

Reviving Lucan: Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, and *Lucans First Booke*

Emma Buckley, St Andrews University

Introduction

In *Bellum Ciuile* 5, Julius Caesar – who has already cut a swathe through Italy and conducted a destructive campaign in Spain – finally ends up battling with nature itself, when he attempts to sail from Brundisium to Dyrrachium. In the confident expectation that with Fortune on his side a storm will prove no obstacle to his desires, he embarks upon the sea in a tiny boat, amidst the protests of the owner, the lowly Amyclas (*BC.5.476-721*). Before setting off, however, he attempts to impress and bribe the humble sailor:

Expecta uotis maiora modestis,
Spesque tuas laxa iuuenis, si iussa secutus
Me uehis Hesperiam, non ultra cuncta carinae
Debebis, manibusque inopem duxisse senectam.
Ne cessa praebere Deo tua fata, uolenti
Angustos opibus subitis implere Penates. *BC.5.532-7*¹
'Enlarge thy hopes, poore man, expect to haue
More wealth from mee then modesty can craue:
Only transport mee to th'Italian shore,
This trade of liuing thou shalt neede no more,
No more shall labour thy poore age sustaine.
Yeild to thy² fate; **a godd is come to raine**

¹ I use the Latin text of Thomas Farnaby, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia, siue, De bello ciuili Caesaris et Pompeii libri X. Adiectis ad marginem notis T. Farnabii, quae loca obscuriora illustrent*, (London, 1618) and the translation of Thomas May, *Lucan's Pharsalia: or The ciuill warres of Rome, betweene Pompey the great, and Iulius Caesar The whole ten bookes. Englished* (London, 1627) throughout.

² they 1627: corrected in subsequent editions (1631, 1635, 1650).

Downe showres of wealth thy little house vpon.’ May, *Phars.* (1627) sig. I2^v-I3^r

In general, May is a very close translator of Lucan, dedicated to replicating as economically as possible the Latin text and not given to flourishes or divagations into ‘free’ translation.³ Nevertheless, when he translates the final line as ‘to raine /Downe showres of wealth thy little house vpon’, May opts for a striking image not in the Latin, but rather inspired by Christopher Marlowe, whose *Tamburlaine* showcases another all-conquering overreacher intoxicated by his own relationship with Fortune and certain of his privileged place in the cosmos. Early in *Tam.* I, the Scythian shepherd attempts to sway the Persian general Theridamas over to his side with words obviously reminiscent of the Julius Caesar of Lucan’s *Bellum Ciuile*:

Forsake thy king and do but join with me,
And we will triumph over all the world.
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.
Draw forth thy sword, thou mighty man-at-arms,
Intending but to raze my charmed skin,
And Jove himself will stretch his hand from heaven
To ward the blow and shield me safe from harm.

See how he rains down heaps of gold in showers,

³ Discussion of May’s translation tends to focus on political/historical issues, but for some remarks on style see Roma Gill, ‘Marlowe, Lucan, and Sulpitius’, *RES* 24 (1973), 401-413; Gerald MacLean, *Time’s Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603–1660* (Wisconsin, 1990), 26–44; Philip Hardie, ‘Lucan in the English Renaissance’ and Susanna Braund, ‘Violence in translation’, in Paulo Asso (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Lucan* (Brill, 2011), 491-506, 507-524; E. J. Paleit, ‘The ‘Caesarist’ Reader and Lucan’s *Bellum Ciuile*, CA. 1590 to 1610’, *RES* 62 (2011), 212-240. May makes sporadic but noticeable use of earlier English drama and poetry, and displays particular knowledge of Marlowe’s works: see Emma Buckley and Edward Paleit (eds), *Thomas May, Lucan’s Pharsalia (1627)*, Tudor and Stuart Translations, 18 (Cambridge: MHRA, forthcoming 2018).

As if he meant to give my soldiers pay; *Tam.* I, 1.ii.171-4.⁴

In the brief glimpse of Tamburlaine that we see in Thomas May's Caesar here, we find another example of the 'blood-brother' relationship between Marlowe's Scythian anti-hero and Lucan's rampaging general that has been traced elsewhere in the literature of early modern England: a relationship already authorised when Tamburlaine explicitly models himself on Caesar (*I Tam.* 3.3.148-165).⁵

This paper will take a close look at two texts which offer far more than an 'imaginative connection' between Tamburlaine and Caesar. Turning first to the revival of Lucan offered in Christopher Marlowe's *Lucans first booke*, I will argue that Marlowe's 'Tamburlainian' Caesar is not simply 'translated' but rather infused with a literary blood-transfusion, inviting a super-charged, hybrid Caesar into early modern English literature. I then trace the effects of this literary resurrection in one later Lucanian author faced with the prospect of killing off Caesar again, in the anonymously authored academic tragedy *Caesar's Revenge*. Lucan's role in early modern debates concerning 'poetry', 'history' and 'truth', his epic's close association with the establishment of a Republican literary-political tradition, and the provocative status of *Bellum Ciuile* in contemporary questions attending to the nature of freedom, tyranny, and the ethics of power and necessity, have been well established.⁶ In this

⁴ Cunningham, J.S. (ed.), *Tamburlaine the Great. Christopher Marlowe* (Revels edition, Manchester, 1981).

⁵ Cf. esp. William Blissett, 'Lucan's Caesar and the Elizabethan Villain', *Studies in Philology* 53.4 (1956): 553-75. More recently Lisa Hopkins, *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (Studies in Performance and Early Modern Drama: Ashgate, 2008), 55-78 remarks the 'imaginative connection' between the two figures but concentrates on the geopolitical resonances of Tamburlaine's Russian/Scythian ethnicity, and the tension produced by similar figures representative of an 'empire of savagery' and the 'civilisation' represented by Rome; Allyna E. Ward, 'Lucanic Irony in Marlowe's "Tamburlaine"', *The Modern Language Review* 103.2 (2008): 311-329 argues that Lucan's vision of cruel providence informs the *Tamburlaine* plays.

⁶ See esp. David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric, and politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge, 1999); E. J. Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar. Responses to Lucan's 'Bellum Ciuile', ca. 1580-1650*. (Classical presences: Oxford, 2013).

paper, however, I trace the path of a more intimate conversation between classical poet, early modern translator and imitator, exploring the peculiarly charged implication of author, poet and character which occurs when the powerful dark matter of Lucan's epic, together with his charismatic anti-hero, is first brought back to life and then killed off again. And I will conclude that for both Marlowe and the author of *CR* the pleasure of engagement with Lucan is exploring the extent to which their protagonists *overreach* strategies of legitimation and justification.⁷ Indeed, such overreach is so successful that even perhaps the most 'politicised' Lucanian author of them all, the monarchist-turned-Republican Thomas May, has real problems killing Caesar and 'completing' Lucan. And when he does finally manage it, he is able to accomplish his task only by appropriating Lucan's regressive poetics of repetition, adopting the politics of personal vengeance, and appropriating the blood-transfusion metaphor first trialled in *Lucans first booke*: a literary strategy serving not to liberate him from Lucan's pessimistic analysis of *both* sides in civil war, but to implicate him fully in Lucan's confusion.

'Drunk with Latin blood': reviving Caesar in *Lucans first booke*

Bella per Emathios plus quam ciuilia campos,
Iusque datum sceleri canimus, populumque potentem
In sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra:
Cognatasque acies: et rupto foedere regni
Certatum totis concussi uiribus orbis,
In commune nefas: infestisque obuia signis
Signa, pares aquilas, & pila minantia pilis.

⁷ For an excellent survey of some of these plays see Paulina Kewes, 'Julius Caesar in Jacobean England', *Seventeenth Century*, 17 (2002): 155–86.

Quis furor, o ciues? quae tanta licentia ferri,
 Gentibus inuisis Latium praebere cruorem? BC.1.1-9
 Wars worse then civill on *Thessalian* playnes,
 And outrage strangling law & 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,
 Eagles alike displaide, darts answering darts.
Romans, what madnes, what huge lust of warre
 Hath made *Barbarians* drunke with *latin* bloud? LFB.1-9⁸

Lucans first booke, named in tandem with *Hero and Leander*, appeared in the Stationers' Register in 1593, the year of Marlowe's death, but it was not until 1600 that the translation, a line for line rendering of *Bellum Ciuile* 1, was published for the first time.⁹ And while Lucan was part of the university syllabus, Marlowe would not have had an English text to work from.¹⁰ The importance of Lucan more broadly to early modern England is well

⁸ I use the edition of Roma Gill (ed.), *The complete works of Christopher Marlowe, vol. 1* (Oxford, 1987).

⁹ For speculation about the intended scope of the project see Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's republican authorship: Lucan, liberty, and the sublime* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009) 6-9: the seminal argument for late authorship of *Lucans first booke* is James Shapiro, "'Metre meete to furnish Lucans style": reconsidering Marlowe's Lucan,' in Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, Constance Brown Kuriyama (eds), *'A poet and a filthy play-maker': new essays on Christopher Marlowe* (AMS Publications, New York, 1999), 315-25.

¹⁰ The first full translation was produced by Sir Arthur Gorges in the 1610s, and the first really successful complete translation, Thomas May's *Pharsalia*, first came out in 1627. See T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespeare's small Latine & lesse Greeke, vol. 1* (University of Illinois Press, 1944), 104: Roma Gill, 'Marlowe, Lucan, and Sulpitius', *RES* 24 (1973): 401-413 has shown that Marlowe was using Sulpitius' commentary very closely. On Marlowe, Gorges and May more generally, see Paleit, *War, liberty, and Caesar*, 219-53.

attested,¹¹ and *LFB* has now been subsumed into arguments about the proto- and pro-Republican sensibility of Marlowe himself.¹² But what strikes the close reader of Marlowe's translation, as J. B. Steane first recognised, is how *Marlovian* this translation is: the aggression, pace and hyperbolic thrust of Lucan's Latin has been matched by an English rendering which achieves similar concision and energy by the deployment of strong verbs and assertive statements, all within a distinctively 'mighty line'.¹³ This does not mean that Marlowe is inattentive to the Latin. Marlowe recognises from the beginning a crucial motif within *Bellum Ciuile*, Lucan's Neronian rhetoric of amplification, when he declares that the war is not just more than civil, but *worse* than civil;¹⁴ and the early modern translator is careful to preserve the shape of the introductory sentence, a poised seven lines in a tradition that signals its epic roots. From the beginning, in other words, the voices of Marlowe and Lucan join in what Steane has called 'a kinship of rare closeness',¹⁵ as the programmatic verb

¹¹ David Norbrook's *Writing the English Republic*, esp. 33-53, identifies a 'cult of Lucan', in which 'republican'-minded elites cleave to Lucan's *Pharsalia* as a vehemently anti-Caesarian text. Paleit's *War, Liberty, and Caesar* has complicated that picture, arguing that seventeenth-century writers are less distinctively 'ideological' in their use of Lucan than Norbrook's model acknowledges, and that Lucan also often offers a strong attraction for 'Caesarist' readers, who are not just fascinated by the martial charisma of Caesar but also prepared to revise judgements about his behaviour in the light of contemporary discourse concerning force, self-interest and necessity. Cf. also by the same author 'Lucan in the Renaissance, pre-1625: An Introduction', *Literature Compass*, 1.1 (2004): 1-6, which stresses the pedagogical context in which Lucan was accessed in the form of rhetoricised excerpts, militating against architectonic or ideological readings.

¹² See esp. Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Republican Authorship*, who makes *Lucans first booke* the nexus of a broader Lucanian engagement in Marlowe's mature dramaturgy, and argues that throughout his work Marlowe exhibits a 'troubled' republicanism.

¹³ J. B. Steane, *Marlowe: A Critical Study*, (Cambridge University Press, 1964) 269-71; cf. esp. also Dan Hooley, 'Raising the Dead: Marlowe's Lucan', in Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko (eds) *Translation and the Classic: Identity as Change in the History of Culture* (Oxford University Press, 2008) 243-60: Hooley concludes (253) that 'Marlowe ...effects an appropriation of Lucan's text in the most literal sense of 'making it one's own'.'

¹⁴ Contrast Gorges' (1614) 'A more then ciuill warre I sing, /That through th' *Emathian* fields did ring' (STC / 1386:02 p.1); Thomas May's 'Warres more then ciuill on Aemathian plaines /We sing' (1627, sig. A^r).

¹⁵ Steane, *Marlowe*, 257.

of performance, now conspicuously at the start of the second verse alerts: Marlowe's 'We sing', Lucan's *canimus*, is now a *true* plural.

Marlowe and Lucan are not, however, simply 'yoke-fellows', reiterating Lucan's partnership with Caesar in *Bellum Ciuile*.¹⁶ rather he infuses the text with a different kind of energy by incorporating a cluster of self-quotation of his own previous work. He first hyperbolises the suicidal right hand of the Roman people, 'turned against its own guts', (*In sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra*, *BC.1.2*) and re-imagines the blood-image of v.9 (in which Latin blood is offered as sacrifice – *praeberere* – to Rome's foreign enemies) as an intoxicating, barbarous blood-thirst. But Marlowe also supplants Lucan's programmatic *dextra* with one of his own phrases – 'conquering swords' (v.3), fundamental to *Tamburlaine*¹⁷ – together with the literal bloodthirstiness and thirst for rule that constantly go hand in hand there.¹⁸ Of course Tamburlaine, like Lucan's Caesar, is a dynamo of power, seeking to know the world and conquer it. He too courts Fortune, arrogates Jove to his cause, and frequently contemplates his own mastery of his destiny and figurative elevation to the stars. And Tamburlaine had 'already' conspicuously compared himself to the Roman general:

¹⁶ Philip Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge University Press, 1993) 107 notes that Lucan and Caesar are already 'yoke-fellows' in *Bellum Ciuile* when the poet addresses his anti-hero to proclaim *Pharsalia nostra /Viuet, & à nullo tenebris damnabitur æuo* (*BC.9.985-6*: 'No age shall vs with darke oblivion staine, /But our Pharsalia euer shall remaine,' May (1627) sig. S2^v).

¹⁷ '...Where you shall hear the Scythian *Tamburlaine* /Threat'ning the world with high astounding terms, /And scourging kingdoms with his conquering sword...' (I *Tam.* prol.4-6): see also I *Tam.* 1.2.220; 3.3.148; 3.3.31; 3.3.230; 4.4.137; 5.1.56; 5.1.515; II *Tam* 1.3.97, and cf. Cheney, *Marlowe's Republican Authorship*, 44-5, who also (p.231) notes that the 'Trumpets and Drums' that Marlowe gives us for *signa* opposing *signa* comes from *Tamburlaine*. On *dextra* (*BC.1.3*, 1.14), the right hand that, instead of guaranteeing kinship between Pompey and Caesar via marriage is paradoxically turned 'victoriously' in suicidal slaughter, see Paul Roche (ed.) *Lucan: De Bello Civili, Book I. Edited with Introduction, Text, and Commentary*, (Oxford, 2009) 58, 99.

¹⁸ Cf. I.*Tam* 1.2.146; 2.7.12; 3.3.165. This substitution is pointed: Marlowe chooses to *avoid* these images when they return again later in the apostrophe to Rome, (*Heu, quantum terræ potuit, pelagique, parari /Hoc, quem ciuiles hauserunt, sanguine, dextræ!* (*BC.1.13-4*: 'Alas, what Seas, what Lands, might you haue tane, /With what bloods losse, which ciuill hands had drawne? May (1627) sig. A1^v) is instead rendered 'Aye me, O what a world of land and sea /Might they have won whom civil broils have slain!' (*LFB.13-4*).

Our conquering swords shall marshal us the way
 We use to march upon the slaughtered foe,
 Trampling their bowels with our horses' hoofs,
 Brave horses bred on the white Tartarian hills.
 My camp is like to Julius Caesar's host,
 That never fought but had the victory;
 Nor in Pharsalia was there such hot war
 As these, my followers, willingly would have. I *Tam.* 3.3.148-155

Tamburlaine's overt self-identification with Caesar has been long recognized, but the riposte of Bajazeth to this vaunting – 'let us glut our swords / That thirst to drink the feeble Persians' blood!' (I *Tam.* 3.3.164-5) – is just as important in terms of understanding Marlowe's translation strategy. Bajazeth's words 'anticipate' Lucan's claim that the Carthaginian shades may drink the blood of the Romans (as Marlowe puts it in *LFB* 'And now Carthage souls be glutted with our bloods!'; & *Pæni saturentur sanguine manes*, *BC.* 1.39) and this anticipation is itself dependent on the association with Lucan already in Tamburlaine's previous words, which press his ambitions to be a *plus quam* Julius Caesar in a play which will outdo not just the battle of Pharsalus but also Lucan's *Pharsalia*.¹⁹ Indeed, Tamburlaine himself frames the issue this way when he boasts that his soldiers would gladly take on 'hotter' wars than Pharsalus ('Nor in *Pharsalia* **was there such hot war** / **As these**, my followers, willingly would have'), punning, not just as many have noted, on the metaliterary resonance of 'Pharsalia' here, but also co-opting the *plus quam* framing of Lucan's text.

¹⁹ Tamburlaine is obsessed more generally with rhetorical *plus quam* framing, both in his evocation of love for Zenocrate (see esp. *Tam* I.1.ii.82-105, 3.iii.117-31) and in hyperbolic figuration of his own power: see e.g. *Tam* I.2.iii.6-24, esp.21; 3.iii.1-10 (esp.3-4); 3.iii.117-131; 5.i.135-90, esp. 155f.; 5.i.446-79, esp.446f.; II *Tam.* 1.iii.12-34, esp.18f.; 1.iii.43-53, esp.50f.; 1.iii.150-72, esp.156, 159f.; 3.iii.1-26, esp.12-16.

In other words, Marlowe's Tamburlaine creates a complex hybrid image-complex, deliberately collapsing 'Marlovian' and 'Lucanian'. It is not enough to see, as Cheney puts it, a 'glance towards Lucan [that] strengthens the inference that Marlowe's knowledge of the *Pharsalia* contributed to the tonalities of violence in Tamburlaine':²⁰ rather, Marlowe reanimates *Lucans First Booke* with his own literary life-blood, transfusing Marlovian imagery of blood and the sword with the imagery already to be found in *Bellum Ciuile*. Now when Marlowe invites the Carthaginian shades to be sated with blood, talks of the infant walls of Rome as steeped in the blood of brothers, and recalls that Carrhae's walls have filled with blood at the death of Crassus, we must see such imagery as a hybrid Lucanian-Marlovian mix (*LFB*.39, 95, 105). To the much used figures for translation and of poetic succession in Marlowe's literary career – metempsychosis, re-birth, transfiguration²¹ – we must also add, then, the notion of literal 'blood-transfusion', as the sustained allusion to *Tamburlaine* through the proem transfuses Lucan's verse with a more hyperbolic, tyrannical, and potent blood mix.²²

Indeed, such an image is symbolic of the dark poetics of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*, and emblemized in the necromancer-witch Erictho, a terrifyingly powerful figure for *nefas*, vile counterpart to Virgil's Sibyl, and, as has long been noted, a figure for the poet Lucan

²⁰ Cheney, *Marlowe's republican authorship*, 104.

²¹ See Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto, 1997); on implication with and tension between 'self' and 'character' see esp. Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1980); Marjorie Garber, "'Here's Nothing Writ': Scribe, Script, and Superscription in Marlowe's Plays," *Theater Journal* 36 (1984): 301-20.

²² Blood-language dominates Marlovian tragedy: to focus only on *Tam.*, it is besmeared (1.i.80), quenches (2.vi.33), it is wept (5.i.24, 85), sweated (5.i.227) and bathed in (5.i.439). Elsewhere in the tragedies blood is quaffed, written in, and even swum in.

himself.²³ The centre of the poem hinges on Sextus Pompeius' desire to know the future, and his visit to the night-witch, whose obsession is death and corpses, and whose ability to communicate with the dead is expounded at length (*BC.6.507-68*). Erictho obliges by reanimating the body of a dead soldier of the Pompeian side, first filling his corpse with fresh blood, then making an infernal prayer which brings new life into his veins (Then with warme blood, opening fresh wounds, shee fills /His breast: and gore to th'inward parts distills' [...]) Then straight the clotted blood grows warme againe /Feedes the blacke wounds, and runnes through euery veine /In his cold breast: and lifes restored heate /Mixt with cold death through partes difused runns, /And to each ioint giues trembling motions', *Phars.* (1627) sig. L4^v).²⁴ Yet the soldier, when commanded, offers no glorious vision of the future on the Virgilian model, but rather a dismal vision of the Underworld in which the *discordia* of civil war has disrupted the very boundaries of Hell itself. The 'happy' denizens of the fields of Elysium now weep in sorrow, and those condemned to Tartarus for their wickedness rejoice, applauding and demanding the plains of the blessed for themselves (*Constrictæ plausêre manus: camposque piorum /Poscit turba nocens, BC.6.798-9*).²⁵

²³ Cf. esp. Jamie Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile* (CUP, 1992), 179-215: 'To denounce Erictho is to denounce Lucan; to come to terms with Erictho is to come to terms with Lucan; she has been the very emblem of the poem, a compact consummation of all that we hate or love about the poet.' (179).

²⁴ *Pectora tum primùm feruenti sanguine supplet /Vulneribus laxata nouis: tabòque medullas /Abluit : [...]* *Protinus astrictus caluit cruor, atráque fouit /Volnera, & in uenas extremaque, membra cucurrit. /Percussæ gelido trepidant sub pectore fibræ: /Et noua desuetis subrepens uita medullis, /Miscetur morti. tunc omnis palpitat artus. /Tendantur nerui: BC.6.667-9, 750-5).*

²⁵ Cf. the complaint of the ghost of Julia, who informs Pompey (in a dream) that she has been expelled from Elysium and forced to mingle with guilty shades: *Sedibus Elysiis, campòsque expulsa piorum /Ad Stygias (inquit) tenebras, manesque nocentes, /Post bellum ciuile trahor: (BC.3.12-14)*. See Neil Bernstein, 'The Dead and their Ghosts in the *Bellum Civile*: Lucan's Visions of History' in Paulo Asso, (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Lucan* (Brill 2011), 257-79, and below.

Erietho's blood-transfusion resuscitated a nameless soldier; Marlowe reanimates Lucan; Tamburlaine energises Caesar. And with the first appearance of Caesar, the intrusive blood-image appears once again:

Caesars renowne for war was lesse, he restles,
Shaming to strive but where he did subdue,
When yre, or hope provokt, heady, & bould,
At al times charging home, & making havock;
Urging his fortune, trusting in the gods,
Destroying what withstood his proud desires,

And glad when blood, & ruine made him way: *LFB.145-51*

In the *Bellum Ciuile*, ruin alone is the source of Caesar's joy (*gaudensque uiam fecisse ruina*, *BC.1.150*). But Caesar's change in characterisation and presentation is indeed more far-reaching. Marlowe's Caesar is now more dynamic and impressive: while Lucan introduces Caesar after crossing the Alps 'conceiving' future war in his mind, Marlowe's Caesar is actively aiming at it (*BC. 184-5; LFB.186*).²⁶ As E. J. Paleit has shown, Marlowe implicates Caesar more personally in the exploits and sufferings which he attributes to his friends, the soldiers (*BC.1.299-304; LFB.300-4*), and while in Lucan his men are stricken by fear, in Marlowe they are a 'wrestling tumult' motivated by respect and love (*LFB.299*; cf. *LFB.356-7* with *BC.1.355-6*). Such a charismatic ability to form friendships and inspire men to fight is distinctly Tamburlainian.²⁷ More Tamburlainian, too, is Caesar's heightened awareness of his help from destiny and his eventually fated success in war. Now war will not be Caesar's

²⁶ Cf. similar hyperbole and added sense of purpose at *BC.1.206-7/LFB.211-2*: while Lucan rounds the simile off with satisfying paradox (the lion 'unconcerned about such a great wound leaves through the sword') Marlowe's Caesarian lion keeps his objective in sight and 'runs upon the hunter' (*LFB. 214*).

²⁷ As Paleit 'The 'Caesarist' Reader', 216-9 notes: 'Both Julius Caesar and Tamburlaine have the quality of inspiring 'love' and unconditional loyalty'. In the same scene in Caesar's own *Bellum Ciuile* (1.7) there is no mention of any support from an individual centurion: Caesar claims that his speech inspires the acclamation of the army. Cf. Matthew Leigh, 'Neronian Literature: Seneca and Lucan' in Miriam Griffin (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*, (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 239-251, esp. p243.

‘judge’ (*BC.1.227*), but will ‘try [his] cause’ (*LFB.229*): and even the gods now collude with Caesar, in a deliberate unbalancing of the famous *sententia* ‘The victorious cause pleased the gods, the losing one Cato’ (*Victrix causa deis placuit sed uicta Catoni, BC.1.128*). Marlowe’s gods don’t just ‘like’ Caesar’s cause, they actively *assist* it: ‘*Caesars* cause, The gods abetted; *Cato* likd the other’ (*LFB.128-9*; cf. *LFB.264-7/BC.1.262-5*).²⁸

Marlovian blood transfuses the programmatic poetics of the proem; it inhabits the charismatic figure of Caesar himself. It also infects the causes of war in Marlowe’s broader re-framing of the conflict in *Bellum Ciuile*. Now the legitimacy of the war – as a political, moral and legal issue – has been reframed as an argument between competing individuals, and Lucan’s careful articulation of separate causes – moving from the relationship between the main antagonists, to more general reflections on the causes for civil war (the paradox common from the moralizing historiographical tradition that it was Rome’s very success that ensured her downfall) – is once again pointedly remodelled as personality-led, and generalizing conflict, which culminates with an inevitable supplement to the Latin:²⁹

Non erat is populus, quem pax tranquilla iuuaret,

Quem sua libertas immotis pasceret armis.

Inde iræ faciles, &, quod suasisset egestas,

Vile nefas: magnúmque decus, ferróque petendum,

²⁸ Cf. Allyna E. Ward, ‘Lucanic Irony in Marlowe's "Tamburlaine", *The Modern Language Review*, 103 (2008), 311-329.

²⁹ Cf. esp. the famous *concordia discors* (*BC.1.97*), referring to the first triumvirate in Lucan but now attributed directly to the warring Caesar and Pompey themselves: (*‘Caesars, and Pompeys jarring love soone ended, /T’was peace against their wils... LFB.98-9*; contrast *Temporis angusti mansit concordia discors, /Paxque, fuit non sponte ducum, BC.1.98-9*). And: ‘These were the causes with respect to the leaders; but the public seeds of war, which always overwhelm powerful peoples, were also underlying... (*Hæ ducibus causae suberant: sed publica belli /Semina, quae populos semper mersêre potentes, BC.1.158-9*) becomes ‘Such humors stirde them up; but this warrs seed, /Was even the same that wrack’s all great dominions..., *LFB. 159-60*). Note too personalization at *LFB 161-3* versus *BC.1.160-2*.

Plus patria potuisse sua: mensuráque iuris

Vis erat: *BC.1.171-6*

Againe, this people could not brooke calme peace,

Them freedome without war might not suffice;

Quarrels were rife, greedy desire stil poore

Did vild deeds; then **t'was worth the price of blood,**

And deem'd renowne to spoile their native town,

Force mastered right, the strongest govern'd all... *LFB.172-7*

Once again we see the intrusive blood-motif overlay the iconic sword (*ferrum*) of Lucan: and once again, Marlowe hyperbolizes and then expands on Lucan's final point.

While it is plausible to see, then, as E. J. Paleit suggests we should, a 'pro-Caesarian' interpretative potential in the text, or as Patrick Cheney prefers, a 'troubled Republicanism', a close reading that pays attention to the blood-motif in *LFB* reveals a translation strategy that is obsessively and personally implicated. Of course, Marlowe never had the opportunity to address the most critical negative interjections Lucan makes against Caesar (expressed most strongly before the battle of Pharsalus, *BC.7.207-13*), and his focus on the first book alone means that *his* Caesar is not left stranded, alone and in peril, as in Lucan's famously unfinished epic. Instead Marlowe's Caesar, like Marlowe's Tamburlaine, embraces a world lacking a coherent moral foundation, free from censorious narratorial perspective, and released from the avowedly self-defeating captivity of the Lucanian model.³⁰ In 1884 John Addington Symonds argued that Marlowe 'is in deadly earnest while creating them [sc. his fictional characters], believes in their reality, and infuses the blood of his own untameable

³⁰ See Masters, *Poetry and Civil War*, esp. p.90 on the fractured voice of Lucan: 'It is, therefore, mimicry of civil war, of divided unity, of *concordia discors*, that has produced this split in the authorial, dominating, legitimising persona, this one poet many poets, this schizophrenia, the fractured voice.'

heart into their veins.’ Powering Caesar through just the same kind of authorial implication with which his Tamburlaine storms heaven, he is not so much interested in *legitimizing* Caesar as he is in equipping him, through a newly potent Marlovian characterisation and destiny, with the means to escape the censorious moralizing and committed fractures of Lucan’s text.³¹

Blood and Death: Killing Caesar in *Caesar’s Revenge*

Hearke how the *Romaine* drums sound bloud & death,

And *Mars* high mounted on his Thracian Steede:

Runs madding through *Pharsalias* purple fieldes.

The earth that’s wont to be a Tombe for Men

It’s now entomb’d with Carkases of Men... *CR Prol.1-5*³²

As Lisa Hopkins most recently has shown, Caesar and Tamburlaine are commonly associated in many early modern works after Marlowe: and his interventionist translation, which revitalises a hybrid Tamburlaine-Caesar, results in many further Tamburlainian-inflected versions of Caesar (e.g. Thomas Lodge’s (1594) *The Wounds of Civil War*, and George Chapman’s *Caesar and Pompey* (composed 1604)).³³ But perhaps the most unsettling exploration of the consequences of Marlowe’s re-modelling instead comes in the

³¹ On identification and implication of Marlowe with his overreaching characters see Patrick Cheney, ‘Biographical Representations: Marlowe’s life of the Author’, in Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne (eds.) *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New directions in biography* (Burlington: Ashgate 2006), 183-204: Cheney quotes Symonds p.194: originally in John Addington Symonds, *Shakespeare’s Predecessors in the English Drama* (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1884 repr. 1908), 484.

³² I use the fascimile edition of F. S. Boas, *The Tragedy of Caesar’s Revenge* (Malone Society Reprints, OUP 1911).

³³ Hopkins, *Cultural Uses*, 55-78.

anonymously authored academic drama entitled *The Tragedie of Caesar and Pompey, or Caesar's Revenge* first published in 1606 (composed 1592-6).³⁴ The title-piece of the 1607 printed edition tells us that it was privately acted by the students of Trinity College, Oxford, and the play has many of the elements of academic drama: Discord presides over the play, and the text has clearly been crafted from Plutarch, Dio, but above all Appian.³⁵

Read on its own terms, however, the reception of *CR* has been less successful. Its exuberant relationship with the popular stage has struck modern critics – *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Lochrine* and *Tamburlaine* are just three obvious vernacular influences – but no sustained interpretative analysis of the play yet exists, and modern critics criticise loose plotting, lack of stylistic flair and ‘ideological’ confusion.³⁶ Perhaps some of the discomfort with the play – for historicising readers accustomed to ‘taking political sides’ when reading the Roman republic in early modern England, at least – arises from the very lack of evidence of explicit authorial investment in the project. It has not been strongly stressed enough, however, how closely the author of *CR* perceives and reacts to a Lucanian poetics of repetition, hyperbole and paradox. And once again this Lucanian sensibility combines with a clearly hyperbolizing Marlovian cast of characters. Here, however, we find not just a Tamburlainian Caesar, whose super-charged blood-lust continues even beyond the frame of

³⁴ A helpful introduction to the play by Lisa Hopkin's MA student Sharon McConnell, via the e-resources of Sheffield Hallam University, may be found at http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/iemls/renplays/Caesars_Revenge_Introduction.htm

³⁵ See esp. F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1914), 267-76.

³⁶ The other line of enquiry is the extent to which Shakespeare may have been influenced by *Caesar's Revenge* in turn (of course in *Julius Caesar*, but also, possibly, *Richard II*): see Ernest Schanzer, ‘A Neglected Source for Julius Caesar’, *Notes & Queries* 199 (1954): 196-7; Geoffrey Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Volume 5: The Roman Plays* (Columbia University Press, 1964), 33-57, 196-211; Jacqueline Pearson, ‘Shakespeare and *Caesar's Revenge*’, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 101-04; William Poole, ‘Julius Caesar and *Caesar's Revenge* again’, *Notes & Queries* 49 (2002): 226-8. Imke Pannen includes *Caesar's Revenge* in her survey of prophetic aspects in early modern drama, *When the bad bleeds: Mantic Elements in English Renaissance Revenge Tragedy* (V & R Unipress, Bonn University, 2010).

his mortal life, but also a ‘Faustian’ Brutus whose actions unwittingly confound Hell in Elysium. From the moment that Discord takes to the stage, promising another reiteration of the fall of Rome that hyperbolically exceeds the conflict that will ‘Dissolve the engines of the broken world’ (*LFB* 79-80; *BC*.1.79-80),³⁷ and from the moment that Brutus reminds his audience that this is a war in which ‘twas best be ouerthrowne’ (*CR* I.i.103), we find ourselves within a highly ironised articulation of the ‘justice’ to be found in civil war and in revenge tragedy, one which will eventually collapse the cosmos in on itself. And in this respect, though it is claimed that the author of *Caesar’s Revenge* borrows heavily on the language and structures of 1580s and 1590s revenge tragedy, the pessimistic representation of the fall of the republic he achieves – one which implicates *everyone* in guilt and finally achieves the complete disintegration of the categories of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ – is distinctly explorative. Closer in its moral ambivalence to Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, the cynical aesthetic of *CR* is more anticipatory of the dark vision of Webster than derivative of the ‘wild justice’ of Kyd.

Caesar’s Revenge obsessively re-stages the aftermath of Lucan’s *Pharsalus* in its first Act, replaying in dramatic form Pompey’s flight (I.i.39-184; cf. *BC*.7.677ff.) and reformulating the deluded dreams of the general before the battle (*BC*.7.7ff; cf. 1.129-42) into reflective regret (I.i.129-43). Caesar too is written through acute combinatorial imitation, collapsing description of the horrific familial violence at Pharsalus (*BC* 7.626-10), his own recollection of the horrifying violence of the battle of Pharsalus (*BC*.7.626-10; cf. 7.570ff.), and his introduction in Lucan’s epic, the confrontation with the mournful *imago patriae*, Roma, at the Rubicon (*BC*.1.185-90):

³⁷ Let *Rome*, growne proud, with her vnconquered strength, /Perish and conquered Be with her owne strength: /And win all powers to disioyne and breake, /Consume, confound, dissolue, and discipate /What Lawes, Armes and Pride hath raised vp. *CR. Prol.* 31-5.

Cæsar Pharsalia doth thy conquest sound
Ioues welcom messenger faire Victory,
Hath Crown'd thy temples with victorious bay,
And Io ioyfull, Io doth she sing
And through the world thy lasting prayses ring.

**But yet amidst thy gratefull melody
I heare a hoarse, and heauy dolfull voyce,
Of my deare Country crying, that to day
My Glorious triumphs worke her owne decay.
In which how many fatall strokes I gaue,
So many woundes her tender brest receiu'd.**

Heere lyeth one that's boucher'd by his Sire
And heere the Sonne was his old Fathers death,
Both slew vnknowing, both vnknowne are slaine,
O that ambition should such mischiefe worke
Or meane Men die for great mens proud desire.

CR. I.ii.216-31

In this arresting moment of hesitation (perhaps inspired by *BC.1.193-4*), Caesar identifies the root cause of the tragedy: the ambition of great men, which ensures the mass carnage enveloping all others. In the next scene, he continues to rue the 'heaped hils of mangled Carkases', and laments the fate of '*Rome* our natiue Country, haples *Rome*, /Whose bowels to vngently we haue peerc'd', evoking the programmatic mass impulse to suicide that Lucan had identified at the beginning of his poem as distinctly Roman (*I.iii.*, 265, 295-6; *BC.1.2-3*). But such 'womanish compassion' (as Antony puts it) does not last long. Instead Caesar's supporters are at hand to re-orient their leader and stoke his blood-lust again, re-framing Pharsalus as 'Reuenge, strange wars and dreadfull stratagemes' which are not yet complete (*I.iii.283-7*).

By the time Caesar returns to Rome, in a conspicuous and highly ominous reimagining of the final act of *I Tam.*, he has cast off any doubts about his actions. Act 2 of *CR* also ends with the fearful anticipation of citizens awaiting the arrival of a conqueror, and in *CR* Cicero now ‘plays’ the Governor of Damascus (who before had hoped for a compassion that would ‘melt his fury into some remorse, /And use us like a loving conqueror’, *I Tam.* V.i.22-3; cf. V.i.55-61):³⁸

Cæsar although of high aspiring thoughtes,
 And vncontrould ambitious Maiesty,
 Yet is of nature faire and courteous,
 You see hee commeth conqueror of the East:
 Clad in the spoyles of the *Pharsalian* fieldes,
 Then wee vnable to resist such powre:
 By gentle peace and meeke submission,
 Must seeke to pacify the victors wrath. CR.II.iv, 1028-35

Given that Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* ends the play by declaring that he has achieved a ‘truce’ with all the world’ (V.i.530) – but only after displaying the ‘slaughtered carcasses’ of the Virgins on Damascus’ walls and putting the rest of the citizens to the sword – Cicero is right to be worried. Even more strikingly, as Lisa Hopkins has noticed, his arrival comes after the unmistakably *Tamburlainian* wooing of Cleopatra, a love affair hinted at but not explored fully in the extant *Bellum Ciuile*.³⁹ Indeed, *CR* does not just replicate a distinctly Marlovian conflation of the language of love and conquest, but also hints, with reprise of the hyperbolizing approach of *Tamburlaine*, that Cleopatra is a *plus quam* Zenocrate, fit to be rewarded with more than the Persian queen was given by *Tamburlaine* (I.vi.507-22):

³⁸ For *Tamburlaine*’s ‘aspiring mind’ see e.g. *I Tam.* 2.vii.18-20.

³⁹ Hopkins, *Cultural Uses*, 60-1. See also e.g. *I Tam* III.iii.117-20.

And to exceed the pompe of *Persian* Queene,
The Sea shall pay the tribute of his pearles.
For to adorne thy goulden yellow lockes,
Which in their curled knots, my thoughts do hold,
Thoughtes captiud to thy beauties conquering power. *CR*. I.vi.518-22

CR's Caesar also frames himself with such competitive hyperbolism. Imagining the victorious outcome of war with Parthia, he anticipates turning rivers red with blood, filling the plains and hills of Media and Armenia with Scythian corpses, and returning to Rome in triumph, with Parthian princes 'Chained in fetters to my charriot wheelles' (III.v, 1441). Accompanied in his mind's eye by a band of conquering soldiers whose very looks can put the Parthians to flight (III.v.1446-50), Caesar cuts an irresistibly Tamburlainian dash here. History of course does not permit that next Tamburlainian step – the acquisition of a crown – but the author of *CR* plays with the conceit, in Antony's repeated efforts to crown Caesar (via appeal to the Sybilline books, III.v, 1459-63).⁴⁰ And while Caesar first pays lip-service to the notion that 'Vertue' is the only motivation for such 'high attempts' (III.v.1468-72), his disavowal of the sign of monarchy ends up illustrating how far *CR*'s Caesar is determined to *outdo* Tamburlaine:

Content you Lordes for I wilbe no King,
An odious name vnto the *Romaine* eare,
Cæsar I am, and wilbe *Cæsar* still,
No other title shall my Fortunes grace:

Which I will make a name of higher state

⁴⁰ On Caesar's reaction to being named 'king' and offered the crown, cf. Suetonius' *Julius Caesar* 79; Plutarch's *Julius Caesar* 60; Dio 44.10-11. On crowns in Tamburlaine see e.g. M. C. Bradbrook (1980) *Themes and Conventions in Elizabethan Tragedy*, 137-8 CUP. Cf. Graham Hammill, 'Time for Marlowe', *English Literary History* 75.2 (2008): 300 on the 'radical metaphysics' and 'deeply materialist understanding of sovereignty' in *Tamburlaine*.

Then Monarch, King or worldes great Potentate.

Of *Ioue* in Heauen, shall ruled bee the skie,

The Earth of *Cæsar*, with like Maiesty.

This is the Scepter that my crowne shall beare,

And this the golden diadem Ile weare,

A farre more rich and royall ornament,

Then all the Crownes that the proud *Persian* gaue.

CR.III.v.1504-15

In this exemplary self-fashioning, *this* Caesar completes the circle of emulous outdoing that Marlowe's Tamburlaine had already evoked with Julius Caesar, emphatically putting even the specious name of virtue aside as he does so.

It is only fitting, then, that even in death *this* Caesar refuses to slow down, serving not as appeasing sacrifice for a lost republic, but agent of further violence. Indeed, he literally continues to haunt the play – and in particular his target Brutus – in a frenzied desire for revenge that appeals to the justice of heaven and draws heavily on the wronged ghosts of earlier revenge tragedy. Such re-framing of the play's ambitious tyrant – who now appeals to 'a iust reueng' and punishment for the shedding of 'guiltles bloud' (*CR*. IV.iii, 2052, 2096) – an obvious reprise of the justice-seeking Hieronimo of *The Spanish Tragedy* – might at first glance seem disconcerting and contradictory. But the author of *CR* has pitted against the overreaching Caesar a manipulative Cassius and a pliable Brutus, pre-emptively crowding out a space for legitimate virtue. Indeed, it is Brutus' confrontation with Caesar at the beginning of the play – a meeting in which Caesar shows mercy to the man for whom he declares a 'firm settled loue', which 'can neere bee turn'd to hate' (I.ii.,188-231, 209) – which provides Caesar's own sense that he has been wronged and deserves 'just' revenge.⁴¹ Drawing on

⁴¹ Lucan also provides a (wholly invented episode) in which Brutus, disguised as a plebeian, tries to kill Caesar at the battle of Pharsalus – failing, Lucan comments, because Caesar had not yet reached the zenith of his

accounts of Brutus' capture and pardon after defeat at Pharsalus – accounts which speculate on the compromise to Brutus' honour, approve Caesar's 'humanity and uprightness', and stress Caesar's love for Brutus⁴² – the author of *CR* provides a particular challenge to an elite early modern audience, conditioned to see ingratitude not just as moral failing but also a dangerously destabilizing force attacking the bonds of friendship and social hierarchy.⁴³

If Brutus is weak and ungrateful, Cassius is compelled to act by the more traditional motivations of revenge tragedy: visions of blood and death (Prol. III.1157-61). When the conspirators vow to act, Cassius renounces Jove, instead subjugating himself to the goddess Revenge, who, he claims, is 'borne in Hel, yet harborest heauens ioyes: /Whose fauor slaughter is, and dandling death, /Bloud-thirsty pleasures and mis boding blisse' (III.vi., 1536-8). In his vow to kill Caesar, Cassius styles himself as Marlowe's amoral Guise, who declares to the audience at the outset of the *Massacre at Paris* that he will use the excuse of religion in order to advance his own interests:

ambition (BC.7.586-96): see O.A.W. Dilke (revised from the edition of J. P. Postgate) *Lucan, De Bello Civili VII* (Bristol Classical Press 1960), 31. Caesar does not mention this episode in his own memoirs.

⁴² See esp. the late first-century CE historian Appian *Civil Wars* 2.111-113, the major source here for *CR*, who openly questions the motives of the tyrannicides and criticizes the ingratitude displayed by Cassius and Brutus, even as he recognized that they might have been motivated by a genuine desire to restore the Republic. He also dwells on Caesar's particular love and affection for Brutus: an episode which clearly underpins the clemency-scene at the start of *Caesar's Revenge*.

⁴³ See e.g. Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, *The Culture of Giving: Informal Support and Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008), who emphasises the importance of reciprocity and indebtedness in elite early modern friendship. I quote here an expanded version of her use (p260) of Ludowick Bryskett's (1606) *A Discourse of Ciuill Life, containing the ethike part of morall philosophie. Fit for the instructing of a gentleman in the course of a vertuous life* (who in turn quotes Seneca on ingratitude): 'And accordingly Seneca was of opinion, that no vice was more contrary to humanitie, or did sooner dissolue the vnitie of mens minds then ingratitude, more abhominable before God, or more odious to al vertuous & honest minds. [...] [G]ratitude or thankfulness is the ornament of all other virtues from which proceedeth the love between the child and the parent, betweene the scholer and his master, the charitie towards our countrey, the honour toward God, the friendship betweene men, and the reverence towards our superiors: so no doubt ingratitude cannot be but directly contrary to all these, and therefore the foulest of al other vices; from which all the euils in the world proceed, to the perpetuall infamie of him that is vnthankful.' (p233-4).

What glory is there in a common good,
That hangs for every peasant to achieve?
That like I best that flies beyond my reach:
Set me to scale the high Pyramids,
And thereon set the Diadem of *Fraunce*,
Ile either rend it with my nails to naught,
Or mount the top with my aspiring wings,
Although my downfall be the deepest hell.
For this, I wake, when others think I sleep,
For this, I wait, that scorn attendance else:
For this, my quenchless thirst whereon I build,
Hath often pleaded kindred to the King.
For this, this head, this heart, this hand and sword,
Contrive, imagine and fully execute
Matters of import, aimed at by many,
Yet understood by none.

*MP. Sc.2, 40-55*⁴⁴

Compare Cassius' vow, whose explicit desire to punish Caesar's ambition conveys clear echoes of the Guise's far less virtuous promise:

We come not Lords, as unresolved men,
For to shew causes of the deed decreed,
This shall dispute for me and tell him why,
This heart, hand, mind, hath marked him out to die:
If it be true that quenchless thirst,
Is pleased with quaffing of ambitious blood,
Then all you devils whet my poniards point,
And I will broach you a blood-sucking heart:

⁴⁴ *The Massacre at Paris with the Death of the Duke of Guise*, Edward J. Esche, (ed.) *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe* vol.4, (Clarendon: Oxford, 1998).

Which full of blood, must blood store to you yeeld,
Were it a peerce to flint or marble stone:
Why so it is for *Cæsars* heart's a stone,
Els would bee mooued with my Countries mone.
They say you furies instigate mens mindes,
And push their armes to finnish bloody deedes:
Prick then mine Elbo: goade my bloody hand,
That it may goare *Cæsars* ambitious heart. *CR. III.vi.1573-1588*

It should come as no surprise, then, that the author of *CR* conspicuously departs from Appian, who writes Brutus and Cassius as independently coming an agreement that Caesar's tyranny needs to be stopped (*Civil Wars* 2.113). Instead, Brutus is first railroaded by anonymous notes, daring him to take action to prove his ancestry,⁴⁵ and then exhorted by Cassius to wake up:

No *Brutus* liue, and wake thy sleepy minde,
Stirre vp those dying sparkes of honors fire,
VWhich in thy gentle breast weare wont to flame:
See how poore *Rome* opprest with Countries wronges,
Implores thine ayde, that bred thee to that end,
Thy kins-mans soule from heauen commandes thine aide:
That lastly must by thee receiue his end,
Then purchas honor by a glorious death,
Or liue renown'd by ending *Cæsars* life. *CR. III.iv.1402-10*

Brutus' response – which channels and reforms Cassius' exhortation – is telling:

I can no longer beare the Tirants pride,
I cannot heare my Country crie for ayde,

⁴⁵ This detail *does* come from Appian: cf. esp. III.iv.1379-85 and *Civil Wars* 2.112.

And not bee mooued with her pitious mone,
Brutus thy soule shall neuer more complaine:
That from thy linage and most vertuous stock,
A bastard weake degenerat branch is borne,
For to distaine the honor of thy house.

No more shall now the *Romains* call me dead,
Ile liue againe and rowze my sleepy thoughts:

And with the Tirants death begin this life. CR.III.iv.1411-20

Brutus' own declarations that he will wake and respond to his *patria*'s distress – words that in themselves may indeed be an honourable statement of commitment to liberty – are also clearly here the parroted response of a malleable figure under Cassius' sway.

It is inevitable, then, that though the conspirators *claim* that Caesar's death is a simple act of restorative justice, done 'for to quite *Romes* wrongs', (III.vi.1704, cf.1730), this action does not bring resolution. Indeed, while Trebonius declares that justice in the universe has been rebalanced ('How heauens have iustly on the authors head / Returnd the guiltles blood which he hath shed,' III.vi.1736-7), the killing of Caesar is immediately re-framed and re-purposed as simply the next phase of yet another repetition and reanimation of obviously Lucanian civil war by Discord. She names Brutus not just 'author of *Romes* liberty', but also the possessor of 'murthering hand and bloody knife', fitting to be revenged by Octavian and Antony. Indeed, her words explicitly repackage the next phase of violence as more Lucanian civil war:⁴⁶

Thessalia once againe must see your blood,
And Romane drommes must strike vp new a laromes,
Harke how *Bellona* shakes her angry lance:

⁴⁶ See BC.1.1-7 (already quoted, p000 above).

And enuie clothed in her crimson weed,
Me thinks I see the fiery shields to clash,
Eagle gainst Eagle, Rome gainst Rome to fight,
Phillipi, Cæsar, quittance must thy wronges,
Whereas that hand shall stab that trayterous heart.
That durst encourage it to worke thy death,
Thus from thine ashes *Cæsar* doth arise
As from *Medeas* haples scatered teeth:
New flames of wars, and new outrageous broyles,
Now smile *Æmathia* that euen in thy top,
Romes victory and pride shalbe entombd,
And those great conquerors of the vanquished earth,
Shall with their swords come there to dig their graues. *CR Prol. IV, 1773-88*

Discord's predictions will come true. The Lucanian cycle will continue as the battle of Philippi promises to rerun the Battle of Pharsalus with interest. The author capitalizes on the already common geographical conflation of Pharsalus and Philippi, exploited by Lucan and now seized upon by Cassius, who imagines the final battle of the play as staged on already blood-drenched ground (V.i.2201-5).⁴⁷ The conventions of academic tragedy contribute with a further weakening of the structures of the cosmos, as Discord emerges again at the beginning of the final act to anticipate Brutus' downfall, predict the dire cosmological phenomenon of the sun's eclipse, and finally invite the dissolution of the boundaries between hell and earth (Prol. V, 2145-9). But even as the body-count begins to mount – the traditional end to a revenge tragedy pressed to absurdity⁴⁸ – the play maintains its internal logic, as it

⁴⁷ Other inversions: Antony takes on Cassius' vengeful role, calling upon Nemesis to 'Raine downe the bloody showers of thy reuenge' and vowing that 'Dread, horror, vengeance, death, and bloody hate: /In this sad fight my murthering sworde awaite.' (V.iii.2381-93).

⁴⁸ Note in particular the series of errors by which Cassius and Titinius die: Cassius, in the mistaken belief that Brutus is already dead, commits suicide in a way that shows he is still committed to a Guise-like scheming: his

works through the implosion of semantic distinctions between right and wrong accompanying this cosmic collapse. Such collapse is literally signalled, indeed, when Cato (son of Cato the Younger) enters, wounded, to die on-stage. The ancient accounts celebrate his valorous death in battle at Philippi: but amidst the distorting prism of this tragedy, *this* Cato's end is also bitter and disillusioned, rejecting the notion that virtue is any kind of proper category at all: 'O vertue whome Phylosophy extols. /Thou art no essence but a naked name, /Bond-slaue to Fortune, weake, and of no power. /To succor them which alwaies honourd thee' (V.ii.2238-41).⁴⁹

The combined pressure of Lucanian repetition and Marlovian energy are finally channelled into the final confrontation of the play. Brutus – tormented by the effects of his decision to act in the conspiracy, and driven mad by the pursuing ghost of Caesar – ends the play as he had begun it, begging for death. But now *he* is allusively re-embodied as Caesar, his anguish framed in exactly the same terms Caesar himself had suffered in Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*, plagued by visions after the battle of Pharsalus in Lucan's seventh book (V.i.2270-80; cf. *BC.7. 776-80*). His actual death becomes not the tragic-heroic final action of a tyrannicide, but almost tragic-comic hyperbole, as he invites the Ghost to slake his blood-thirst, drag down his body to Hell, 'Boyle ... or burne, teare ... hatefull flesh, /Deuoure, consume, pull, pinch, plague, paine [h]is hart', and feed on his soul endlessly (V.v.2502-25). Indeed, when he invokes the 'rights of Hell' ('Hell craues her right, and heere the furyes stand, /And all the hell-hounds compasse me a round /Each seeking for a parte of this same prey... V.v. 2516-8) he too positions himself as Marlovian copy, echoing the cry of the doomed Faustus: 'Damned

end is framed as a tragedy not just for Rome but also for himself, in a self-heroising epitaph that draws on Virgil's Aeneas (V.v.2435-2447; cf. *Aen.1.94-101*); Titinius, appearing just too late to let Cassius know that Brutus is still alive, proceeds to commit suicide himself, offering a sententious address to his knife highly reminiscent of Lucanian paradox (V.v.2495-8).

⁴⁹ Cf. e.g. Plutarch *Brutus* 49.9; *Cato the Younger* 73.3; Appian *BC.5.135*.

art thou, Faustus, damned! Despair and die! /Hell calls for right, and with a roaring voice
/Says, 'Faustus, come, thine hour is come.' / And Faustus will come to do thee right...'

(*Faustus* 'A' V.i.49-52).⁵⁰

The shadow that Marlowe's Hell casts over the end of *CR* is not accidental. The Ghost of Caesar exults in the spectacle of Brutus' death, and ends the play boasting that he shall henceforth enjoy the pleasures of sweet Elysium, in an emphatic reiteration of *The Spanish Tragedy* that recalls the Ghost of Andrea's anticipation of welcoming his friends to Elysium, and condemnation of his enemies to Hell (*CR* V.v.2555-70IV.5; cf. *TST* IV. 5.45-8). Yet while *TST* offered a moral eschatology separating the virtuous in Elysium from the wicked in Hell, a bipartite Underworld with distinctions between good and evil, *CR* confounds the expectations of final 'justice' set by *The Spanish Tragedy* by recalling the pressure such divisions had already come under in Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* and Marlowe's *Faustus*.⁵¹ And in *CR* too the sheer volume of violence finally results in the cosmic dissolution that had been predicted at the outset by Discord:

I, now my longing hopes haue their desire,
The world is nothing but a massie heape:
Of bodys slayne, The Sea a lake of blood,
The Furies that for slaughter only thirst,
Are with these Massakers and slaughters cloyde,
Tysiphones pale, and *Megeras* thin face,
Is now puft vp, and swolne with quaffing blood,

⁵⁰ Bevington, D. M., & Rasmussen, E. (eds) *Dr. Faustus: The A- and B- texts (1604, 1616)* (Manchester 2014) Cf. Boas, *University Drama*, p270.

⁵¹ On Marlowe's debts to Lucan for this vision of the underworld see Paul Kocher, *Christopher Marlowe: a study of his thought, learning, and character* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1974), 150-7. This is not to downplay the complexity of the nature of resolution in *The Spanish Tragedy*: see, e.g., Geoffrey Aggeler, 'The Eschatological Crux in *The Spanish Tragedy*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 86 (1987), 319-331.

Caron that vsed but an old rotten boate
 Must nowe a nauie rigg for to transport,
 The howling soules, vnto the *Stigian* stronde.
 Hell and *Elisium* must be digd in one,
 And both will be to litle to contayne,
 Numberles numbers of afflicted ghostes,
 That I my selfe haue tumbling thither sent. *CR. Epil. 2531-44*

Caesar's Revenge thus runs the attractions to negative repetition in Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* and the energy of Marlovian tyranny and to their natural endpoint. Marlowe's Faustus had scoffed at damnation, optimistically but mistakenly assuming that he could confound Hell in Elysium (*Faustus* 'A' I.iii.60-1).⁵² But as *CR* envelops its cast in a ruthlessly repetitious cycle of violence which culminates not just with the 'heaped hils of mangled Carkases' of Lucan's *Pharsalus/Pharsalia* (I.iii.265) but rather with the world itself as 'nothing but a massie heape: /Of bodys slayne', it is the overreaching Caesar whose dynamic self-belief allows him the pleasure of an Elysian existence. The result – a literal mess – is a pointed reflection of a Lucanian poetics unable to contain its dynamic protagonist and the completion of the eschatological confusion anticipated in Lucan's own vision of discord in the Underworld. It is also, pointedly, a clear recognition that this chaos arises from a conflict *lacking* any explicit moral vantage point or political positioning.

Completing Lucan: *venturi me teque legent...*

The anonymous author of *CR*, exploiting to the hilt the amoral potential of a Tamburlainian Caesar inhabiting a Lucanian world, 'completes' Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile* by transforming the

⁵² Cf. C. L. Barber, 'The Form of Faustus' Fortunes Good or Bad', *The Tulane Drama Review* 8 (1964): 92-119, 116: 'The extraordinary pun in "confounds hell in Elysium" suggests that Faustus is able to change the world by the way he names it, to *destroy* or *baffle* hell by *equating* or *mixing* it with Elysium'.

story of Rome into full-on revenge tragedy, one that is resolved not by the arraignment of the dead in Hell, but through the dissolution of the cosmos and the confusion of its moral eschatology. Such demonic energy was only available and authorized by his recognition of *Lucans first Booke*'s own life-giving literary blood-transfusion, one which powers a serious and pessimistic articulation of the possibility of finding a 'right side' in civil war. Such a close reading, deliberately avoiding the broader historicist approach often taken to early modern 'Lucanian' works, nonetheless reveals that such poetics are political: that while Lucan could be the poet of historical 'truth', early modern authors recognized a much messier, less clear-cut moral picture in his regressive and repetitive poetics. *CR*, so often read as an outlier 'looking back' to *Tamburlaine* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, should be seen instead (and like much academic drama) as at the forefront of the new darker explorations of human character and the nature of justice that look ahead to the cynicism of Webster: a dark vision authorized by his immersion in Lucan and *Lucans first booke* together.

So how to close off and complete the story of Caesar? Perhaps the most famous attempt is made by Thomas May, who not only wrote the tragedy *Cleopatra* and translated Lucan (1626-7), but also provided continuations of the unfinished Neronian epic in both English and Latin which he re-edited through the 1630s and 1640s. A crucial case-study in David Norbrook's 'cult of Lucan', May's changing political allegiances have powered interpretation of his work,⁵³ though E. J. Paleit's fresh reading of translation and continuation together well identifies how the continuing intertextual presence of Lucan undercuts any clear-cut 'Augustan' attitudes to monarchy and dynastic rule, making any definition of

⁵³ *A Continuation* was first produced in English in 1630 and revised in three subsequent editions (the final publication in 1650). A translation of *A Continuation* into Latin, the *Supplementum Lucani*, was first produced in 1640 and revised in 1646. See Birger Backhaus, (ed.), *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May. Einleitung, Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (BAC 65, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2005).

‘republican’ translation versus ‘courtly’ continuation highly problematic.⁵⁴ The critics have noted, too, how much less aggressive May is than Marlowe and Lucan.⁵⁵ Yet he was certainly not unaware of Marlowe, for traces of *LFB* can be seen in his own *Pharsalia*,⁵⁶ and even in his translation *Pharsalia* May is unable to resist rescuing Caesar from the extreme peril that he finds himself in as the *Bellum Ciuile* breaks off. Supplementing after Sulpitius (with an ending itself derived from Plutarch) with an extra twenty-five verses, May allows *his* Caesar to swim to safety, powering through the water to find safety in the ships of his that have come to meet him.

May’s 1630 *A Continuation* expands markedly, ranging in seven books through Egypt, Africa, and Spain, making its centre-piece Cato’s suicide at Utica, and its climax Caesar’s assassination at Rome: and it is adorned with the same kind of historical notes that attend his earlier translation and ‘prove’ his adherence to the truth of history, via Hirtius, Dio, and Plutarch.⁵⁷ But *A Continuation* also emphasizes and indeed enlarges upon the characteristics of Caesar that we have seen in Lucan – above all his boldness, swiftness, and his wrath – in ways quite obviously also Marlovian. In particular, Caesar’s comfort with Jovian associations and his delight in the triumphal ‘celebrations’ on his return to Rome (which fill nearly the whole fifth book of *A Continuation*) have a clearly Tamburlainian

⁵⁴ Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar*, 269-82, arguing against R .T. Bruère, ‘The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May’s *Supplementum Lucani*’, *Classical Philology*, 48 (1949): 145-63; Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London: Hodder Arnold, 1983), 184-5; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 225-228.

⁵⁵ See Cheney, *Marlowe’s Republican Authorship*, 42-3; Yanick Maes, ‘*Haec Monstra Edidit*. Translating Lucan in the Early Seventeenth Century’ in Emma Buckley and Martin Dinter, (eds.), *A Companion to the Neronian Age* (Blackwell-Wiley, 2011), 405-24.

⁵⁶ Cf. esp. Let dire *Pharsalia* grone with armed Hoasts, /And glut with blood the Carthaginian Ghosts (May (1627) sig. A2^r) with *LFB* 38-9, ‘*Pharsalia* grone with slaughter; / And *Carthage* soules be glutted with our blouds’; also the entrance of Caesar and his conversation with the *imago* of Rome (May (1627) sig. A4^r), *LFB* 185-192).

⁵⁷ On May’s ancient sources see Backhaus, *Das Supplementum Lucani*, 63-7.

flavour.⁵⁸ And Caesar's love for Cleopatra, played out in a banquet-scene at Alexandria in book 2 of *A Continuation*, offers a clear refraction of the combined thirst for sovereignty and erotic union that is at the heart of *Tamburlaine*,⁵⁹ though now Cleopatra – hyperbolically exceeding even Marlowe – is Caesar's match, a more willing and complicit partner in 'Ambitious pride, and Soueraignties dire loue' than Tamburlaine's Zenocrate (*Cont.*2, sig. C6^r).

May struggles not to write a superhuman Caesar, then, even as he aims to kill him off; he cannot resist Lucan's unresolved, repetitive poetics even as he ends Lucan's epic. And he is also compelled to frame the further battles in the civil war in Africa and Spain as not just a repetition of Pharsalus/*Pharsalia*, but also as a theatre of revenge. The battle of Thapsus is a 'fatall Tragedy' for Libyan ghosts to view / And glut their dire reuenge with Roman blood' (*Cont.* 3, sig. D5^r-D5^v), and Brutus takes the stage as 'An Actor now in Caesar's Tragedy' (*Cont.* 7, sig. K1^r). Such impulses converge most conspicuously in the final episode of *A Continuation*, the death of Caesar. Here we find, on the one hand, satisfactory repetition-as-reversal, as Caesar re-enacts closely in his own demise the fate that befell Pompey in *Bellum Ciuile*,⁶⁰ together with final words that frame his death as appropriate expiation to the Republican Roman constitution (so often figured by Lucan via the symbolic *toga*, and

⁵⁸ Cf. esp. *Cont.* 5 (1630) sig. G4^r-G4^v.

⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. 'Let *loue* my warrant be; whom powerfull loue /So oft has forc'd from Heauen; or let it proue /The Thunderers excuse to future times /That *Caesar* now partakes the Thunderers crimes... (*Cont.* 2, sig. C5^r) with 'The thirst of reign and sweetness of a crown, /That caused the eldest son of heavenly Ops /To thrust his doting father from his chair /And place himself in th'empyrean heaven, /Moved me to manage arms against thy state. /What better precedent than mighty Ioue?', *Tam* I, II. vii.12-17).

⁶⁰ The date of *Caesar's* glory was expir'd, /And Fortune weary'd with his Triumphs now /Reuolts from him; more ruine and more woe /Was yet behinde for wretched Rome to tast· /Nor can their quiet happinesse outlast /The life of *Caesar*, whose approaching Fate /More Ciuill warres and wounds must expiate· /No vertue, bountie, grace, nor clemency /Could long secure vsurped Soueraignty... (*Cont.* 7, sig. J8^r). For the same complex of fate, ruin and fortune, together with Pompey's similar veiling of his head at the moment of death, see esp. *BC.*7.85-90, 242ff.

rendered almost always by May as ‘gowne’): a pointed development of Lucan’s own prediction that Caesar would one day become Brutus’ sacrificial victim (*uictima*, *BC.7.596*):⁶¹

Through many wounds his life disseized, fled
At last; and he, who neuer vanquished
By open warre, with blood and slaughter strew’d
So many lands, with his owne blood embrew’d
The seat of wronged Iustice, and fell downe
A sacrifice t’ appease th’ offended gowne. (*Cont. 7*, sig. K6^v).

The death itself, combining the covering of his face, suppression of speech, and internal revolving of ‘silent thoughts’ is another example of the repetition-compulsion of the work, for this is exactly how Pompey died in Lucan (*Cont. 7*, sig. K6^r-K7^r; *BC.8.613-36*). But where Pompey was content to concentrate on his own *fama* in the manner of his death, and to serve as an *exemplum* to his wife and son, Caesar’s thoughts are *still* aspiring, as now he prepares for translation to the heavens:

Yet has not Fortune chang’d, nor giuen the power
Of *Caesar’s* head to any Conquerour;
By no Superiours proud command I die,
But by subiected Romes conspiracy:
Who to the World confesses by her feares,
My State and strength to be too great for hers,
And from earths highest Throne, sends me to be
By after-ages made a Deitie: (*Cont. 7*, sig. K7^r)

⁶¹ For a sensitive reading of the *Continuation* and its resolution see E. J. Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar* 269-82.

For May's Caesar, death is not the end but rather the opportunity to take up an eternal afterlife in heaven, in an escape from mortality exceeding human law and literary closure alike. And, as May has already acknowledged, he is right, for there will be no 'clean' ending with the death of Caesar: rather, 'in stead of freedome now /More desolation, Tragedies and woe /After this slaughter must againe ensue; /And all the people that dire action rue /Which they desir'd. Philippi's balefull day, /Perusia's siege, and fatall Mutina, /With Leuca's fleet shall make afflicted Rome /Truly lament ore slaughter'd *Caesar's* Tombe.' (*Cont.* 7, sig. K3^r).

As both David Norbrook and E. J. Paleit have explored, Thomas May's difficulty in closing off the *Bellum Ciuile* also manifested itself in continuing recalibrations of the supplement, as he offered revised editions of *A Continuation* in 1633 and 1650, together with a Latin re-imagining, the *Supplementum Lucani*, published first in 1640 and again in 1646. Changes to the prefatory poem, 'The Complaint of Calliope against the Destinies' (deprecating Lucan's early demise because of Nero's tyranny, and modelled after Sulpitius, Statius and Spencer), in concert with a striking new frontispiece to accompany later editions of the work in Latin and English, together creatively re-determined the reception of his work. Calliope moves from (vernacular) regret at Lucan's passing in the first editions of *A Continuation* to an active revivification of his dead corpse via blood-sacrifice in the 1640 *Supplementum*, an act of revival authorized by May's move closer to Lucan in his dense, dark and more 'Lucanian' reimagining of *A Continuation*.⁶² This prefatory poem was accompanied by a striking engraving depicting Calliope's blood-offering, which was placed *after* the

⁶² May pointedly signals the change in the first words of the reworked Latin elegy: *Fleuerat Annæi fatum miserabile Vatis /Calliope* ('Calliope had wept for the wretched fate of her poet Lucan, *Suppl.* (1640) sig.*3^v): and it is worth remarking that the title-page of the 1630 *Continuation* is 'Olympian' in perspective, featuring an arch displaying Apollo, Mercury, and *Historia*. On the conditions of May's composition of the *Supplementum* during a period of time spent in the Netherlands, together with analysis of the differences between the 'Complaint' of *A Continuation* and its Latin counterpart in the *Supplementum* see Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar*, 285-96; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 225-8.

dedicatory poem in the 1640 *Supplementum* (first printed in Leiden by Willem Christiaensz van der Boxe), but which in the 1646 subsequent Latin edition had made its way onto the front page. May's final effort at completion – the 1650 *A Continuation* – now too incorporated that picture as frontispiece, and re-translated into English the dark act of revivification authorizing the supplement as 'The Mind of the Picture, or Frontispiece':

Huc venit, magicis instructaque ritibus, Umbram

Excivit Vatis Calliopea sui.

Inferno taurus mactatur Victima Regi;

Et tibi, Persephone, casta juvenca cadit;

Lanigerum Eumenides placantur cæde bidentum:

Pocula tum sacro plena cruore capit,

Et sic Calliope, charæ dum porrigit Umbræ;

O dolor Aonii Marce, decusque chori,

Hoc bibe; non aliud jam dat tibi Nectar Apollo,

Nec possunt vitam reddere fata tuam;

Sic vocem reddunt. hoc saltem munere metam

Attingat tandem magna Camæna suam.

Non hanc, Cæsareo madeat dum sanguine Roma,

Claudito; vindictæ parsque sit illa tuæ,

Ut cujus dederit victoria sceptrum Neroni,

Manibus occumbat Victima caesa tuis.

Dixerat, at Cyathum dextra pallente recepit,

Hausit, & Aoniæ paruit Umbra Deæ.

*Suppl. (1640) sig.*3^v*

To this dark thicket did the Muse descend

To raise her Poet's Ghost; and to that end

Prepar'd the sacrifice. Pluto, to thee
A Bull was kill'd, to thy Persephone
A Virgin Heifer; to th' Eumenides
A two-year sheep. Then with the bloud of these
She fill'd a cup, and gave it to the hand
Of her dear Poets Ghost, with this command;
Thou, once the Glorie of th' Aonian Wood,
But now their sorrow, Lucan, drink this Bloud.
No other Nectar Phoebus gives thee now;
Nor can the Fates a second life bestow:
A second voice by this charm'd cup they may,
To give some progress to that stately Lay
Thou left'st unfinish'd. End it not until
The Senates swords the life of Cæsar spil;
That he, whose conquests gave dire Nero Reign,
May as a sacrifice to thee be slain.
The Ghosts received the cup in his pale hand,
Drunk, and fulfill'd Calliopes command.

Cont. (1650) sig. A4^r

David Norbrook reads this as a final declaration of political allegiance, May's use of the blood-sacrifice paradigm an endorsement of regicide. E. J. Paleit suggests that this frontispiece and poem together provide focus for the broader pessimism of the *Supplementum*, which damns both the *virtus* of Caesar and the *libertas* of his opponents equally. Both, however, recognize the peculiar level of implication of Caesar, Lucan and May himself here, an implication also encouraged via the title-page of the Latin *Supplementum*, with its slogan

venturi meque teque legent.⁶³ future ages will read Lucan and Caesar in the *Pharsalia*, Lucan and May in the *Supplementum*.

In sum, May's *Continuations* bring to a fitting close the programmatic blood-trope first encoded by Marlowe in *Lucans first Booke* and then exploited by the exuberant author of *Caesar's Revenge*, who was content to allow his Caesar an everlasting and Elysian exultation amidst the wreckage of the world. Perhaps May's Lucanian supplement ends the story of Caesar less with a bang than a whimper: the fusion of the voices of May and Lucan in Latin, a corollary of the literal blood-transfusion required to give the Poet's Ghost a 'second voice', are a poor and feeble reflection of the hyperbolic energy authorized by the Marlovian-Lucanian blood-mix. Yet in its way, this blood image is an equally fitting encapsulation of the conversation between ancient and early modern. For while the gift of a second voice to Lucan is characterized as the merciful gift of the Muse Calliope, it surely cannot fail to remind its audience of the debased necromancy of Erictho, together with the dismal prophecy of the soldier of Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*: a voice that speaks only under compulsion, and can provide no glorious prediction of the future. Nor does the 1650 *Continuation* offer any sense that it has escaped the repetitious modes of reciprocal violence characterising both civil war and *Bellum Ciuile*. In what must be a deliberate challenge to the end of the *Continuation* 'proper', and a satisfying Lucanian paradox in itself, Caesar's death is *not* now an act of appeasement to satisfy the 'gowne' – symbol of civil, legitimate, constitutional Rome – but merely the catalyst for the archetypally worst tyrant, Nero, and a sacrifice only to Lucan *himself*.⁶⁴ From this point of view, Caesar's death is simply and no more than an act of

⁶³ *Suppl.* (1640) sig. *3^r: cf. see Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar*, 290-1; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 80-1.

⁶⁴ On Nero see Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, c.1590-1630', in Kevin Sharpe (ed.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 21-44; Paulina

personal revenge, while May's composition of it is an act that implicates him in precisely the same behaviour as his characters.⁶⁵ In the end May's struggle to reanimate a voice that does not want to be heard, to complete the story of a Caesar who refuses to be die, all the while failing to find any firm moral or political vantage point, proves just as firmly as Marlowe and the author of *CR* that to appropriate the Lucanian voice is to be implicated in it.⁶⁶

Kewes, 'Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 74 (2011): 515-51.

⁶⁵ See esp. the half-line not translated by May in his 1650 version *Non hanc, Cæsareo madeat dum sanguine Roma, /Claudito; vindictae parsque sit illa tuæ, /Ut cujus dederit victoria sceptrum Neroni, / Manibus occumbat Victima caesa tuis...* ('Don't end this poem while Rome is yet steeped in Caesarian blood; **let this be part of your revenge**, that he whose victory granted power to Nero, fall a victim/sacrifice slain for your shades.'

⁶⁶ I would like to thank Ed Paleit for allowing the use of forthcoming but as yet unpublished work, and in particular Syrithe Pugh for her many helpful suggestions in revising this paper.