and his wife Zabina, Clauserus' account states that the conqueror's wife empathised with the Turkish king and begged her husband not to attack him: "They say that Timur's wife [. . .] would not allow Timur to take the offensive against Bajazeth, a praiseworthy man who had fought with great glory against the Christian faith in defence of the religion of Mohammed. Indeed she advised the king to leave so great a man in peace and not to make trouble for him, since he had not deserved to suffer any harm at the hands of those who supported the same religion" (qtd. in Thomas and Tydeman, 143).

When Zenocrate lies dying before Tamburlaine he acknowledges her importance to his humanity and he warns her, "Live still, my love, and so conserve my life, / Or, dying, be the author of my death" (Tamburlaine, II.II.iv.55-6). Of course in this situation, Tamburlaine's will to control everything is futile, for he has no control over Nature, only over men.

When she dies, Tamburlaine threatens the powers he once claimed to control:

What, is she dead? Techelles, draw thy sword,
 And wound the earth, that it may cleave in twain,
 And we descend into th'infernal vaults
 To hale the Fatal Sisters by the hair
 And throw them in the triple moat of hell
 For taking hence my fair Zenocrate (96-101).

Tamburlaine's inability to affect change in Zenocrate's condition and his empty threats to the Fates, which cannot be fulfilled, bring the tyrant down from his self-deified position to a human position by exposing his weakness. Zenocrate serves to draw out Tamburlaine's humanity, and reveal that he is, despite his claims, just a man. By now Tamburlaine's rhetoric is tiring and his boasts of divine authority unveiled as mere hubris.

The inclusion of Zenocrate in the life of Tamburlaine was unique to Marlowe, but her characterisation derives from a combination of Lucan's depiction of Pompey's two wives: Julia, Julius Caesar's daughter, and Cornelia. Pompey's first wife, Julia, only features in Lucan's epic as a ghost from Hades, haunting Pompey with his familial relationship with his enemy:

"Never, Magnus, by the ghosts
and by my shade, will you stop being his son-in-law;
in vain you sever with the sword your pledges: civil
war will make you mine." So spoke the ghost and fled
away, melting through her trembling husband's embrace

(Lucan Civil War, III.31-5).

Pompey is troubled by his eternal relationship with Caesar and the ghost of his dead wife reinforces his emotional weaknesses and confirms for him that he will lose against Caesar.

But Marlowe's Tamburlaine avoids being haunted by such ghosts from the past by sparing Zenocrate's father after his defeat in Damascus. He preys on his wife's emotional vulnerability regarding the lives of the virgins in Damascus and her father's life. By sparing the Soldan, who matters more to Zenocrate than the virgins, Tamburlaine manages to win this victory. He even admits, "[The Soldan's] life so consumes Zenocrate, / Whose sorrows lay more siege unto my soul / Than all my army to Damascus' walls" (I Tamburlaine, V.i.154-6).

Zenocrate's acceptance of Tamburlaine's treatment of the virgins of Damascus and her silent resignation to her husband's terror can be attributed to her sense of marital loyalty. But when she and Anippe find the Turkish emperor Bajazeth and his wife brained against their cages, she doubts her loyalty:

Wretched Zenocrate, that livest to see
Damascus' walls dyed with Egyptian blood,
Thy father's subjects and thy countrymen;

[.]

Ah Tamburlaine, wert thou the cause of this,
 That termest Zenocrate thy dearest love -
 Whose lives were dearer to Zenocrate
 Than her own life, or aught save thine own love?

(I Tamburlaine V.i.213-3, 336-9).

The horrific ends of Bajazeth and his wife allow Zenocrate the opportunity to contemplate on her place in Tamburlaine's life. This show of psychological depth alters the way the audience regards her devotion to Tamburlaine because it is evidence that her conscience troubles her. Greenblatt's remarks on Shakespeare's "unprecedented representation of tormented inwardness" (Will, 311) in Hamlet equally apply to the way Marlowe dramatises Zenocrate's conflict of conscience. This contrast is made between Tamburlaine and Zenocrate's moral character because it emphasises her loyalty to her husband.

When she learns that her father has moved to place the Arabian king against Tamburlaine in exchange for her hand in marriage. Zenocrate is evocatively reminded of Lavinia:

But as the gods, to end the Trojan's toil,
 Prevented Turnus of Lavinia,
 And fatally enriched Aeneas' love,
 So, for a final issue to my griefs,
 To pacify my country and my love,
 Must Tamburlaine, by their resistless powers,
 With virtue of a gentle victory
 Conclude a league of honour to my hope;

Then, as the powers divine have pre-ordained,
 With happy safety of my father's life
 Send like defence of fair Arabia (V.i.393-403).

By calling on the most problematic incident of Aeneas' journey to found Rome, Zenocrate reinforces the pessimistic attitude towards the gods in Marlowe's epic drama: Aeneas slaughtered Turnus as he begged for his life because of human weakness and free-will, not because of divine providence. When he kills Turnus in the final passages of The Aeneid, Aeneas' heroism is dismantled; he is temporarily stripped of his famous pietas and is reduced, like Thyestes, to a victim of his own ire. Virgil's modification of Greek heroism includes Aeneas' fall into his own furor but Marlowe reverses this by making Tamburlaine's weakness love. Zenocrate's desire for "a gentle victory" contradicts the intended analogy with Aeneas: instead of showing Tamburlaine in a more positive light, as an heroic figure, Zenocrate's comparison denies heroic praise and questions the role of the gods in bloody war.

Zenocrate is true to her word and consents to marry Tamburlaine after he defeats Arabia and he spares the Soldan. Her resistance to warfare and violence never wanes though and she begs her husband to abandon his military exploits:

Sweet Tamburlaine, when wilt thou leave these arms
 And save thy sacred person free from scathe
 And dangerous chances of the wrathful war?

(II Tamburlaine, I.iii.9-11).

Zenocrate's loyalty to her husband has clouded her perception of reality and she is unable to see Tamburlaine for what he is: to her he is "sweet" and his person "sacred" but she fails to acknowledge his arrogant desire for conquest and war. Here is another reversal of Lucan: Zenocrate matches Cornelia (and Marcia) in loyalty to her husband but Pompey was motivated to improve the lot of the people and Cornelia's loyalty to him is admirable. But Tamburlaine wishes to deny freedom from the people and he is only motivated by hubris and victory for himself.

Three women are introduced in Lucan's epic in order to complement the three protagonists: Cato and Marcia, Caesar and Cleopatra, and Pompey and Cornelia. Lucan's depiction of the relationships between the protagonists and these particular women reveals fundamental issues about the protagonists. By introducing the Egyptian empress to the life of Tamburlaine Marlowe presents contrasting characteristics of the tyrant figure: by humanising Tamburlaine in this way Marlowe complicates the figure of Tamburlaine as an agent of Hell. Like reading Virgil's account of Aeneas' slaughter of Turnus, Marlowe complicates the characterisation of the terror Tamburlaine.¹³

For Lucan, Cornelia's role as a loyal wife and wholly devoted to all of her husband's acts emphasises Pompey's human emotions in contrast to the constant emphasis on his militant mentality. The presence of Cornelia in Lucan's epic highlights Pompey's ability to inspire unquestioning devotion, even when he suffers defeat: "Lucan uses Cornelia to highlight

¹³ In Julius Caesar (1599), Shakespeare imitates Marlowe's complex representation of tyranny in the events leading up to and following Caesar's assassination. His tragedy, like Lucan's epic, lacks a single hero and instead focuses on three main protagonists: Brutus, Cassius and Mark Antony. Shakespeare was aware of the paradox in the fact that Caesar was praised as a great ruler and a Roman hero despite the fact that he was also a tyrant. While Shakespeare's Caesar self-fashions his divinity in an echo of Marlowe's Tamburlaine, it is Brutus' foul part in Caesar's murder and simultaneous "care" for Rome that Shakespeare focuses on.

[Pompey's] greatness" (Braund, xxxi). Zenocrate's inclusion in Marlowe's epic about Tamburlaine also serves to highlight the positive aspects and human qualities about the Turkish conqueror. Her loyalty to Tamburlaine despite his heinous crimes, even the innocent slaughter of the virgins of Damascus, subverts the nature of Cornelia's duty to Pompey.¹⁴

The devotion that Pompey inspires is most evident when Pompey prepares to approach Ptolemy in Egypt and Cornelia begs to accompany him even though they both understand that there are assassins waiting for Pompey before he reaches Ptolemy's court.¹⁵ Cornelia acts without hesitation:

Cornelia headlong rushed towards the enemy boat,
 the less prepared to be apart from her husband as he left
 because she feared disaster. "Stay behind, my reckless wife
 you too, my son, I pray, and watch my fortunes
 far from shore, and on this neck put to the test
 the tyrant's loyalty," he said. But, deaf to his injunction
 frantically Cornelia stretched out both her hands: "Where
 are you going
 without me, cruel man? (Lucan 8.577-584).

Pompey refuses to allow Cornelia to accompany him yet she cries out in desperation to share her lover's fate.

¹⁴ Cf. Kyd's translation of Garnier's tragedy, *Cornelia*, printed in 1594. The dramatic action takes place after the battle at Pharsalia.

¹⁵ Understanding that the Egyptians mean to kill him, Pompey continues towards their shores: "he yields to Fate, and when bidden leave his fleet, / obeys and chooses to prefer death to fear" (Lucan, 8.575-6).

Cornelia's devotion to Pompey continues even following his brutal assassination. After the Egyptians brutally stab Pompey, Cornelia cries out in anguish, questioning why she still lives although her husband is dying, "As you approached your final destiny, / did I deserve to live? I shall die" (Lucan 8.652-3).

In a further reversal of the Lucanic model, when Tamburlaine watches Zenocrate fade from life, instead of questioning his own existence he threatens Death. But Death is unswayed by Tamburlaine's threats and takes Zenocrate. He is threatened by his inability to counter the heavens because it is concrete evidence that he is subject to the powerful force of death.¹⁶ In vain, Tamburlaine responds to Zenocrate's death by ordering Techelles to wound the earth, threatening the Fates, and he calls Usumcasane and Theridamas to arms to challenge the heavens.

c. Tamburlaine's Progeny

Another significant departure from the source material is the inclusion of a third son to Tamburlaine. Calyphas's disposition is starkly contrasted with Tamburlaine and although he resembles his mother Zenocrate Tamburlaine has a strong dislike for him. Calyphas even begs to be dismissed from war duties with his brothers in order to accompany his mother: "But while my brothers follow arms, my lord, / Let me accompany my gracious mother" (II Tamburlaine I.iii.65-6). The mighty Turkish conqueror is disgusted with his eldest son and distances the child from him: "Bastardly boy, sprung from some coward's loins, / And not the issue of great Tamburlaine" (69-70).

¹⁶ Cf. the Dance of Death: "The daunce of death, which all must runne on row: / Though how, or when, the lord alone doth know" (Tottel's Miscellany, 125).

But while Zenocrate is present Calyphas has some support and she warns Tamburlaine that bloody warfare is not suitable for young princes: "My lord, such speeches to our princely sons / Dismay their minds before they come to prove, / The wounding troubles angry war affords" (85-7). The younger boys pipe up against their mother and affirm their likeness to Tamburlaine by pleading for bloodshed (88-95). Kingship, for Tamburlaine, Celebinus and Amyras is seen as the reward for bloodshed and cruelty; in this morality he who sheds the most blood is the best king. This will prove a flaw to Calyphas when Zenocrate cannot defend him from his father.

Calyphas fatally chooses to remain in his tent playing cards rather than join his brothers and father in battle, saying that he does not like to murder men: "I take no pleasure to be murderous, / Nor care for blood when wine will quench my thirst" (II Tamburlaine IV.i.29-30). When Tamburlaine notices Calyphas' absence he drags the boy out in front of Amyras and Celebinus, the three tributary kings, Theridamas, Techelles and Usumcasane, and the Turkish kings, Orcanes, Jerusalem and Trebizond to execute "justice" on him for his cowardice: "Shroud any thought may hold my striving hands / From martial justice on thy wretched soul?" (95-6).

The witnesses all beg for Calyphas' salvation from his father's hands but their pleas are in vain and Tamburlaine is determined to make an example of the boy:

Stand up, my boys, and I will teach ye arms

And what the jealousy of wars must do.

[.]

Here, Jove, receive his fainting soul again,

A form not meet to give that subject essence
 Whose matter is the flesh of Tamburlaine,
 Wherein an incorporeal spirit moves,
 Made of the mould whereof thyself consists,
 Which makes me valiant, proud, ambitious,
 Ready to levy power against thy throne,
 That I might move the turning spears of heaven:
 For earth and all this airy region
 Cannot contain the state of Tamburlaine.

[Stabs Calyphas] (103-120).

By murdering his child in front of witnesses who both support and oppose him, Tamburlaine reveals that he cannot control all men: since he has no control over Calyphas, he destroys the young boy. This spectacle also demonstrates Tamburlaine's inexorable power over men and his ungodly disposition.¹⁷ Appalled at Tamburlaine's actions, Jerusalem, like Hieronimo and Thyestes, cries for justice from the heavens:

Thy victories are grown so violent
 That shortly heaven, filled with the meteors
 Of blood and fire thy tyrannies have made,
 Will pour down blood and fire on they head,
 Whose scalding drops will pierce thy seething brains

¹⁷ Emily C. Bartels' study, Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe (1993), recognises the early modern fascination with "the strange" in Marlowe's stage dramas. Her reading of Marlowe's plays places them in a subversive context for placing the spectacle of otherness onstage: "Marlowe's plays, in bringing alien types to centre stage, subversively resist that exploitation and expose the demonisation of an other as a strategy for self-authorisation and self-empowerment, whether on the foreign or the domestic front" (xv).

And with our bloods revenge our bloods on thee (140-5).

Tamburlaine's act of murder is made worse by the familial tie with the victim and is prompted in Lucan's condemnation of a civil war where brothers battle each other to death:

Love over-rules my will, I must obey thee,
Caesar; he whom I heare thy trumpets charge
 I hould no Romaine; by these ten blest ensignes
 And all thy several triumphs, shouldst thou bid me
 Intombe my sword within my brothers bowels;
 Or fathers throate; or womens groning wombe;
 This hand (albeit unwilling) should performe it;
 Or rob the gods; or sacred temples fire;
 These troupes should soone pull down the church of Jove
 (Marlowe Lucan, 373-381).

Marlowe's translation of this passage in Lucan where Roman cohorts vow to kill even their own brothers for Caesar matches the horrors Tamburlaine inflicts on his own child and the virgins of Damascus. Herein lies the paradox of resistance theory that Marlowe presents in the "mirror" of his tragedy; firstly that God is the author of tyranny suggests that he knowingly causes suffering; and secondly, that men must endure this wrath if tyranny is divine because tyrants are divinely appointed.

Marlowe furthers this paradox by eliminating any discussion of Tamburlaine's punishments after death, or the loss of his empire by his other two children. Instead, Marlowe's play ends with the possibility that

the tyrant's other two war-like sons will continue scourging. Amyras pledges to take his father's place: "Heavens witness me, with what a broken heart / And damnèd spirit I ascend this seat" (II Tamburlaine V.iii.206-7). Marlowe leaves the possibility that Tamburlaine's scourging is endless by including Amyras.

But when the play closes, Bajazeth's son Callapine is still a threat to Tamburlaine's empire since he has escaped captivity and gathered allies to attack the force of Tamburlaine. The tragedy of the world is mirrored in Marlowe's two-part tragedy: the world of the play stages the repetitive cycle of warfare, changes of leadership and death and suggests that this cycle is endless by avoiding closure at the end of the play.

The historical accounts agree that after his death Tamburlaine was survived by two incompetent sons. But the histories contend that when the sons attempted to continue the conquests of their father both sons were quickly eliminated by their enemies as a result of discord between them. The historians interpret the boys' inability to rule as divine justice for Tamburlaine's crimes in an attempt to justify the paradox that despite being a cruel and terrible tyrant he died a natural death and did not outwardly suffer a fall. Whestone writes,

In the end this great personage, without disgrace of fortune, after sundry great victories, by the course of nature died, and left behind him two sons, every way far unlike their father; between whom envy followed such dissention that through their incapacities to govern the conquests of their father, the children of Bajazeth, whom they kept prisoner, stole into Asia, and so won the people to disobedience, as they recovered the goods and possessions

that their father lost. The like did other kings and princes whom Tamburlaine had spoiled, insomuch as in the small time this empire was so abased that many days ago there was no remembrance left, either of him or his lineage (qtd. in Thomas and Tydeman 95-6).

The swift end of Tamburlaine's line after his death was further interpreted by the early historians as evidence for the transitory duration of the scourge in human history. But Marlowe excludes this moralising from his drama and instead the tragedy closes with the East still at war.

In the historical sources for Tamburlaine, the authors use the division between the sons of Tamburlaine as evidence for a divine plan. In the vernacular tradition, both Gorboduc and Jocasta use examples of tyranny and civil disobedience to extricate a moral message about obedience and resistance. Marlowe abandons the moralising technique of his sources and dramatic models so although there was some rivalry between the boys when they tried to impress their father, Tamburlaine's sons appear united in their militaristic goals when he dies.

Marlowe's pessimism here inverts Lucan's hopeful passages that speculate on the role of Pompey's two sons and the future of the Republic. After Pompey's murder Cornelia travels to meet Cato and perform the proper burial rights for Pompey. She repeats Pompey's dying message: "never, / while someone of my stock remains on earth, / let Caesars have the chance to reign" (Lucan, 9.88-90). Cornelia then advises the boys that only one man will prove a victor in this war:

Whichever Pompey comes on to the waves will find

a fleet, and my successor will bring war to all
 the nations of the world: only keep your spirits undaunted
 and mindful of your father's rights. One man alone will it be
 right

to obey, if he takes the side of freedom - Cato

(93-7).

Tamburlaine's message stands in dark contrast to Pompey's desire to maintain liberty by means of warfare and he begs that they continue conquering the world.

In contrast to Cornelia's message for liberty, Tamburlaine offers a darker message promoting tyranny: "So, reign, my son, scourge and control those slaves, / Guiding thy chariot with thy father's hand" (Tamburlaine, II.V.iii.228-9). Tamburlaine's words specifically limit freedom and express a desire to take freedom away from the people ("control those slaves"), and unlike Gorboduc and Jocasta that end with the hope for a return to political order, Marlowe's drama ends with Amyras praising the work of his father: "Let earth and heaven his timeless death deplore, / For both their worths will equal him no more" (252-3).

In his depiction of the exploits of the tyrant Tamburlaine, Marlowe departs from the historical material that sought to make a de casibus example of the eastern terror. Instead of Whetstone and Fortescue's moralising tone that condemned the self-professed scourge of God to the fires of Hell, Marlowe adopted the ironic tone of Lucan's pessimistic epic on the Roman civil war. Lucan showed how men are helpless under a tyrannous ruler, even one who claims to be descended from the gods.

Instead of looking ahead to a new golden age, in the way that Virgil's epic did, Lucan's epic was located in primarily in the frame of

tragedy: it shows a world where the gods have abandoned all concern for men and Fortune presides over Rome. Caesar is aided by Fortune in his quest to gain political control in Rome and he is portrayed as a terrifying force and an enemy of Rome (through Lucan's comparison between Caesar and Hannibal).

In Lucan's epic, blood flows freely, brothers fight brothers, Romans kill Romans, and corpses lie rotting unburied while crows pick at their flesh. At the end of Book One, Lucan draws an analogy between Rome in the midst of civil war and a dark and godless place. Marlowe's translation reads:

The flattering skie gliter'd in often flames,
 And sundry fiery meteors blaz'd in heaven;
 [.]
Titan himselfe throand in the midst of heaven,
 His burning chariot plng'd in sable cloudes,
 And whelm'd the world in darknesse, making men
 Dispaire of day
 [.]
 Cole-blacke Charibdis whirl'd a sea of bloud;
 [.]
 Crownes fell from holy statues, ominous burds
 Defil'd the day, and wilde beastes were seene,
 Leaving the woods, to lodge in the streetes of Rome.
 (Marlowe Lucan, 528-558).

Lucan predicts that these events will plague Rome as a result of the civil war.¹⁸

Marlowe's tragedy questions the paradoxes inherent in orthodox doctrine and presents a mirror in which to see the possible results of these doctrines. In modelling his material after the ironic tone of Lucan's picture of wars worse than civil, Marlowe creates a mirror of Hell on earth by allowing Tamburlaine the stage space as his own personal arena to prove himself a scourge. He tells Amyras,

Thus am I right the scourge of highest Jove,
And see the figure of my dignity
By which I hold my name and majesty

(II Tamburlaine, IV.iii.24-6).

His allegiance to Jove relies on his understanding of his role as scourge to bring terror to all of the known world. In Marlowe's heavily ironic mirror text, the tyrant is rewarded on the basis of his undying faith in himself and his own divinity.

¹⁸ Cf. Virgil's description of the prediction for Civil War after Caesar's assassination at Georgics I.464ff.

Conclusion

I began by asking what cultural and literary influences produced in Shakespeare's imagination a fear that the forces of Hell could infiltrate earthly events. In trying to determine what contributed to the fears about Hell's agents on earth this thesis began with an investigation of the de casibus mode from the 1550s and charted the progression of Elizabethan tragedy up until the figure of Marlowe's tyrant Tamburlaine, "born of some infernal hag, / And sent from Hell to tyrannise on earth".

In making Tamburlaine an unstoppable force of evil in the East who claims divine ordinance, Marlowe's tragedy depicts the threatening image of a world where humans are subject to a god's whim. This is made more threatening by the possibility that even an infernal deity can govern human affairs, evident in the emphasis in tragedy on Pluto's role in earthly sin and damnation in The Spanish Tragedy.

During the course of this thesis I have had to limit my research of key texts and use the legendary figures from Marlowe and Shakespeare as concrete evidence for a changed attitude towards Hell and damnation by the 1590s. Tamburlaine and Richard III are very familiar figures in studies in Renaissance drama but it is clear they derive from much earlier, and practically unknown, figures. In the course of this thesis I have tried to reclaim a lost "Tudor" heritage for an "Elizabethan", or "Renaissance", literary tradition that contributed to the development of Hell on stage.

Every student of Renaissance literature is familiar with Tamburlaine and Richard III, but less so with pre-Shakespearean tragic figures. But texts like the ones discussed in this thesis are important in their own right and my thesis opens up possibilities for further literary

analysis in sixteenth century literature and drama. In particular, further study of other Elizabethan texts that engage with the Senecan trope for framing earthly events by Hell should help to detect the various manifestations of this link. How did the development of the link between earthly events and Hell in the seventeenth-century alter and work to shape the modern archetypal Miltonic Satan?

Appendix A

Table 1: Texts Printed by William Williamson

Author	Date	Title	STC
Niccolo Machiavelli		<u>The Art of War</u>	17165
John Northbrooke	1571	<u>A briefe and pithie sum of the Christian faith</u>	18663 f.
John Northbrooke	1571 1573 1575	<u>The Poor Man's Garden</u>	18664 f. 18665 18666 (d?)
	1572	<u>The Treasure of Gladness</u>	24193
	1572	<u>The Secrete of Secretes, containing the instructions of Aristotle</u>	770.3
John Denton's	1572	<u>Epigraph on the death of Edward Stanley, earl of Darby</u>	6674 (d);
Philip More	1573		486
Hughes Sureau du Rosier's	1573	<u>Confession et recognoissance</u>	7368
Nicholas Nichols	1573	<u>A spiritual poseaye most godly consolations and prayers</u>	18543
Rudolph Walther	1573	<u>De Syllabaraum et carminum ratione, libri duo</u>	25011
Athenagoras	1573	Latin edition of <u>The Most notable and Excellent Discourse Touching the Resurrection of the Dead</u>	886
Dutch Author, unknown	1574	<u>Certain news of the whole description, aid, and help of the Christian Princes for the deliverance of poor Christians in the low countries</u>	5182-2.2 (d);
William Clerke	1574	<u>The Trial of bastardy</u>	5411.7
J. Jones, trans.	1574	Latin edition of Galen's books on the elements	11537.3

John Jones	1574	<u>The Arte of Science and Medecine</u>	14724 a.9
H. Grantham, trans. Girolamo Cataneo	1574	<u>A most brief tables to know readily how many ranks of footmen go to the making of a just battle</u>	4790
Edward Hake	1574	<u>A Touchestone for this time present, espresly declaring such ruins, enormities, and abuses as trouble the Church of God [...]</u>	12609
Richard Robinson	1574	<u>The Rewarde of Wickednesse</u>	21121.7 (d)

Works Cited

Primary Texts

-
- Adams, Joseph Quincy, Ed. Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas: A Selection of Plays Illustrating the History of the English Drama from its origin down to Shakespeare. London: George G Harrap & Co. : 1924.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas. Summa Theologicæ A Concise Translation. Ed. Timothy McDermott. Texas: Christian Classics, 1989.
- Aristotle. The Poetics of Aristotle. Trans. and commentary by Stephen Halliwell. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1987.
- Ascham, Roger. The Schoolmaster (1570). Ed. Lawrence V. Ryan. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1967.
- Augustine. Confessions. Trans., R.S. Pine-Coffin. London: Penguin, 1961.
 - - -. The City of God against the Pagans. Trans., R.W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Baldwin, William. The Funeralles of King Edward the sixt. 1560. STC 1243.
 - - -. Beware the Cat. Ed. William A. Ringler and Michael Flachmann. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1988.
 - - -. ed. A Mirror for Magistrates. (1559 & 1563). Ed. Lily B. Campbell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Bale, John. The Pageant of Popes. 1555. STC 7552.
- Barclay, Alexander, trans. A Myrroure of good manners. By Dominus Mancinus. 1520 STC 17242 /5.
- Boas, Frederick S. The Works of Thomas Kyd. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1901.
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. See: Lydgate, John.

- Bond, Ronald B. ed. Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and A Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570): A Critical Edition. London: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Calvin, John. On God and Political Duty. Ed John T. McNeill. London: Collier Macmillan, 1950.
- Cawley, A.C., ed. Everyman and Medieval Miracle Plays. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1962.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Riverside Chaucer. Ed. Larry D. Benson. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- - -. Troilus and Criseyde. Trans. and ed. Barry Windeatt. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Cicero. Tusculan Disputations. Latin text ed. and trans. J.E. King. LCL. London: Heinemann, 1971.
- Cunliffe, John W, ed. Early English Classical Tragedies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Dante. The Divine Comedy. The Portable Dante. Trans. and ed. Mark Musa. London: Penguin Books, 1995. 1-586.
- Dolman, John, trans. Those fyve questions which Marke Tullye Cicero disputed in his manor of Tusculanum. By Cicero. London 1561. STC 5317.
- Eccles, Mark, ed. The Macro Plays: The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom, Mankind. The Early English Text Society, Series I. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Elyot, Sir Thomas. The Book Named the Governor. Ed. S. E. Lehmborg. London: J. M. Dent, 1970.
- Euripides. Euripides. Edited by David Grene & Richard Lattimore, III. The Phoenician Women. Trans. Lattimore. London: University of Chicago Press, 1958. 67-140.
- Fulwell, Ulpian. Like will to like quoth the Devill to the Collier. 1568. STC 11473.

Fulwood, William. The shape of ii monsters. 1562. STC 11485.

Gascoigne, George. Jocasta. The Posies. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969. 244-326. References to this play refer to the page number.

Googe, Barnabe. Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets. Ed. Judith M. Kennedy. London: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Heywood, Jasper, trans. Seneca. Troas. Vocht 3-86.

- - -. Thyestes. Vocht 91-195.

- - -. Hercules Furens. Vocht 198-292.

Heywood, John. The Spider and the Flie: A Parable. 1556. STC 13308.

"Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion, A." Ed. Bond 209-259.

Hotman, François. Francogallia. Franklin 47-96.

- - -. A true and plaine report of the furious outrages of France. 1573. Trans. E. Varamuund. STC 13847.5.

Hughes, Thomas et al. Gismond of Salerne In Love. Ed. Cunliffe 162-216.

Kyd, Thomas. The Spanish Tragedy. Ed. David Bevington. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Lloyd, Lodowick. The Pilgrimage of Princes. 1573. STC 16624.

Lucan. Civil War. Trans. and ed. Susan H. Braund. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- - -. The Civil War. Trans. and ed. J.D. Duff. LCL. London: William Heinemann, 1962.

Luther, Martin. On the Bondage of the Will. Trans. and ed. E. Gordon Rupp. The Library of Christian Classics Vol. 17, Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation. London: SCM Press 1969. 293-309.

- Lydgate, John, trans. The Fall of Princes. By Giovanni Boccaccio. Ed. Henry Bergen. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press for the Early English Text Society, Extra Series Vols 121-125, 1924-27.
- Marlowe, Christopher. Tamburlaine the Great. Ed. J.S. Cunningham. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.
- - -. Doctor Faustus A- and B- texts (1604, 1616). Eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- - -. "The First Booke of Lucan, Translated into English". The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe. Ed. Fredson Bowers. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973. Vol. 2, 280-306.
- More, Sir Thomas. The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems. Ed. Richard S. Sylvester. London: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Neville, Alexander, trans. Oedipus. Thomas Newton, ed. Seneca his Tenne Tragedies Translated into English. London: Constable and Company, 1927. 187-231.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings. Eds. Raymond Geuss and Ronald Speirs. Trans. Ronald Speirs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 1-116.
- Ovid. Metamorphoses. Trans. Arthur Golding as Metamorphosis (1564-7). Ed. W.H.D. Rouse as Shakespeare's Ovid: Being Arthur Golding's Translation of the Metamorphoses. London: Centaur Press, 1961.
- Peele, George. The Battle of Alcazar. MSR. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1907.
- Pickering, John. The Interlude of Vice (Horestes) 1567. MSR. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Ponet, John. A Short Catechisme. 1553. English Reformers. Ed. T.H.L. Parker. Vol. XXVI of The Library of Christian Classics. XXVI Vols. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- - -. "Proper Responses to Unjust Tyrannical Governments." A Short Treatise of Political Power [1556]. Menston: Scolar, 1970.

- Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie 1589. Menston: Scolar Press, 1968.
- Quintilian. The Orator's Education. Trans. and ed. Donald A. Russell. LCL. London: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Robinson, Richard. The Rewards of Wickedness. 1574. STC 21121.7.
- - -. A Golden Mirrour. 1589. STC 21121.5
- Sackville, Thomas and Thomas Norton. Gorboduc; or Ferrex and Porrex. Adams 503-535.
- Seneca. Troades. Latin text ed. and trans. Frank Justus Miller, Seneca's Tragedies (LCL). London: William Heinemann, 1916.
- - -. Thyestes. Latin text ed. with Introduction and Commentary by R. J. Tarrant, Seneca's Thyestes. Atlanta: The American Philological Association, 1985; rpt. 1989.
- - -. Hercules Furens. Latin text ed. and trans. John G. Fitch, Seneca VIII Tragedies (LCL). London: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- - -. The Moral Essays. Latin text ed. and trans. John W. Basore. (LCL). London: Heinemann, 1928.
- Shakespeare, William. King Richard III. Ed. and into by Janis Lull. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- - - Hamlet. Ed. and Introduction by Harold Jenkins. London: Arden Shakespeare, 1982.
- Sidney, Sir Philip. An Apology for Poetry, or The Defence of Poesy. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd and R.W. Maslen. 3rd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Soliman and Perseda. Old English Plays Vol. V. Ed. W. Carew Hazlitt. London: Reeves and Turner, 1874.
- St. Patrick's Purgatory. Ed. Robert Easting. The Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Storer, Thomas. The life and death of Thomas Wolsey [1599]. STC 23294.
- The Castle of Perseverance. Ed. Eccles 1-111.

The True Tragedie of Richard the Third. MSR. Edited and Introduction by W.W.Greg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Turberville, George. Tragical Tales. 1587. STC 24330.

Virgil. The Aeneid. Trans. David West. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

- - -. The Aeneid Books I-IV. Ed. R. Deryck Williams. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.

- - -. Georgics. Trans. L.P. Wilkinson. London: Penguin Books, 1982.

Vocht, H. de. Jasper Heywood and his Translations of Seneca's *Troas*, *Thyestes*, and *Hercules Furens*, Edited from the Octavos of 1559, 1560 and 1561. London: David Nutt, 1913.

Yates, James. The Castell of Courtesie 1582. STC 26079.

Secondary Texts

- Aggeler, Geoffrey. "The Eschatological crux in the Spanish Tragedy." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 86 (1987): 319-331.
- Andrews, John F. "'Dearly Bought Revenge': Samson Agonistes, Hamlet, and Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy." Milton Studies 13 (1979): 81-107.
- Ardolino, Frank. Apocalypse & Armada in Kyd's Spanish Tragedy. Kirksville: Sixteenth-Century Journal Publishers, 1995.
- Armstrong, W.A. "The Influence of Seneca on the Elizabethan Tyrant." The Review of English Studies 24 (1948): 19-36.
- - - . "The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant." Review of English Studies 22 (1946): 161-181.
- Ayres, Philip J. "Degrees of Heresy: Justified Revenge and Elizabethan Narratives." Studies in Philology 69 (1972): 461-74.
- Baker, Howard. Introduction to Tragedy: A Study in a Development of Form in *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus*. 1939. New York: Russell & Russell, 1965.
- Bartels, Emily C. "The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe's Tamburlaine, Part One." Renaissance Drama 23 (1992): 3-24.
- - -. Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
- Berg, James Emmanuel. "Gorboduc as a Tragic Discovery of 'Feudalism'." Studies in English Literature 40 (2000): 199-226.
- Bernstein, Alan E. The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds. Cornell University Press: London, 1993.
- Betteridge, Thomas. Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83. Ashgate: Aldershot, 1999.

- Bevington, David M. From *Mankind* to Marlowe; Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1962.
- - -. Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Boas, Frederick S. University Drama in the Tudor Age. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1914.
- Boyle, A.J. Tragic Seneca An essay in the Theatrical Tradition. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Braden, Gordon. Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege. London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Bradford, Alan T. "Drama and Architecture under Elizabeth I: The 'Regular' Phase." English Literary Renaissance 14 (1984): 2-28.
- - -. "Mirrors of Mutability: Winter Landscapes in Tudor Poetry." English Literary Renaissance 4 (1974): 3-39.
- Broude, Ronald. "Revenge and Revenge Tragedy in Renaissance England." Renaissance Quarterly 28 (1975): 38-58.
- Budra, Paul. A Mirror for Magistrates and the *de casibus* Tradition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Tamburlaine: An Elizabethan Vagabond." Studies in Philology 84.3 (1987): 308-323.
- - -. Constructing 'Monsters' in Shakespearean Drama and Early Modern Culture. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
- Burrow, Colin. "Virgil in English Translation". The Cambridge Companion to Virgil. Ed. Charles Martindale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 21-37.
- Bushnell, Rebecca W. Tragedies of Tyrants Political Thought and Theatre in the English Renaissance. London: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Campbell, Lily B. ed. The Mirror for Magistrates. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.

- - - . Shakespeare's "Histories"; Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1947.
- Caputo, Nicoletta. " 'Which Play Was of a King How He Should Rule His Realm': Tudor Interludes Advising the Ruler." Voices of the Renaissance: Special Issue of the Hungarian Journal for English and American Studies. Ed. György E. Szönyi. Forthcoming 2006.
- Cavanagh, Dermot. Language and Politics in the Sixteenth-Century History Play. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Clemen, Wolfgang. English Tragedy before Shakespeare, The Development of Dramatic Speech, Trans. T.S.Dorsch. London: Methuen & Co., 1961.
- Cox, John D. and David Scott Kastan, eds. A New History of Early English Drama. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- Cox, John D. "Devils and Power in Marlowe and Shakespeare." Yearbook of English Studies 23 (1993): 46-64.
- - - . The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama, 1350-1642. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Cunliffe, John W. The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy. Hamden: Archon Books, 1965.
- Edwards, Philip. "Thrusting Elysium into Hell: The Originality of The Spanish Tragedy." Elizabethan Theatre XI. Ed. A.L. Magnusson and C.E. McGee. Port Credit, Ontario: P.D. Geary, 1991. 117-132.
- Erne, Lukas. "'Enter the Ghost of Andrea': Recovering Thomas Kyd's Two-Part Play." English Literary Renaissance 30 (2000): 339-72.
- Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- Friendenreich, Kenneth, Roma Gill and Constance B. Kuriyama, eds. "A Poet and a filthy Play-maker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1988.

- Gill, Roma. "Marlowe, Lucan, and Sulpitius." Review of English Studies XXIV (1973): 401-413.
- - -. "Marlowe and the Art of Translation." Friedenreich, 327-343.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. Hamlet in Purgatory. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- - -. Will in the World: How Shakespeare became Shakespeare. London: Jonathan Cape, 2004.
- - -. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Happé, Peter. "Tragic Themes in Three Tudor Moralities". Studies in English Literature 2 (1965): 207-27.
- Hill, Eugene D. "Senecan and Vergilian Perspectives in The Spanish Tragedy." English Literary Renaissance 15 (1985): 143-65.
- - -. "The First Elizabethan Tragedy: A Contextual Reading of Cambises." Studies In Philology 4 (1992): 404-433.
- Hunter, G.K. "Seneca and the Elizabethans: A Case-Study in 'Influence.'" Shakespeare Survey 20 (1967): 17-27.
- - -. English Drama 1586-1642: The Age of Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- - -. "Ironies of Justice in The Spanish Tragedy." Renaissance Drama 8, 1965.
- Jones, Emry. The Origins of Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Justice, Steven. "Spain, Tragedy, and The Spanish Tragedy." Studies in English Literature 25 (1985): 271-288.
- Kelley, Donald R. François Hotman: A Revolutionary's Ordeal. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. Ideas and forms of tragedy from Aristotle to the Middle Ages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- - -. Chaucerian Tragedy. Cambridge: D.S.Brewer, 1997.
- - -. The Devil at Baptism: Ritual, Theology, and Drama. London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

- Kennedy, George. Quintilian. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1969.
- Kerrigan, John. Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Kiefer, Frederick. "Fortune and Providence in the Mirror for Magistrates." Studies in Philology 74 (1977): 146-64.
- Knapp, Robert S. "Resistance, Religion, and the Aesthetic: Power and Drama in the Towneley, 'Magnus Herodes', 'Cambises', and 'Richard III'". Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama 33 (1994): 143-52.
- - -. "Horestes: The Uses of Revenge". English Literary History 40 (1973): 205-20.
- Leech, Clifford, ed. Marlowe: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- Le Goff, Jacques. The Birth of Purgatory. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Levine, Mortimer. The Early Elizabethan Succession Question 1558-1568. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- Lewis, C.S. English Literature in the Sixteenth-Century Excluding Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Macfarlane, Alan. Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England: A regional and comparative study. London: Routledge, 1970.
- Miola, Robert S. "Euripides at Gray's Inn: Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's Jocasta". The Female Tragic Hero in English Renaissance Drama. New York: Palgrave, 2002. 33-50.
- - -. Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- - -. Shakespeare's Reading. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Moretti, Franco. Signs Taken for Wonders: Essays in the sociology of literary forms. Trans. Susan Fischer, David Forgacs and David Miller. London: Verso, 1988.

- Newton, John and Jo Bath, eds. Early Modern Ghosts. Proc. of the 'Early Modern Ghosts' Conf., 24, March 2001. Centre for Seventeenth Century Studies: Durham University, 2002.
- Oestrerich-Hart, Donna J. "'Therefore, since I cannot prove a lover.'" Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900 40 (2000): 241-61.
- Patch, Howard R. The Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Literature. 1927. London: Frank Cass. Rpt. 1967.
- Peery, William. "Tragic Retribution in the 1559 Mirror for Magistrates." Studies in Philology 46 (1949): 113-30.
- Phillips, James E. "A Revaluation of Horestes (1567)." Huntington Library Quarterly 18 (1955): 227-244.
- Pincombe, Mike. Elizabethan Humanism: Literature and Learning in the later Sixteenth Century. London: Longman, 2001.
- - -. "Robert Dudley, Gorboduc, and 'The masque of Beauty and Desire': A Reconsideration of the Evidence for Political Intervention". Parergon 20 (2003): 19-44.
- - -. "Sackville Tragicus: A Case of Poetic Identity." Piesse, A. J. ed. Sixteenth-century Identities. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000. 112-132.
- Pontfarcy, Yolande de. Introduction. Saint Patrick's Purgatory: A Twelfth Century Tale of a Journey to the Other World. Trans. Jean-Michael Picard. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1985. 9-41.
- Rasmussen, Eric. "The Implications of Past Tense Verbs in Early Elizabethan Dumb Shows". English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature 67 (1986): 417-419.
- Ribner, Irving. "Marlowe's Tragicke Glasse." Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig. Ed. R. Hosely. London: Routledge & K. Paul. 1963. 91-114.
- - -. "The Idea of History in Marlowe's Tamburlaine." English Literary History 20 (1953): 251-266.
- - -. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. London: Methuen & Co., 1965.

- Rist, Thomas. "Religion, Politics, Revenge: The Dead in Renaissance Drama." Early Modern Literary Studies 9 (2003): 1-20.
- Shapiro, James. "'Metre meete to furnish Lucans style': Reconsidering Marlowe's Lucan". Friedenreich 315-325.
- Sharpe, James. Witchcraft in Early Modern England. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001.
- Skinner, Quentin. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume Two: The Age of Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Smith, Bruce R. Ancient Scripts & Modern Experience on the English Stage 1500-1700. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Smith, Molly. "The Theatre and the Scaffold: Death as Spectacle in The Spanish Tragedy", Studies in English Literature 32 (1992): 217-232.
- Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil, A History of a Metaphor in Relation to his Major Villains. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Staines, David. "To Out-Herod Herod: The Development of a Dramatic Character." The Drama of the Middle Ages. Ed. Clifford Davidson. New York: AMS Press, 1982. 207-231.
- Thomas, Vivien and William Tydeman, eds. Christopher Marlowe: The plays and their sources. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Waith, Eugene M. The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden. Chatto & Windus: London, 1962.
- Walker, Greg. The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Watson, Philip S. Let God be God! An Interpretation of the Theology of Martin Luther. London: Epworth Press, 1947.

Wiggins, Martin. Journeyman in Murder: The Assassin in English Renaissance Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Williams, Derych R. ed. Virgil: The Aeneid Books I-IV. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.

Winston, Jessica. "A Mirror for Magistrates and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England." Studies in Philology 101 (2004): 381-400.