Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Late Tudor and Stuart Drama

Medieval Institute Publications

12-4-2019

Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage

Lisa Hopkins

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip_ltsd

Part of the Dramatic Literature, Criticism and Theory Commons

Recommended Citation

Hopkins, Lisa, "Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage" (2019). *Late Tudor and Stuart Drama*. 2.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip_ltsd/2

This Monograph is brought to you for free and open access by the Medieval Institute Publications at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Late Tudor and Stuart Drama by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.

DE GRUYTER

Lisa Hopkins

GREEKS AND TROJANS ON THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH STAGE

LATE TUDOR AND STUART DRAMA GENDER,
PERFORMANCE, AND MATERIAL CULTURE

DE
G

MEDIEVAL
RESEARCH

Lisa Hopkins

Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage

Late Tudor and Stuart Drama

Gender, Performance, and Material Culture

Series Editors

Cristina León Alfar (Hunter College, CUNY, USA)

Helen Ostovich (McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada)

Lisa Hopkins

Greeks and Trojans on the Early Modern English Stage

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-1-5015-1858-4

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-1-5015-1462-3

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-1-5015-1450-0

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019951942

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2020 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Boston/Berlin

Cover image: © Victoria and Albert Museum, London

Typesetting: Integra Software Services Pvt. Ltd.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

For my mother, Marjorie Cronin,
who is marking her ninth decade
by learning Greek

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgements

I owe debts of gratitude to Bill Angus; Yasmin Arshad; Todd Borlik; my classics teachers Mrs. Goulding, Mr. Kennedy, and especially Miss Boldry who made me learn a chorus from Euripides's *Hecabe* by heart; Arun Cheta; Nicholas Coureas; Pavel Drabek; Alison Findlay; Jim Fitzmaurice; Erika Gaffney; Dave Kathman; Domenico Lovascio, who nobly read the whole manuscript; David McInnis; Vassia Markidou for letting me see the proof of her work on travellers to Troy; Kirk Melnikoff and Lucy Munro, who organised the Marlowe Society of America conference in Wittenberg which focused my mind on *Hoffman*; Michael Paraskos and everyone involved with the annual Othello's Island conference on Cyprus, which gives me a constant incentive to be interested in the Hellenic world; Tanya Pollard, Janice Valls-Russell, Fran Rayner and all the participants of their seminar on Troy at the International Shakespeare Conference in Stratford-upon-Avon in July 2018, which prompted the first half of chapter 5; Tom Rutter; Jasmine Seymour; Rachel White, Bethany Jones, and Imogen Felstead, who organised the conference on "Embodiment and New Materialism in Premodern Literature and Culture, 1350–1700" at Lancaster University which introduced me to *Albumazar*; and, as always, Chris and Sam. I have been extremely fortunate in the support and companionship of my Renaissance colleagues at Sheffield Hallam, Susan Anderson, Dan Cadman, Annaliese Connolly, Colm MacCrossan, and until recently Matt Steggle. Parts of chapter 1 have previously appeared as "What's Actaeon to Aeneas? Marlowe's Mythological Mischief," *Marlowe Studies* 4 (2014): 49–62 and "Marlovian Models and Itinerant Identities: Dido, Tamburlaine, and the Discourse of Colonialism," *Marlowe Studies* 5 (2015): 61–78; of chapter 4 as "England's Empire in Europe," in *Early Modern Identities in English: Religion, Gender, Nature*, edited by Lorna Fitzsimmons (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 145–64; of chapter 5 as "On the Edge of the S(h)elf: Arbella Stuart," in *Women on the Edge*, edited by Lisa Hopkins and Aidan Norrie (Leeds: ARC Humanities Press, 2019); of chapter 8 as "Caterina Cornaro and the Colonization of Cyprus," in *Colonization, Piracy, and Trade in Early Modern Europe: The Roles of Powerful Women and Queens*, edited by Estelle Paranque, Nate Probosco, and Claire Jowitt (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2017), 97–116; and of chapter 9 as "Love and War on Venus' Island: *Othello* and *The Lover's Melancholy*," *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 25.1 (2016): 51–63.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Acknowledgements — VII

Introduction — 1

Notes — 19

Part I: Wandering Trojans

Chapter 1

What's Actaeon to Aeneas? — 27

Notes — 40

Chapter 2

Aeneas and the Voyagers — 43

Notes — 60

Part II: The Ruins of Troy

Chapter 3

***Troilus and Cressida*: Shakespeare's Wooden World — 65**

Notes — 78

Chapter 4

Where Is Hector Now? — 81

Notes — 99

Chapter 5

Making Troy New — 103

Notes — 116

Part III: Striking Too Short at Greeks

Chapter 6

The Greek Actor: Art, Aesthetics, and Drama — 123

Notes — 142

Chapter 7

Metatheatrical and Metamorphosis in Thomas Tomkis's *Albumazar* — 145

Notes — 161

Part IV: Greece on the Edge

Chapter 8

The Edge of the Hellenic World — 165

Notes — 183

Chapter 9

What Venus Did with Mars: Love and War in the Mediterranean — 187

Notes — 201

Conclusion — 205

Notes — 208

Works Cited — 211

Index — 225

Introduction

No story was more interesting to early modern Europe than that of Troy.¹ Montaigne said “There is nothing so alive in the mouths of men as [Homer’s] name and his works,”² and this fascination had many manifestations, including a fashion for naming children after characters from the Trojan Wars: various Ettores, Polissenas, and Ercoles stalked the ducal courts of Renaissance Italy and the Italian dramatist Giambattista Della Porta had a nephew or grandson called Trojano di Gennaro;³ in England Walter Devereux, first Earl of Essex, named his daughter Penelope; in France King Henri II called his youngest son François-Hercule, and Dominique Goy-Blanquet notes that Philippe Mouskes of Tournai stated in his thirteenth-century *Chronique rimée* that “en cest isle sommes Troïen (on this island we are Trojans, all)”; in neighbouring Burgundy, then an independent duchy, Duke Philip “encouraged his chroniclers to advertise his own Trojan lineage.”⁴ This was partly because almost every country in Europe laid claim to having been founded by a fleeing Trojan exile: Heather James explains that “France had its Francus, son of Priam; Denmark claimed Danus; Ireland, Hiberus; Saxony, Saxo.”⁵ In the case of Britain, the Trojan prince Aeneas was supposedly the ancestor of the Tudors, and his voyages in search of a new homeland were seen as authorising the attempts of his supposed descendants to find new lands to colonise: in 1563 Thomas Stukeley, setting out for “Terra Florida,” was compared to Aeneas.⁶ At home, too, the supposed connection was important, because Aeneas’s great-grandson Brutus had supposedly founded London and bestowed on it the name Troynovaunt, New Troy; in the words of Philip Robinson, “Troy and London go together. Such, at least, is the argument of many an early modern Lord Mayor’s Show,”⁷ while Kim Gilchrist observes that the idea of Brutus was woven into the fabric of everyday life: “the textual form that perhaps most simply and eloquently demonstrates the permeation and habit of popular belief in the Brutan histories is the almanac . . . An almanac’s timeline very often indicated the beginning of British chronology with the arrival of Brute, a practice that became more common after 1585.”⁸

Because their myth of origins claimed descent from Trojan exiles, for early modern English audiences Trojans were good and Greeks were bad, at least in theory. The name of the Greek Ajax was punningly transformed to a “jakes” (that is, a toilet) by Sir John Harington in his *Metamorphosis of Ajax*, and Katherine Heavey notes that “There was a tendency in early modern England to elevate the Trojans over the Greeks, because of the belief that Britain had been founded by Aeneas’s descendant Brutus: indeed, some critics have argued that Shakespeare privileges his Trojans in this way.”⁹ In Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida* we do indeed find

a term that would have had a particularly sharp resonance in early seventeenth-century England:

Pandarus. I swear to you, I think Helen loves him better than Paris.
Cressida. Then she's a merry Greek indeed.¹⁰

Sara Hanna reminds us that “the Elizabethan epithets ‘mad Greek’ and ‘merry Greek’ cover a variety of revellers, rogues, harlots, liars, cheats, deceivers, panders, drunkards, and parasites. Shakespeare, certainly familiar with this tradition, offers his own variations on the theme.”¹¹ Whatever greatness the Greeks might once have had was now decayed, and desperately imperilled by Greece’s precarious geopolitical position. Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou observe that “To early modern England, Greece was an enigma. It was the origin and idealized pinnacle of Western philosophy, tragedy, democracy, heroic human endeavour and, at the same time, an example of decadence: a fallen state, currently under Ottoman control, and therefore an exotic, dangerous ‘other,’”¹² especially after Athens fell to the Ottomans in 1458. Greece is central to the concept of Renaissance European identities, yet it is also dangerously poised on the very edge of Europe, and a particularly porous and problematic edge at that; as I shall explore below, early modern plays evince a lurking fear that Greece was a pressure point at which Christian Europe and “heathen” borderlands might all too easily bleed into each other.

Direct encounters with both Greece and Greeks contributed to the distrust of the country and its inhabitants. Efterpi Mitsi notes that “in the final decades of the sixteenth century . . . Britons began writing and publishing accounts of their travels to Ottoman or Venetian-ruled Greece,” and they did not like what they saw: “The early travellers viewed Greece as a paradox or even an irony, placing early Modern Greece in the Ottoman East rather than Europe.”¹³ In his *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica*, the Scottish traveller William Lithgow declared that

In all this Country of Greece I could finde nothing to answer the famous relations, given by ancient Authors of the excellency of that land, but the name onely; the barbarousnesse of Turkes and Time, having defaced all the Monuments of Antiquity: No shew of honour, no habitation of men in an honest fashion, nor possessours of the Countrey in a Principality.¹⁴

The Greeks, with their legendary past of adulterous queens and deceptive gifts, were for Lithgow disturbing, troublesome figures, “them” whereas the Trojans were “us”: he recounts how

From th'Ithac Rockes we fled Laertes shore,
 And curs'd the land that dire Ulysses bore.
 For Illions sake, with Dardan blood attir'd,
 Whose wooden Horse, the Trojan Temples fir'd.¹⁵

Efterpi Mitsi remarks that it has been suggested that the reason for Lithgow's banishment from Scotland was his pursuit of a woman named Helen, which might have given extra impetus to his particular animus against Greek women.¹⁶ However, the Induction to John Marston's *The Malcontent* is swayed by no such motive and there too a character displays a virulently pro-Trojan bias:

Sly. I have an excellent thought: if some fifty of the Grecians that were crammed in the horse-belly had eaten garlic, do you not think the Trojans might have smelt out their knavery?

Cond. Very likely.

Sly. By God, I would they had, for I love Hector horribly.

Sinklo. O, but, coz, coz:

"Great Alexander, when he came to the tomb of Achilles,
 Spake with a big loud voice, O thou thrice blessèd and happy!"

Sly. Alexander was an ass to speak so well of a filthy cullion.¹⁷

"I love Hector horribly" might stand as a reasonable summing-up of the opinion of early modern Englishmen about Hector in particular and the Trojans in general, and that love coloured how early modern British travellers saw the homeland of Hector's killers.

Early modern Englishmen also began to come into contact with Greeks at home. A Greek exile named Christophoros Angelos arrived in England in 1608 and became the author of "the pamphlet of *Christopher Angell, a Grecian who tasted of many stripes and torments inflicted by the Turkes for the faith which he had in Christ Jesus* ... published in Oxford, 1617";¹⁸ W. B. Patterson explains that "Christophoros Angelos, a native of the Peloponesus, was persecuted by the Turkish authorities in Athens and imprisoned, but was allowed to sail on an English ship to Yarmouth in 1608. In East Anglia he had the good fortune to be befriended by John Jegon, the bishop of Norwich, and other members of the clergy of that diocese, who contributed money to help support him and who sent him on to Cambridge."¹⁹ He was followed by others, who rapidly acquired an unsavoury reputation for falsely pretending to be indigent: Mitsi notes that "In the late sixteenth century, many London parishes collected alms not only for English captives but also for other Christians, who had suffered under the oppression of the Ottomans and whose families were held captives. Examining the city's parish records from 1587 to 1595, Roslyn Knutson mentions the petitions of a number of Greeks,"²⁰ and W. B. Patterson observes that

It was not uncommon in the early seventeenth century for Greeks who had been ruined by the actions of local Turkish officials, or who had a child or other relative in a Turkish prison as security for a fine, to come to England to try to ameliorate their unhappy condition. In 1609, for example, Patrick Young, the keeper of the king's library, whose philhellenic actions earned for him the jocular title of "the patriarch of the Greeks," sent letters to several friends in England on behalf of Anastasios Joseph, a native of Cappadocia.

This inevitably strained relations: Patterson goes on to remark that "In a letter to John Williams, principal of Jesus College, Oxford, in the spring of 1612, Young said, in the course of commending Dionysios Koronaios, that he was not unaware that 'the first love of the majority for the Greeks has now cooled.' Nor was he ignorant, he went on to say, of the crookedness of their character and of their supreme love of lying."²¹

The theoretical distinction between bad Greeks and good Trojans was however complicated by other factors. In the first place, Greeks too were ancestors, albeit of the Scots rather than of the English. The Greek prince Danaus, one of the fifty sons of Priam, supposedly married Scota, daughter of an Egyptian pharaoh, and together they became the progenitors of the Scottish royal family, which after 1603 was of course the same as the English; Mitsi reminds us that the Scottish-born Prince Henry was figured as a new Constantine and argues that "this myth of origin connects Britons to Greeks."²² Indeed, the Greeks were even ancestors of the Trojans, since legend had it that "Troy was first built by Dardanus sonne to Corinthus King of Corinth, who having slaine his brother Iasius, fled to this Country,"²³ and Christy Desmet observes that in one version of the Brutus story, John Hardyng's *Chronicle*, Brutus's wife was said to be Greek.²⁴ There was also a surprising affinity between the Church of England and Greek Orthodoxy, to the extent that in 1619 there was talk of bringing the two together in some form of association and from 1616 "King James and George Abbott, the archbishop of Canterbury, proposed scholarships for Greek orthodox students to study in England."²⁵ Patterson notes that

there were features of the Greek Church that were extremely attractive to the English . . . some Englishmen saw Greek theology as a purer form of Christian belief than the conflicting western versions. The Greek Church, like the English, was episcopal in polity. Liturgy was centrally important to both churches—more so than verbal orthodoxy. Music figured prominently in both traditions. Both churches stressed the importance of the scriptures.²⁶

It also helped that there was clear blue water between Orthodoxy and Catholicism: Lithgow noted that "They differ much in Ceremonies, and principles of Religion from the Papists, and the computation of their Kalender is as ours,"²⁷ and Joe Moshenska observes that "English Protestants were deeply concerned with the

plight of the Greek Orthodox, whom they saw as natural allies, trapped between the contempt and oppression of the Roman Catholics and the Turks.”²⁸

In addition, the territory that had once been Trojan was no less alien than the territory that had once been Greek. Miriam Jacobson remarks that “For Marlowe, the boundaries of empire are permeable and dynamic. Marlowe’s Hellestont is a fluid, synchronic space, at once ancient and modern, European and eastern”; she argues that this is partly because “for English eyes, the lands of the early modern Ottoman Empire were in the process of becoming the ‘East’ but were not fixed in space or time. They were also, at the same time, lands of classical antiquity and ancient Greek myth. The site of ancient Troy, near ancient Abydos, was also the site of an Ottoman military garrison: both places were coextensive and equally present for early modern readers and travelers.”²⁹ Troy might be the supposed ancestral homeland, but it too was now a dangerous and alien place, as the travel narratives of Lithgow and others make clear, and its meaning was further troubled by the fact that the Turks too claimed descent from the Trojans. Dominique Goy-Blanquet notes that

Montaigne, writing in praise of Homer’s creative power, notes that “most nations seeke to derive themselves from his inventions” and recalls how the Turk “Machomet, second of that name, Emperour of Turkes,” wrote to Pope Pius II that he could not understand why “the Italians will bandie against me, seeing we have our common off-spring, from the Troians; and I as well as they have an interest to revenge the blood of Hector upon the Graecians, whom they favour against mee.” This was a long-reverberating feud: Pope Pius II, who had initially accepted the Franks’ Trojan origins, was much incensed by the Turks’ similar claims.³⁰

Vassiliki Markidou, observing that “In the early modern era the remains of Troy constituted a highly popular, secularized pilgrimage,” argues that “ruinous sites, linked to both myth and history and remote in spatial as well as temporal terms, functioned as stages on which the specific travelers conducted their performances”;³¹ the ways in which those selves were created depended on the extent to which the Turks could successfully be Othered, but if the Turks were Trojans too, the boundary between self and Other becomes radically destabilised.

Another significant factor was that the Greeks had won, and several individual Greeks were heroic and charismatic figures: Achilles, Penelope, and Hercules were just three obvious examples. Perhaps most importantly of all, the Greeks were the ones who got to tell the story. Everything we know or think we know about Troy and the Trojan War comes to us through Homer; if there were any poets writing in Luvian (if that was indeed the language of Troy), their works have not survived, and could probably not be read if they had. Nor was Homer the only Greek writer who had given important stories to early modern Britain. As Sara Hanna notes,

Shakespeare knew several Greek authors—as a minimum Plutarch and Lucian—and various works of other Greek authors were translated into English in the sixteenth century, including texts by Aesop, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Euripides, Aristotle, Theocritus, Longus, Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius. Moreover, Shakespeare undoubtedly gleaned Greek thought from a variety of secondary sources.³²

Ben Jonson may have famously quipped that Shakespeare had small Latin and less Greek, but Greek was nevertheless important to him. A. D. Nuttall sees a Shakespeare who “had a faculty for driving through the available un-Greek transmitting text to whatever lay on the other side,”³³ while Michael Silk simply declares, “Against all the odds, perhaps, there is a real affinity between Shakespeare and Greek tragedy.”³⁴ Greek drama in particular was part of the cultural landscape: Tanya Pollard observes that after Roger Ascham translated *Philoctetes* in 1543,

newly visible Greek plays challenged early modern writers to reimagine the affective possibilities of tragedy, comedy, and the emerging hybrid genre of tragicomedy. Because tragedy in particular was firmly linked with its Greek origin and etymology, iconic figures such as Hecuba and Iphigenia acquired a privileged status as synecdoches for the tragic theater.³⁵

As the names of Hecuba and Iphigenia suggest, many of these plays were about the characters of the Trojan War, including some which are now lost. Sonja Fielitz comments on the popularity of Troy as a subject for entertainments;³⁶ Matthew Steggle notes that there is a lost play on *Timoclea at the Siege of Thebes* (1574) and another lost play called *Troy*,³⁷ and Domenico Lovascio suggests that the 1583 *A historie of Telomo* might have been about Ajax.³⁸ These plays brought the sufferings of Trojans to the early modern stage, but they viewed them through a Greek lens.

A central argument of this book is that it was this privilege of narration that constituted the most significant difference between Greece and Troy in early modern perceptions. There were of course other differences: Troy was understood as one city, whereas the Hellenic world spread out to encompass Sicily, Cyprus, Rhodes, Crete, and even, as we shall see, left memories as far afield as Flushing; Troy is us, Greece is them; Troy is associated with ancestry and cultural transmission and Greece with cuckoldry and broken bloodlines, something which Marlowe puts to good account when he makes the figure of the Greek Actaeon interrogate that of the Trojan Aeneas. Troy is lost forever, whereas Greece is merely imperilled, and yet paradoxically the ruins of what was believed to be Troy (Alexandria Troas) were still accessible in a way that Greece was not. Above all, though, Greeks told the story, and this had a number of ramifications for early modern drama’s image not only of Greeks and Trojans but also, ultimately, of itself, since it understands itself as a form implicated in

its own indebtedness to the theatrical traditions of Greece. One of the simplest and yet simultaneously most profound consequences of this is that Trojans are true and Greeks are duplicitous. Marlowe's Tamburlaine the Great, for instance, can be imagined as Greek, but is never imagined as Trojan. This is primarily because the Greeks won; a Trojan narration is always implicitly a narration of loss, and Tamburlaine is nothing if not a winner. But it is also, I think, because a Trojan identity is consistently imagined as an innately authentic one. The Trojans do not deceive (indeed their guilelessness is the principal reason that they are themselves deceived by the wooden horse); they tell no stories that we know of, act no pageants; Pandarus is a pandar, Cressida a Cressid, Troilus a Troilus. Tamburlaine by contrast is constantly staging himself; his is a self-dramatising sensibility, and thus it is also implicitly a Greek sensibility. A similar idea seems to underlie the moment when a character in Richard Brome's play *The Sparagus Garden* declares that

'Twas not Achilles' sword, but Homer's pen
That made brave Hector die the best of men:
And if that powerful Homer likewise would
Helen had been a hag and Troy had stood.³⁹

This acknowledges the Greek prerogative of representation: to be a Trojan is to lose, and thus to become a passive subject of representation; to be a Greek is to win, and to get to tell the story. At the same time, though, it names Hector as "brave" and identifies him simply as "the best of men." Maybe he never existed, but we would be poorer if we were unable to imagine him.

The Troy story was always present in the collective cultural consciousness, but there were times when it spoke with particular urgency to early modern dramatists. One of these was the 1590s. There is a 1599 Admiral's Men fragment of a play about Troilus and Cressida and John S. P. Tatlock says of the references in the *Henriad* and *Twelfth Night* "the fact that these signs of popular interest seem to be confined to plays dated between 1598 and 1602 is evidence, confirmed by other matters, that the especial vogue of the Troy-Troilus story in the drama was around that time,"⁴⁰ while Liz Oakley-Brown argues that "early Shakespeare texts use Greek myths to explore masculine, Protestant identity in the 1590s."⁴¹ As has often been observed, this peak in interest is partly to do with the Earl of Essex, who not only had a sister named Penelope but was himself figured as "Achilles alter"⁴² and whose shadowy presence in *Troilus and Cressida* has been traced by Eric S. Mallin,⁴³ and partly to do with the publication of Chapman's translation of Homer's *Iliad*. I think a third and underrated influence is the fascination with Greece and Troy found in the works of Christopher Marlowe and in a number of plays which are influenced by him. For a sense of the ways in which allusions to

the Greeks and Trojans matter in plays written between 1590 and ca. 1600, we can for instance look at two plays by Shakespeare, *Richard II* and *Hamlet*, and one by Marlowe, *Edward II*. These plays are in dialogue with each other, and they are also imaginatively engaged with the story of the Trojan War and its aftermath.

For all its setting in mediaeval England, there is something oddly Greek about *Richard II*. As early as 1554 William Baldwin's *A memorial of suche princes, as since the tyme of king Richard the seconde, haue been vnfortunate in the realme of England* connects the historical Richard II to Greece when it mentions Creon and his daughter Creusa,⁴⁴ and the lost early modern play *Phoenissae* seems also to have mentioned both Richard II and ancient Greece.⁴⁵ In 2017 there was a conference on *Richard II* and *Seven Against Thebes* in Verona,⁴⁶ implying a latent Greekness about Shakespeare's play, and it does have two clear echoes of the Troy story. First Richard himself asks rhetorically,

Was this face the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face
That like the sun did make beholders wink?
Is this the face which faced so many follies,
That was at last outfaced by Bolingbroke?⁴⁷

This obviously recalls *Doctor Faustus*, where "Was this the face that launched a thousand ships" is the question that Faustus asks when Helen of Troy appears to him,⁴⁸ and so obliquely connects Richard himself to Helen. Later, the queen addresses Richard as "Ah, thou the model where old Troy did stand!" (5.1.211), and her remark that "This is the way / To Julius Caesar's ill-erected Tower" (5.1.1–2) could also be seen as glancing by implication at the *translatio imperii* material associated with Troy, which saw the Romans as descended from Aeneas.

The submerged Trojanness of *Richard II* works in a number of ways. In the first place, *Richard II* is clearly in dialogue with *Edward II*.⁴⁹ Edward's lament "But what are kings, when regiment is gone, / But perfect shadows in a sunshine day?"⁵⁰ is one that could well have been uttered by Richard, and his "Whither you will; all places are alike, / And every earth is fit for burial" (5.1.145–46) is very close to Richard's equally self-pitying

Or I'll be buried in the King's highway,
Some way of common trade where subjects' feet
May hourly trample on their sovereign's head,
For on my heart they tread now whilst I live,
And buried once, why not upon my head?
(3.3.154–58)

Both plays also focus on the fact that, as Edward has it, “Two kings in England cannot reign at once” (5.1.58), and *Edward II*, like *Richard II*, is surprisingly interested in the classical past. In one way Marlowe’s play could perhaps be seen as always already implicitly connected to Greece in that some of its characters are homosexual; Liz Oakley-Brown sees *Love’s Labour’s Lost* as “Greek” because of its emphasis on homosociality as well as its interest in an academe and references to Hercules,⁵¹ and certainly Greece afforded some writers a way of talking about same-sex love. In Chapman’s *Homer* we hear that Patroclus “Was never absent from the tent of that man-loving Greek, / Late-hurt Eurypilus” and we are told of Achilles mourning Patroclus that “his man-slaughtering hands impos’d into his oft-kiss’d breast”;⁵² neither Eurypilus’s “man-loving nature” nor Patroclus’s “oft-kiss’d breast” definitively implies homosexuality, but both hint at it.⁵³

In *Edward II*, classical precedents are invoked specifically to authorise or comment on homosexuality. Mortimer Senior reminds his nephew that

Great Alexander loved Hephaestion,
The conquering Hercules for Hylas wept,
And for Patroclus stern Achilles drooped.
And not kings only, but the wisest men:
The Roman Tully loved Octavius,
Grave Socrates, wild Alcibiades.

(1.4.391–96)

It is also notable that a character immediately identifiable as homosexual is insistently connected to Greece. Gaveston repeatedly associates himself with Greece when he says in his opening speech that he would have “like Leander, gasped upon the sand” (1.1.8) and declares, “The sight of London to my exiled eyes / Is as Elysium to a new-come soul” (1.1.10–11); he also imagines staging a show which would feature “One like Actaeon, peeping through the grove” (1.1.66). Other characters respond to the air of Greekness which hovers about Gaveston. Edward assures him that “Not Hylas was more mourned of Hercules / Than thou hast been of me since thy exile” (1.1.143–44), Warwick compares him to Phaethon (1.4.16), Mortimer Junior says his “proud fantastic liveries make such show / As if that Proteus, god of shapes, appeared” (1.4.410–11), and Isabella rages,

Like frantic Juno will I fill the earth
With ghastly murmur of my sighs and cries,
For never doted Jove on Ganymede
So much as he on cursèd Gaveston.

(1.4.178–81)

Edward himself compares Gaveston to Danaë (2.2.53) and says “’Tis not the hugest monster of the sea / Nor foulest harpy that shall swallow him” (2.2.45–46).

Sara Hanna's description of "that most prominent feature of Greek geography, the sea"⁵⁴ is particularly pertinent here, for the sea and its monsters wash through *Edward II* from the moment Gaveston lands, and the king's death, even though its cause is fire, is also connected to the channel water in which he is forced to stand.

References to Greece and Troy also occur in other contexts in the play. Edward orders, "Beaumont, fly / As fast as Iris or Jove's Mercury" (1.4.369–70), Prince Edward refers to Atlas (3.1.77), and Isabella speaks of "the shore of Tanaïs," which takes its name from a Greek colony (4.2.30) and was associated with Greece's status as borderland. Edward exhorts "Gallop apace, bright Phoebus, through the sky" (4.3.45) and later orders,

Come Spencer, come Baldock, come sit down by me,
Make trial now of that philosophy
That in our famous nurseries of arts
Thou sucked'st from Plato and from Aristotle.

(4.7.15–19)

Edward speaks of "the snaky wreath of Tisiphon" (5.1.45) and Mortimer Junior says "I view the prince with Aristarchus's eyes, / Whose looks were as a breeching to a boy" (5.4.52–53).

Most notably, as I have explored in more detail elsewhere, *Edward II* revisits the *Odyssey*.⁵⁵ Isabella wishes "That charming Circe, walking on the waves, / Had changed my shape" (1.4.172–73);⁵⁶ Edward declares, "My heart is as an anvil unto sorrow, / Which beats upon it like the Cyclops's hammers" (1.4.311–12);⁵⁷ and Gaveston is like "the Greekish strumpet" (2.5.15) Helen, who was the cause of Odysseus's wanderings. Finally, Edward, believing himself preparing to die, thinks not of the Christian god but of a classical one: "Let Pluto's bells ring out my fatal knell / And hags howl for my death at Charon's shore" (4.7.89–90), and the extent to which his sufferings represent the visit to Hell which is the traditional lot of the epic hero is made clear in the resonant name of "Lightborn," an Anglicised version of "Lucifer." Edward, who started the play safely at home with his wife and son, has inverted the teleology of the *Odyssey* by undergoing a series of terrifying watery journeys, strewn with shipwrecks and forced landings, which have taken him, inexorably, ever further away from them.

The connection to Greece resurfaces in *Hamlet*, a play which in some ways tells the same story as *Edward II*, in that it focuses on a king, his unfaithful wife, and his only son. This too is a story which both draws on and inverts the *Odyssey*, where Penelope is never unfaithful, though the spectre of a possible forced remarriage for her hangs heavy over Odysseus's return; both Claudius and Mortimer could be seen as echoing Penelope's suitors, and both Edward III

and Hamlet are in something of the same situation as Telemachus, the son of Odysseus and Penelope. More broadly, though, *Hamlet* is obsessed with the classical world. Hamlet himself is a man of many doubles: he and Laertes (who like his sister Ophelia has a Greek name, in Laertes's case one which specifically evokes the *Odyssey*) both lose a father and seek revenge, he and Fortinbras are both nephews of a reigning king, and he and his father share a name. Pyrrhus, who hesitates before he kills a king, is another such double, and in at least three recent productions the interval curtain has fallen on a Hamlet echoing Pyrrhus's paused pose, standing above Claudius as Pyrrhus stands above Priam. Both Hamlet and Pyrrhus are sons of fathers whom they perceive to have been great, but who are now dead. Both find difficulty in living up to these fathers because they themselves are engaged in deeply questionable acts. In a way, both perfectly encapsulate the Renaissance itself, aware of past greatness but also aware that they themselves are belated, inadequate, and unworthy in comparison, "no more like my father than I to Hercules" (1.2.152–53). The essence of the Renaissance lay in the rediscovery of classical learning, yet the first lesson of that classical learning was that later generations could never equal earlier ones, as humanity progressively degenerated and moved inexorably further away from its original Golden Age. The stories of Edward II, Hamlet, and Richard II, childless himself but also a forerunner of Elizabeth I (who was often compared to him), all raise questions about historical change and the passing of previous generations, and all use echoes of Greece and Troy to do it.

Fathers and sons were by no means the only topic to which stories about Greeks and Trojans could speak in early modern England. Despite the legendary centrality of the prince, *Hamlet* is also a play about women. Greece and Troy also offered several examples of notable women. Tanya Pollard notes that "80 percent of the Greek tragedies printed in individual or partial editions before 1600 featured female protagonists—strikingly higher than their 51 percent ratio in the full canon of extant Greek tragedies—and in the more accessible realm of vernacular translations, the number is an even higher 94 percent"; she draws particular attention to "Euripides' *Hecuba*, which stands out conspicuously as the most prominent Greek play in the period."⁵⁸ Greek and Trojan women figured in eye-catching stories full of human interest, but they were also useful to dramatists and other early modern cultural practitioners because of their exemplarity. Medea and Clytemnestra both exemplified women's wickedness, and Medea in particular could also be used to discuss monstrous maternity. Helen represented both beauty and infidelity. Antigone connoted issues about burial, Hecuba and Andromache were bereaved mothers, Cassandra spoke the truth but went unheeded, and Iphigenia and Polyxena were both innocent victims sacrificed to male desires and ambitions. Stories about Greece

and Troy also seem to have appealed particularly to women: Pollard notes that “Euripides’s plays clearly attracted female attention in early modern England. Queen Elizabeth herself translated a play by Euripides—we do not know which,”⁵⁹ and at Hardwick Hall Bess of Hardwick, an indefatigable needle-woman and commissioner of embroideries, persistently imaged herself as Penelope. Women from the classical past could speak loudly on the early modern stage: Katherine Heavey notes that in *Gorboduc*, “fascinatingly, Medea’s story is tied to Britain’s history, where previously she was insistently associated with the foreign” and that “Medea’s story is again associated with that of ancient Britain in *Lochrine*”; moreover, “Echoes of Medea can be discerned in two of Shakespeare’s most alarming anti-heroines, Tamora and Lady Macbeth,” and it is also possible to connect Medea to Mary, Queen of Scots,⁶⁰ while Lady Jane Lumley’s translation of Euripides’s *Iphigenia at Aulis* clearly glances at the execution of her cousin, Lady Jane Grey, brought to her death by the machinations of her father and father-in-law.

For many authors Greece and Troy also offered a way of talking about forms of government. In Robert Greene’s *Euphues his censure to Philautus*, the story told by Achilles focuses on how the Athenians “feared, least their Aristocracie should be reduced to a Monarchy.”⁶¹ In Chapman’s Homer, Achilles calls Agamemnon “Thou subject-eating king!” and Ulysses says “We must not all be kings: the rule is most irregular / Where many rule,”⁶² paving the way for the celebrated defence of hierarchy by the Ulysses of *Troilus and Cressida*. In particular, Daniel Cadman identifies “appropriations of narratives featuring Alexander the Great as a means of interrogating the different implications that James’s accession might pose.”⁶³ In William Alexander’s *The Alexandraean Tragedie*, the debate over Alexander’s successor becomes in effect a debate about hereditary versus elective succession, and to some extent a discussion of the nature of good rule. In Samuel Daniel’s *Philotas*, the act five Chorus says,

Well, then I see there is small difference now
Betwixt your state and ours, you ciuill Greeks,
You great contriuers of free gouernments,
Whose skill the world from out all countries seeks.⁶⁴

The idea of Greeks as devisers of systems of government was a topos with a long lifetime. Robert Miola notes that “Translating Sophocles’ *Electra* in 1649 Christopher Wase makes the play a royalist allegory, with the executed Charles I as Agamemnon, Cromwell as Aegisthus, Prince Charles as Orestes, and Charles’ imprisoned daughter Elizabeth as a hapless *Electra*.”⁶⁵ Miola also discusses *Timon of Athens*, noting that “Since the Athenians institutionalized their banishments in the *ostracism*—the annual expulsion of the city’s best and

most powerful men to prevent the possible rise of demagogues—their practices gained special notoriety in the Renaissance”; he argues that it is clear that “Shakespeare intends us to see Timon’s banishment in relation to Alcibiades’ and in relation to the notorious Athenian practice.”⁶⁶ Just as Shakespeare and Jonson use their Roman plays for coded reflections on early modern political issues, then, so too could plays about the Greeks and Trojans be used, but with the added benefit that Greece and Troy between them offered a wider range of regime types: the full title of Lithgow’s *Total discourse* explains that his voyages included “surveying of forty eight Kingdomes ancient and modern; twenty one Rei-publicks, ten absolute Principalities, with two hundred Islands” and offers “an exact Relation of the Lawes, Religions, Policies and Governments of all their Princes, Potentates and People,” and *Troilus and Cressida* includes two council scenes in which we see first the Greeks and then the Trojans arriving at decisions through a process of discussion and debate.

The effect of such attention to the government of Greece in former times might have been sharpened by the irony of the fact that early modern Greece had no say at all in its own government, since it was a province of the Ottoman Empire. Whatever it had once been, Greece in the early modern world was part of the edge of Christendom, and a part to which fear of the Turks drew particular attention. The liminal state of Greece is stressed in many texts: Alison Findlay notes of *Two Noble Kinsmen* that “Theseus’s conquest over the Amazons in the play, and earlier in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, echoes that of the Great Turk, Mahomet II, over the Amazons in Greece.”⁶⁷ The sense of Greece as borderland is particularly evident in Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine the Great*, where Menaphon encourages the new Persian king Cosroe,

Afric and Europe bordering on your land
And continent to your dominions,
How easily may you with a mighty host
Pass into Graecia, as did Cyrus once,
And cause them to withdraw their forces home
Lest you subdue the pride of Christendom!⁶⁸

Greece, it seems, is just round the corner from Persia, and so it is too in the dramatised version of Richard Johnson’s prose romance *The Most Famous History of the Seaven Champions of Christendome*, first published in 1596 and much influenced by Marlowe. Johnson’s text gives a strong sense of the embattled state of Greece, which is imagined as directly contiguous with Persia: “Saint George had ridden twentie leagues from the Persian Court, and before hys departure was bruted in the Soldans Pallace, the English Champion had recovered the sight of Grecia.”⁶⁹

The story told by Johnson begins soon after the fall of Troy:

After the angre Greekes has the chieftest Cittie in Phrigia, and turn King Priams glorious buildinges to a waste and desolate wildernes, Duke Aeneas exempted from his natieue habitation, with manie of his distressed countrimen (Pilgrims) wandered the world to some happie region, where they might erect the Image of their late subdued Troy . . .⁷⁰

Goran Stanivukovic argues that the Trojan setting is used for the purpose of “evoking heroism ruined by Helen of Troy’s destructive beauty. By implication, Troy subverts the heroic motif in his fiction,”⁷¹ and Sonja Fielitz observes that in *The Magnificent Entertainment*, staged for James’s coronation, Dekker and Jonson linked Troy to Saints Andrew and George,⁷² who are two of Johnson’s heroes. However much we are invited to think of Troy, though, the Greece which we see in Johnson’s romance is not the Greece which has just won the Trojan War with the help of the goddesses Athena and Hera, but a distinctly later one where George meets a mighty giant who worships Mahomet and Termagaunt. Several of the knights’ adventures take them to regions that in the early modern world were or had been Greek, and all are wild and dangerous, though St. Patrick is improbably credited with recovering Rhodes from the Turks.⁷³ The ruler of Thessaly bands together with those of Persia, Egypt, Morocco, Jerusalem, Tartary, and Sicily to declare war on Christendom after the seven champions have abducted their various daughters and/or irritated them in other ways; St. George is appointed leader of the Christian resistance, and the others follow him “with as much willingnes, as the Graecians followed Agamemnon to the wofull ouerthrow of Troy.”⁷⁴ In this moment, as St. George marches like Agamemnon on various Greek-identified opponents who are simultaneously classical, heathen, and also the actual or potential fathers-in-law of Christian saints, we catch something of the rich variety of ways in which Greece and Troy could signify on the early modern English stage.

That richness and variety are what this book seeks to respond to. It talks about Greeks and Trojans in a variety of early modern forms and contexts, one of which should perhaps be apologised for. At the same time as I was writing this I was also editing a collection of essays on Bess of Hardwick. The two were meant to be entirely separate projects and I did not at all want Bess in this book. However, she came anyway, and after various attempts to excise her I have ultimately let her stay, because in the end it says something about the degree of interest in Greeks and Trojans that they should intersect at so many points with the concerns of a not very well educated woman living in then-remote Derbyshire; though it is often remarked that Hardwick Hall, the house built by Bess in her old age, has no library, that did not stop Bess or her granddaughter Arbella Stuart from telling the tale of Troy and making it part of their

everyday lives and indeed their very identities. The other recurrent presence needs no apology: Christopher Marlowe produced some of the period's most poignant and powerful evocations of Troy, and haunted the imagination of those who came after him. It is wholly fitting for him to be the principal subject of the first two chapters, and to be a presence too in some of the later ones, for he coloured and shaped early modern England's view of Greece and Troy.

The book is in four parts, two mainly on Trojans and two mainly on Greeks. As the chapters progress they move through space as well as time, and it may seem that some of them have come a long way from Greece and Troy both chronologically and geographically. In fact this mimics the trajectory of the *translatio imperii* and also the way in which Greek identities become increasingly diasporic (as Trojan ones always already were) after Greece itself falls to the Ottomans. The first part, "Wandering Trojans," has two chapters which between them limn the beginnings of this sense of dispersal. The first of these, "What's Actaeon to Aeneas?," focuses on the way that Aeneas, the *ur*-colonist, becomes a model for the early modern colonial enterprise. Camoens's *The Lusads*, a classic first contact narrative, juxtaposes a council of the gods on Olympus with the voyage of Vasco da Gama, and the dedication to the Portuguese king Dom Sebastian, who was to perish in an ill-advised military campaign in North Africa, exhorts him to "Look on your Argonauts as they plough the angry waves."⁷⁵ The chapter begins by examining how and to what effect Marlowe connects the figure of the Trojan Aeneas to the Greek Actaeon, whose association with cuckoldry interrogates Aeneas's ancestral and authorising status. Aeneas is a figure always already troubled by the fact that he marks the moment at which Troy turns into Rome. The legends of treachery and deception which accrue to his name mark the end of the idea of Trojans as true, untainted even by the mechanics of representation, and this is underlined by the fact that he himself becomes the hero of the first non-Greek epic, Virgil's *Aeneid*, which inverts the logic of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* by privileging the perspective of the Trojans. Marlowe explores the tension inherent in Aeneas's dual status as last Trojan and first Roman, laying full stress on his slipperiness but also inviting us to share Dido's desire to hear his unique eyewitness perspective on the fall of Troy. The story she ultimately draws from him, rich in emotional power and yet also deceptive, fragmented, and self-serving, becomes the template for all the complex, conflicted accounts of Trojan matter which subsequently find their way onto the early modern stage.

The second chapter, "Aeneas and the Voyagers," builds on this to consider how both Marlowe himself, and a number of other writers who are obviously remembering him, use figures from the Greek and Trojan past to interrogate England's plans for a colonial future. It focuses on a group of plays which are, I argue, united by three things: all are in various ways predicated on and inter-

vene in the expansionist drive to export Englishness to colonies or enclaves overseas; all in one way or another recall or echo the story of the *translatio imperii*, usually with specific reference to the figure of Aeneas; and all adapt or appropriate Marlowe (and sometimes Shakespeare too). These plays include Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* (1631), Day, Rowley, and Wilkins's *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), (Heywood's?) *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (ca. 1596), Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (ca. 1588), Henry Burnell's *Landgartha* (1641), Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612), and Dabridgcourt Belchier's *Hans Beer-Pot* (1618). I argue that all these plays interrogate the place of Aeneas in English myths of empire, and thus use the tale of Troy to ask questions about early modern English identities.

The second part, "The Ruins of Troy," has three chapters. The first of these is on *Troilus and Cressida*. In many early modern texts there is little or no engagement with the specifics of Troy. In Robert Greene's *Euphues his censure to Philautus*, the Greeks' banners bear Latin mottoes (sig. B1v), and the Greeks have pavilions and are generally chivalric; in Chapman's Homer we hear of "the horrid tennis" which the winds play with Ulysses's ship and are told that Patroclus made "five colonels," a title not known in bronze-age Greece but controversially bestowed by the Earl of Essex on a number of his friends during his time in Ireland.⁷⁶ All of these images suggest an ancient world conceived of as just like the early modern one. *Troilus and Cressida*, though, is an exception to this: it imagines Troy as an agricultural society with a lot of objects made of wood, and the way that it makes that wooden town real for us helps us to feel the affective potential of the Troy story in early modern England.

Of all Trojans, the most famous was Hector; even *Troilus and Cressida* treats him with respect. The fourth chapter, "Where Is Hector Now?," considers some of the subsequent history of this iconic figure and the extent to which it is always already tainted with a sense that he is a creation of myth and literature rather than of history, inviting audiences to register both the grandeur of the tale of Troy and the fact that it represents a vanished world. There were no Trojan remains, unless you believed that London Stone was the Palladium, and it is not possible to evidence the existence of this idea before the nineteenth century. There were no Trojan bodies extant, nor any trustworthy tombs: on Chios William Lithgow was shown what purported to be the tomb of Homer, but he noted that "whether it was his Tombe or not, I doe not know"⁷⁷ even before he reached Palmapreto and was shown another tomb of Homer.⁷⁸ In any case, the sole link in the supposed chain of descent from Troy to the Tudors was Aeneas, by no means the most interesting of Trojans: there was no connection to the beautiful Polyxena, the fertile and iconically grieving Hecuba, the noble Andromache or the prophetic Cassandra, and none either to the heroic Hector. Nevertheless, there are clear

signs of characters from the Trojan Wars being reimagined and reinvented for the early modern world. When Alice Arden uses a towel to kill her husband, Clytemnestra appears to have moved to Faversham; in *Richard III*, Cassandra has morphed into Margaret of Anjou. There might similarly be modern Hectors, as in *The Lusians* where Camoens terms Heitor da Silveira “This Portuguese Hector.”⁷⁹ I look particularly at how the figure of Hector was mobilised to boost the status of the Palatinate when James I’s daughter Elizabeth married the Elector Frederick. As the focus of English interest in the Continent moved from its traditional locus of France to a new spotlight on Germany, the idea of a shared Trojan ancestry became an important tool for promoting the princess’s marriage. If Aeneas offered a way to promote the English colonial enterprise, Hector afforded an opportunity to connect England to Europe.

The fifth chapter looks at the way the legacies of Greece and Troy were still present and practised in the fabric of the household, in the shape of women’s representations of Greece and Troy in needlework and in drama intended for household performance. At the heart of the Troy story is the trauma of women having to leave home for marriage, starting with Hesione, who is never forgotten; moving on to Helen; and culminating with Andromache, who will have to take a second husband who can never be the equal of her first, Hector. For the heroine of Jane Lumley’s *Iphigenia*, there is actually not all that much difference between marriage and death (indeed death offers an escape),⁸⁰ while the fact that the embroideries at Hardwick Hall reused old ecclesiastical vestments tinges them with a faint reminder of the days when nunneries offered women a viable alternative to marriage. It is perhaps also not surprising that Bess of Hardwick herself was particularly interested in Penelope, a heroine who governs her household without a husband; for Bess Troy becomes a story to furnish a home to, while for Lumley it becomes a story to act out in one’s home and a way to talk about one’s own family.⁸¹ Troy, so often seen as mediaeval and chivalric, offered a world that might seem safer for women than their own, and was also a story that lends scope and meaning to female suffering such as that of Lady Jane Grey. What men lost with swords, women, it seems, could remake and repurpose with needles and with words.

The third part of the book, “Striking Too Short at Greeks,” has two chapters, which both focus on the major cultural legacy of Greece, drama, and the extent to which the early modern stage felt willing and able to emulate Greek models. The first of these, “The Greek Actor: Art, Aesthetics, and Drama,” focuses on tragedy. One of the reasons for the cultural interest in Greece was the conviction that classical stories were peculiarly capable of eliciting an emotional response; Thomas Heywood in his *An Apology for Actors* tells how Aristotle, when the tutor of Alexander the Great, “caused the destruction of Troy to be acted before his

pupill, in which the valor of Achilles was so naturally exprest, that it imprest the hart of Alexander, in so much that all his succeeding actions were meerly shaped after that patterne . . . to see a Hector all besmered in bloud, trampling upon the bulkes of Kinges. A Troylus returning from the field in the sight of his father Priam . . . Oh these were sights to make an Alexander."⁸² I consider in turn Massinger's *The Roman Actor*, Chettle's *Hoffman*, which I approach via a brief excursus to *Hamlet*, and finally Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy*, which is set in Rhodes, an island considered the centre of the earth by Aristotle⁸³ but which had come to mark the periphery of Christendom.⁸⁴ *Hoffman* also takes us to an edge of Christendom, since the Baltic was the last part of Europe to be converted to Christianity (and Chettle's play suggests that that conversion may not always run very deep). *The Roman Actor* is inevitably less interested in the idea of Christendom, but it speaks implicitly, as the other plays do explicitly, of the conquered and liminal situation of Greece and the fact of its cultural decline. What all these plays chart is both the cultural and emotional power of Greek art and the fact that actual political power has now moved to very different geographical locations in which Greekness, when it is reproduced, must be reproduced with a difference.

The seventh chapter, "Metatheatre and Metamorphosis in Thomas Tomkis's *Albumazar*," stays with drama but turns from tragedy to comedy. It considers in particular the way Tomkis's play asks questions about the effects and implications of various Greek-based forms of knowledge, and by extension about processes of learning in general. Echoing both *Medea* and Aristophanes, evoking characters from the Trojan War and parodying Greek terminology, *Albumazar* invites us to consider the transformation of Greek culture as a central part of its enquiry into the whole concept of transformation. Ultimately, this Marlowe-mad play uses Greek philosophy to ask some probing questions about the relationship between the material and the spiritual.

The fourth part of the book, "Greece on the Edge," contains two chapters which consider the liminal position of Greece and the wider Hellenic world as an embattled frontier of Christendom. Both focus on Cyprus, not geographically Greek but very much part of the Hellenic world. Even more than Greece itself, Cyprus was a frontier territory, lost to the Turks in 1571 but still not quite despaired of: in 1607 there was an abortive Tuscan attempt to retake it. (There were Englishmen present so this was probably general knowledge.⁸⁵) The eighth chapter, "The Edge of the Hellenic World," suggests that *Othello* develops the idea of Cyprus as poised on the edge of Christendom by a series of references to Egypt which both foreshadow *Antony and Cleopatra* and seem to echo the story of Caterina Cornaro, last queen of Cyprus and herself a subject of mythopoeia. I argue that *Othello*'s and Desdemona's imaginations work in different ways, with his drawn to the mytho-

poetic and hers to the practical and personal. This difference finds expression in the play in a tension between women's lived experience and a culturally validated urge to see the feminine in terms of the abstract and symbolic; this is embodied in the play's setting on Cyprus, the legendary home of the goddess Venus, and it helps us to see the extent to which the people and places of the Hellenic world could be used as dramatic shortcuts to the representation of exemplarity and abstraction. Finally the ninth chapter, "What Venus Did with Mars: Love and War in the Mediterranean," traces how the connection between Cyprus and Venus is explored not only in *Othello* but also in John Ford's *The Lover's Melancholy* (1628), which like so much of Ford's work builds on and responds to *Othello*, and which helps us to see the importance of Venus's island both to Ford's own play and to *Othello* and to understand still more clearly the grip of classical mythology, and indeed of the impulse to think in mythological terms, on the early modern imagination. *Othello* is sometimes discussed as a "Turk play," but I suggest that its apparent memories of Lyly make it also a Greek play, and *The Lover's Melancholy* is one of Ford's two definitively Greek plays, the other being *The Broken Heart*, which I discuss in the conclusion. Collectively, these plays examine a Hellenic culture poised on the embattled edge of Christendom, but also explore its role as a locus of exemplarity.

Notes

1 John S. P. Tatlock opened his 1915 survey of "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood" (*PMLA* 30.4 [1915]: 673–770) by remarking, "No traditional story was so popular in the Elizabethan age as that of the siege of Troy and some of its episodes; because of its antiquity and undying beauty, of the fame and greatness of the early writers who had treated it, and to some extent of the tradition that the Britons were descendants of the Trojans" (p. 673). He also provides a very helpful overview of plays and poems about the Trojan War.

2 Quoted in Linda Charnes, "'So unsecret to ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1989): 413–40, p. 416.

3 Louise George Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta, Dramatist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 53.

4 Dominique Goy-Blanquet, "'This Realm is an Empire': Tales of Origins in Medieval and Early Modern France and England," in *Interweaving Myths in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Janice Valls-Russell, Agnès Lafont, and Charlotte Coffin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), pp. 65–85, p. 69.

5 Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 15.

6 Stephen Alford, *London's Triumph: Merchant Adventurers and the Tudor City* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2018), p. 149.

- 7 Philip Robinson, "The Multiple Meanings of Troy in Early Modern London's Mayoral Show," *Seventeenth Century* 26.2 (2011): 221–39, p. 221.
- 8 Kim Gilchrist, "'The wonder is, he hath endured so long': King Lear and the Erosion of the Brutal Histories," *Shakespeare* (2019), p. 4. Online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2018.1561503>.
- 9 Katherine Heavey, "'Proper Men': Myth, Manhood and the Trojan War in Greene, Shakespeare and Heywood," *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 7 (2015). Online: <http://www.northernrenaissance.org/proper-men-myth-manhood-and-the-trojan-war-in-greene-shakespeare-and-heywood/>.
- 10 William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, edited by David Bevington [1988] (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 1.2.105–7.
- 11 Sara Hanna, "Shakespeare's Greek World: The Temptations of the Sea," in *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan (London: Associated University Presses, 1998), pp. 107–28, p. 108.
- 12 Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, "Introduction," in *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 1–44, p. 1. They also comment more generally on perceptions of Greeks as debauched and degenerate (p. 32).
- 13 Efterpi Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing, 1596–1682* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 1 and 139.
- 14 William Lithgow, *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632), pp. 71–72.
- 15 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, p. 60.
- 16 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 126.
- 17 John Marston, *The Malcontent*, edited by George K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), Induction 115–24.
- 18 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, pp. 5 and 17.
- 19 W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 204.
- 20 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 30.
- 21 Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 203 and 204.
- 22 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 29.
- 23 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 124.
- 24 Christy Desmet, "Afterlives of the Prose *Brut* in Early Modern Chronicle and Literature," in *Readers and Writers of the Prose Brut (Trivium 36)*, edited by William Marx and Raluca Radulescu (Lampeter: Trivium, 2006), pp. 227–46, p. 231.
- 25 Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, pp. 197 and 216.
- 26 Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, p. 219.
- 27 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, p. 117.
- 28 Joe Moshenska, *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby* (London: William Heinemann, 2016), p. 286.
- 29 Miriam Jacobson, *Barbarous Antiquity: Reorienting the Past in the Poetry of Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), pp. 152 and 6.
- 30 Goy-Blanquet, "'This Realm is an Empire,'" p. 69.
- 31 Vassiliki Markidou, "Performing Identity: Early Seventeenth-Century Travelers to the Ruins of Troy," *Journeys* 19.2 (2018): 67–81, p. 68.

- 32 Hanna, "Shakespeare's Greek World," p. 108.
- 33 A. D. Nuttall, "Action at a Distance: Shakespeare and the Greeks," in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 209–22, p. 214.
- 34 Michael Silk, "Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship," in *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 241–57, p. 241.
- 35 Tanya Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 2.
- 36 Sonja Fielitz, "Jacobean Troys," in *Urban Encounters: Experience and Representation in the Early Modern City*, edited by Per Sivefors (Pisa: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2013), pp. 54–69, pp. 62–63.
- 37 Matthew Steggle, *Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 113.
- 38 Domenico Lovascio, "Leicester's Men and the Lost *Telomo* of 1583," *Early Theatre* 20.1 (2017): 9–26.
- 39 Richard Brome, *The Sparagus Garden*, edited by Julie Sanders. Online: <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/brome/viewOriginal.jsp?play=SG&type=CRIT>, 3.1.527.
- 40 Tatlock, "The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature," pp. 677 and 675.
- 41 Liz Oakley-Brown, "Embodying Greece in Elizabethan England: A Rhizomatic Review of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *Love's Labour's Lost*," in *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 69–91, p. 73.
- 42 See Andrew Hiscock, "'Achilles Alter': The Heroic Lives and Afterlives of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex," in *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*, edited by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 101–32.
- 43 Eric S. Mallin, *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), pp. 27–29.
- 44 William Baldwin, *A memorial of suche princes, as since the tyme of king Richard the seconde, haue been vnfortunate in the realme of England* (London: John Wayland, 1554).
- 45 <https://www.lostplays.org/lpd/Phoenissae>.
- 46 <http://www.thespis.it/kingshipandpower/>.
- 47 William Shakespeare, *Richard II*, edited by Stanley Wells (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 4.1.280–85.
- 48 Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), A text, 5.1.89.
- 49 See for instance Darlene Farabee, "The Critical Backstory: *Edward II*'s Critics in History to 1990," in *Edward II: A Critical Reader*, edited by Kirk Melnikoff (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 21–41, p. 23; and Roslyn L. Knutson, "*Edward II* in Repertory," also in *Edward II: A Critical Reader*, pp. 119–44, p. 139.
- 50 Christopher Marlowe, *Edward II*, in *The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: Everyman, 1999), 5.1.26–27.
- 51 Oakley-Brown, "Embodying Greece in Elizabethan England," pp. 81–83.
- 52 George Chapman, *Chapman's Homer: The Iliad and the Odyssey* (London: Wordsworth, 2000), *Iliad*, Book 15, lines 361–62 and Book 18, line 280.

- 53 Other unconventional sexual practices might also surface: in the *Odyssey*, we hear of Aeolus that “His daughters to his sons he gave as wives.” Chapman, *Chapman’s Homer, Odyssey*, Book 10, line 9.
- 54 Hanna, “Shakespeare’s Greek World,” p. 110.
- 55 Martin T. Williams also draws the parallel between Marlowe’s treatment of the sea in *Hero and Leander* and Homer’s in *The Odyssey* (“The Temptations in Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander*,” *Modern Language Quarterly* [1955]: 226–31, p. 227). For further discussion of this see my *Christopher Marlowe, Dramatist* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008).
- 56 Charles Forker, in the notes on this in his Revels edition of the play (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), thinks the allusions both here and to Juno are from Ovid, but he also points out that Circe here is on her way to Scylla, another character first encountered in the *Odyssey*.
- 57 Though Forker thinks the allusion this time is to Virgil.
- 58 Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*, pp. 6 and 8.
- 59 Tanya Pollard, “What’s Hecuba to Shakespeare?,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 65.4 (Winter 2012): 1060–93, p. 1071.
- 60 Katherine Heavey, *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558–1688* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 101, 102, 105, and 164–65.
- 61 Robert Greene, *Euphues his censure to Philautus* (London: John Wolfe for Edward White, 1587), sig. L4v.
- 62 Chapman, *Chapman’s Homer, Iliad*, Book 1, line 229 and Book 2, lines 172–73.
- 63 Daniel Cadman, *Sovereigns and Subjects in Early Modern Neo-Senecan Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 94.
- 64 Samuel Daniel, *Philotas*, edited by Laurence Michel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949).
- 65 Robert Miola, “Early Modern Antigones: Receptions, Refractions, Replays,” *Classical Receptions Journal* 6.2 (2014): 221–44, p. 240.
- 66 Robert S. Miola, “Timon in Shakespeare’s Athens,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (Spring 1980): 21–30, pp. 27 and 28.
- 67 Alison Findlay, “Reshaping Athens in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *Two Noble Kinsmen*,” in *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 196–216, p. 208.
- 68 Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great*, in *The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), Part One, 1.1.127–32.
- 69 Richard Johnson, *The Most Famous History of the Seaven Champions of Christendome* (London: Cuthbert Burbie, 1596), p. 106.
- 70 Johnson, *Seaven Champions of Christendome*, sig. B1r.
- 71 Goran V. Stanivukovic, “Cruising the Mediterranean: Narratives of Sexuality and Geographies of the Eastern Mediterranean in Early Modern English Prose Romances,” in *Remapping the Mediterranean World in Early Modern English Writings*, edited by Goran V. Stanivukovic (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 59–74, p. 65.
- 72 Fielitz, “Jacobean Troys,” p. 62.
- 73 Johnson, *Seaven Champions of Christendome*, p. 77.
- 74 Johnson, *Seaven Champions of Christendome*, p. 125.
- 75 Luis de Camoens, *The Lusads*, translated by William C. Atkinson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1952), p. 41.
- 76 Chapman, *Chapman’s Homer, Odyssey*, Book 5, line 431, and *Iliad*, Book 16, line 157.

77 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, p. 101.

78 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 181.

79 Camoens, *The Lusiads*, p. 229.

80 I have argued elsewhere that there was often a deep-seated emotional unease attached to the fates of early modern royal women for whom marriages were arranged to foreign princes or kings (“Marrying the Dead,” in *Staged Transgression in Shakespeare’s England*, edited by Edel Semple and Rory Loughnane [Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013], pp. 165–79).

81 I am indebted to Marion Wynne-Davies for the suggestion that *Iphigenia* was designed for performance specifically at Nonsuch.

82 Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London, 1612), sigs B3v–B4r.

83 Graham Robb, *The Ancient Paths* (London: Picador, 2013), p. 133.

84 This had already been explored in Kyd’s *Soliman and Perseda*, of which Laurence Publicover observes that “What draws the knights to the tournament in Rhodes is a shared respect for chivalry, and the episode thus gives physical form to a dimension of Mediterranean geography . . . its capacity to bring together, in a kind of cultural whirlpool, peoples of different nations and faiths whose shared values transcend (or partially transcend) ethnic or religious differences” (Laurence Publicover, *Dramatic Geography: Romance, Intertextuality, and Cultural Encounter in Early Modern Mediterranean Drama* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017], p. 98). Lindsay Ann Reid notes that *Soliman and Perseda* is an influence on *The Maid’s Tragedy*: she speaks of the Beaumont and Fletcher play’s “remarkable (though previously neglected) intertextual relationship with Thomas Kyd’s *Soliman and Perseda* (ca. 1590),” and she also notes that “for Beaumont and Fletcher, as well as for their original audiences, references to the play’s Rhodian setting would have been inextricably linked to such grander narratives of Mediterranean warfare and Ottoman expansionism” (Lindsay Ann Reid, “Beaumont and Fletcher’s Rhodes: Early Modern Geopolitics and Mythological Topography in *The Maid’s Tragedy*,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 16.2 [2012]. Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/16-2/16-2toc.htm>).

85 See Marios Hadjianastasis, “Corsair Tactics and Lofty Ideals: The 1607 Tuscan Raid on Cyprus,” in *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp. 22–36.

This page intentionally left blank

Part I: **Wandering Trojans**

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 1

What's Actaeon to Aeneas?

No playwright engaged more creatively or productively with the classical past than Christopher Marlowe. In *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe's hero remembers how he has "made blind Homer sing to me, / Of Alexander's love and Oenone's death,"¹ and Neil Rhodes argues that both *Faustus* and *Tamburlaine* are influenced by Greek literature in other ways too: "it is Xenophon and Lucian who can offer, at least in part, some explanation of the unusual mix of the heroic and the sceptical—or wonder and irony—that we find in Marlowe, especially in his two most popular plays, *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*"; for Rhodes, "The similarities between the main storylines of *Tamburlaine* and the *Cyropaideia* are fairly obvious."² In *Dido, Queen of Carthage* a different Marlowe hero tells the tale of Troy himself, and does so in ways which were to prove hugely influential on later literature of the period. In this chapter, I examine how Marlowe yokes two ostensibly unconnected figures from classical mythology, the Trojan Aeneas and the Greek Actaeon, in such a way that the one is used to critically examine the other.

Aeneas was central to England's image of both its past and its future, for his great-grandson Brutus was the legendary founder of Britain, and the *translatio imperii* which his bloodline embodied had supposedly brought the cultural authority of Troy to London. He was to be found everywhere, from public theatres to the walls of private houses: John Astington notes that "surviving titles of plays, now mostly lost, suggest that the most popular Troy-related subject was the legend of Dido and Aeneas" and that "In 1533 King Henry VIII acquired a set of five tapestries of *The Story of Aeneas*, all of which survive today at Hampton Court";³ Henry VIII was particularly interested in Aeneas because his Welsh ancestry supposedly allowed him to claim direct descent from Camber, son of Aeneas's great-great-grandson Locrine. Crucially for the early modern interest in travel and trade, descent from Aeneas was also seen as authorising the hoped-for onward trajectory of his bloodline into lands still being discovered. Not for nothing did the illustrations in Brandt's *Aeneid* use Columbus's ships as models for Aeneas's,⁴ and Vassiliki Markidou notes that George Sandys "translated the first book of Virgil's *Aeneid* while seeking preferment with the Virginia Company";⁵ we also know that there was a copy of the Middle English prose Brut chronicle in the possession of the sixteenth-century explorer Armagill Waad, who was "hailed by his son as the 'English Columbus.'"⁶ A number of writers of Marlowe's time turned their attention to the supposed progeny of Aeneas as detailed in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *The History of the Kings of Britain*, including William Warner, author of *Albions England*, who along with Walter Warner the mathematician is one

of the two candidates for the “Warner” whom Kyd named as the friend of Christopher Marlowe (and whose father went with Richard Chancellor to Russia in 1553 and died on one of William Towerson’s voyages to Guinea).⁷ Marlowe, however, eschews the “British History,” and I suggest that this, like his notable failure to engage in the predominantly heterosexual form of the sonnet, is a speaking silence. The second of the two myths I want to explore and to relate to the figure of Aeneas, that of Actaeon, is “commonly interpreted as a tale of forbidden knowledge,”⁸ but the horns with which Actaeon is associated also suggested cuckoldry. I shall argue that connecting Aeneas to Actaeon thus allows Marlowe to call into question the idea of patrilineal transmission which formed the basis both for the *translatio imperii* itself and for the cultural uses to which Marlowe’s England put it.

Aeneas’s status as *ur*-colonist meant that when he is remembered in early modern literature, it is often in conjunction with the New World.⁹ All of Marlowe’s plays are in a fundamental sense concerned with the difficulties of accommodating classical models and philosophies in a world trembling on the edge of modernity. It is therefore no coincidence that he regularly and insistently recalls Aeneas, who features in or is remembered in almost all his plays. Aeneas’s landfall in Africa is presented in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* as essentially a first contact narrative,¹⁰ and modernity for Marlowe is conditioned by the impact of the discovery not only of new lands but more fundamentally of the people who lived in them, who had bestowed exotic polysyllabic names on these strange territories and had devised for them complex cosmogonies and histories which might be quite independent of other traditions. According to the Baines Note, Marlowe’s personal scepticism about established teachings and beliefs was partly prompted by his encounter with representatives of an alternative belief system, presumably in the shape of two Native Americans named Manteo and Wanchese whom his friend Thomas Hariot brought back from the fledgling English colony in Roanoke. For many Elizabethans, both geography and cartography were easily assimilable within familiar paradigms. Sir Thomas Smith, writing in 1572 to his son who was about to depart for Ireland, advised that

For the first year there, and peradventure the second, ye shall do well to take one sure and convenient place to make a fort, as Byrso was to Dido, and Mons Aventinus to Romulus.¹¹

People, though, may not be so readily readable as replicas of classical originals, and the knowledge which Manteo and Wanchese seem to have offered Marlowe was impossible to reconcile with any existing belief system to which he had access. In his plays, his characters’ travels show them not a second Troy but a

place which is wholly new, for the proper apprehension of which new paradigms must be deployed, and the focus on the motif of the first contact narrative, which throws emphasis onto the human rather than the cartographical, makes the story of Aeneas an apt and versatile trope for such encounters.

So what is he like, this figure who so insistently returns, Marlowe's most indefatigable *revenant*? In fact the Aeneas Marlowe offers us is a character whom one might not be sorry never to see again. "Warlike Aeneas, and in these base robes?" asks Dido incredulously,¹² and if Marlowe's original audience were expecting a pious epic hero, they might well be tempted to echo her. Bedraggled, bemused, and unable even to recognise his own mother, Marlowe's Aeneas seems to consistently mistake or misunderstand his own destined trajectory, and to have no idea of the narrative with which Marlowe's original audience would have been so easily familiar. The effect might have been one of history being made before us, but at times it actually comes closer to one of history being very nearly bungled before us, with echoes of the classic sci-fi paradox of the past going wrong when it is revisited. When Dido invites him into the cave he is comically slow to guess what she might have in mind; Achates, Ilioneus, Sergestus, and Cloanthus have all met one of Dido's suitors at various national and international events, but Aeneas has never come across any of them (3.1.140–48); when he first has to sail away he seems quite ready to abandon Ascanius, despite the fact that the boy is central to the prophecy of the founding of Rome; and Marlowe denies him a single opportunity ever to do or say anything really impressive in front of us.

This inadequacy is most striking when Dido begs Aeneas to tell her what really happened at the end of the siege of Troy:

May I entreat thee to discourse at large,
And truly too, how Troy was overcome?
For many tales go of that city's fall,
And scarcely do agree upon one point.
Some say Antenor did betray the town,
Others report 'twas Sinon's perjury;
But all in this, that Troy is overcome,
And Priam dead. Yet how, we hear no news.

(2.1.106–13)

On the surface, the request is innocuous enough, but it raises a number of issues. Dido knows that Troy has fallen, and it is apparent elsewhere in the play that she is in touch with other parts of the Greco-Trojan world: she has portraits of people whom Aeneas's followers recognise (3.1.140–46), and she appears also to have a visual representation of Priam himself (though it is not quite clear what exactly Aeneas is reacting to when he says "O, yet this stone doth

make Aeneas weep!” [2.1.15]). She might therefore be expected to have access to reliable sources of information, but in fact she has heard a variety of mutually incompatible stories which “scarcely do agree upon one point.” Now, though, she is confident that she is about to find out what happened, for Aeneas is an eyewitness. Surely he can tell not only “at large” but “truly too” what caused Troy to fall—and yet in the same breath as Dido articulates this expectation she also implicitly acknowledges its potential fallacy, for the apparently innocuous addition of “too” to “truly” smuggles in an unsettling suggestion that what is told “at large” may not necessarily be told “truly.” Truth, it seems, has to be separately stipulated for.

When Aeneas does begin to reply, his first gambit is to declare explicitly that he is not doing so as himself: “Then speak, Aeneas, with Achilles’ tongue” (2.1.121). He tells us not what happened in Troy, which he could have seen, but what was said and done in the Greek camp, which he cannot possibly have been privy to, and his narrative is also inflected by hindsight, so that the first time Sinon is mentioned he is “false Sinon” (2.1.144), which would not have been what anyone in Troy would have thought at the time. Not until nearly fifty lines after he begins does he start to talk from personal experience, when he recounts the drawing in of the horse and adds “In which unhappy work was I employed” (2.1.169), and almost as soon as he has introduced the personal perspective he disables it again as he writes off himself and all Trojans as unconscious:

We banqueted, till, overcome with wine,
Some surfeited, and others soundly slept.
(2.1.178–79)

There is no indication of his authority for describing the actions of Sinon and the Greeks, as he immediately proceeds to do, until line 191:

Frighted with this confused noise, I rose,
And looking from a turret might behold
Young infants swimming in their parents’ blood . . .
(2.1. 191– 93)

Finally he has a bird’s-eye view, but he very soon ceases to be concerned with public events when “thinking to go down, came Hector’s ghost” (2.1.201), which apparently appears to him alone and gives him the convenient advice that he should run away. Though he assures us that he killed many Greeks before he did so, his own part in the narrative becomes strangely opaque as he passes over his mother’s miraculous abstraction of his person and moves swiftly on to telling Dido instead exactly what Pyrrhus did, although he himself

was not present to see it. By contrast, he is notably reticent in explaining what happened to his wife Creusa, although he *was* present when she disappeared:

O there I lost my wife, and had not we
Fought manfully, I had not told this tale.
(2.1.270–71)

As he makes good his escape, he also manages to leave both Cassandra and Polyxena to their fates, though at least he knows what happened to them; in the case of Hecuba he is not even sure of that, though Achates has an idea.

All in all, it is difficult to suppose that Dido feels particularly edified by this narrative, and Aeneas emerges as a shabby figure, whose principal concern is to shift blame away from himself and who appears to have come out of the whole affair remarkably well. That does not mean, however, that no sympathy is evoked for the Trojans more generally. Ironically, Aeneas's obviously partial and biased narration does not obscure what happened, but crystallises it into a series of vivid and terrifying vignettes, showing us frightened women and a helpless elderly man and offering us Creusa as a victim without a voice or even a story, so that we are forced to engage our imaginations if we want to consider what might have happened to her. Troy is lost, but the unexpected appearance of Hector's ghost testifies to its continuing power to haunt, and the power of Marlowe's evocation of it ensured that it had a literary tradition discrete from, but coexisting with, its cultural influence.

Despite Aeneas's general unimpressiveness, this rather doleful revenant comes back and back, and he does so in ways which both differ from Marlowe's other invocations of classical mythology and also serve to underline the association of Aeneas with the New World. In *Tamburlaine the Great*, allusions to the classical past are for the most part just so much baggage that the characters carry around with them, which prevents them from forging ahead in a new world bounded not by the Pillars of Hercules but by the trajectory "from Persepolis to Mexico" (3.3.255); knowledge from the old world cuts no ice in the face of Tamburlaine's harder-headed practice of *realpolitik*, for which the only explanatory model that Meander can find is that "Some powers divine, or else infernal, mixed / Their angry seeds at his conception" (2.6.9–10). Nevertheless, the characters are wedded to the idea of fashioning themselves after classical precedents. Menaphon advises Cosroe to model his strategy on Cyrus's (1.1.130) and compares Tamburlaine to Atlas (2.1.11) and Achilles (2.1.24); Ceneus recalls Darius (1.1.154). Both are apparently working on the assumption that if moderns do what their classical role models did they can expect the same outcome, and some at least of the characters also appear to believe that stories from the classical past are not myths but historical fact: "Was there such brethren, sweet Meander, say, / That

sprung of teeth of dragons venomous?” (2.2.51). Tamburlaine by contrast is interested in only two sorts of classical myth: those which can teach him how to seize power, and those which can help him to woo. He likes stories about “the eldest son of heavenly Ops” who “Thrust his doting father from his chair” (2.7.13–14), and he calls Zenocrate “lovelier than the love of Jove” (1.2.87) because, as he explains to Techelles, “women must be flatterèd” (1.2.107)—and she is indeed persuaded by “His talk much sweeter than the Muses’ song” (3.2.50). The qualities of classical mythology most valued in the world of the Tamburlaine plays, then, are its ease of assimilation and applicability, and its ability to offer precedents or paradigms that characters may aspire to or borrow from.

The plays’ references to Aeneas, though, work rather differently. The Soldan thinks that “we march as Meleager did” (4.3.1), and Meleager is a figure who points us back to the Aeneas story, at least as understood by Marlowe, since in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* Dido notes that one of her many suitors is “Meleager’s son, a warlike prince” (3.1.162). To march as he did, though, is worrying, for Meleager was burned to death, so that this reference points in the directly opposite direction from that which the Soldan appears to suppose: it augurs not victory but defeat and annihilation. Philemus’s reflex troping of the Arabian king as the Turnus to Tamburlaine’s Aeneas (5.1.381) similarly serves to align the doomed Egyptian forces with the dead past and to position Tamburlaine as an emblem of a relentlessly advancing and dangerously inchoate future, not locked into any one fixed, easily assimilable identity but veering dizzily from shepherd to king and flicking between white, red, and black.

This sense that the oncoming future holds a range of possibilities rather than any repetition of the stable narrative afforded by the past is arguably underlined by the sense of uncertainty which attaches itself to the end of the play. Historically, Tamburlaine’s empire waned in the hands of his descendants: does Marlowe remember that, and are we meant to see Amyras as an obviously pale shadow of his father, or does the apparently successful marginalisation of Celebinus mean that he has forgotten it? We cannot know: beyond the end of the play lies a blank, a map still waiting to be filled in. By the same token, the identity of Tamburlaine himself now begins visibly to settle as his story has been unfolded, apprehended, and concluded. That does not mean, though, that it is reducible or that it can be easily packaged in the way that has been possible for the characters of the play to do with the figures from the classical past that they have evoked: Tamburlaine may connote victory in something of the same way that Aeneas does when opposed to Turnus, but is that all he means, or do the meanings which accrue to him still have the potential to change and to be inflected by events? Certainly some of the cultural meanings made of the figure of Tamburlaine both by Marlowe and by others would suggest that the answer to

this question is that they do have the potential for change, for as I have discussed elsewhere, he proves able to stand as both model for English youth and patroller of borders as well as barbarous Scythian Other.¹³ Tamburlaine, then, may be an Aeneas, but he is an Aeneas whose meaning is in flux, and as such he calls into question the meaning of Aeneas himself.

I have already suggested that when Aeneas does come back, he fails to be himself. A telling example of this distance of Marlowe's Aeneas from his classical "self" is his behaviour in a rather mysterious scene in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* during which he sees what either is or appears to him to be a representation of Priam. In the *Aeneid*, an equivalent event provides a moment of calm and reflection before the emotion of the retelling of the siege of Troy; its cause is also clear, because it is prompted when Aeneas sees "pictured . . . the Trojan War, with all the battles round Ilium in their correct order, for their fame had already spread over the world."¹⁴ In *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, by contrast, the atmosphere is febrile, and there is no readily available way of explaining what happens. Without any indication of an external stimulus, Achates asks, "Why stands my sweet Aeneas thus amazed?" (2.1.2), to which his leader replies,

O my Achates, Theban Niobe,
Who for her sons' death wept out life and breath,
And, dry with grief, was turned into a stone,
Had not such passions in her head as I.
Methinks that town there should be Troy, yon Ida's hill,
There Xanthus' stream, because here's Priamus,
And when I know it is not, then I die.

(2.1.3–9)

Marlowe deliberately withholds any explanation of Aeneas's sudden conviction that he can see Priam, making the most likely explanation for a previously uninitiated reader the suggestion that Aeneas is simply hallucinating. There is also another important difference between the two passages. In the *Aeneid*, the story of the fall of Troy is already known, and has been so long enough for artists to depict its events in the correct sequence, and it is therefore possible to verify independently the account which Aeneas gives of events. In *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, however, Dido, as we have seen, is still asking Aeneas what really happened, for "many tales go of that city's fall, / And scarcely do agree upon one point" (2.1.107–9). What Dido does not say but what Marlowe's audience would almost certainly have known was that in one of those variant versions Aeneas was himself the betrayer of Troy, and Emma Buckley argues that Marlowe is visibly drawing on that tradition here,¹⁵ so that a certain degree of scepticism inevitably attaches itself to Aeneas's narrative. In Samuel Harding's

1640 play *Sicily and Naples, or, The Fatall Vnion*, an account is referred to as “a tale as sad, and dismall / As that of Troy, and as much truth in’t too”;¹⁶ it is left hanging whether that means that it is wholly true or that it is obviously not true at all. There is a similar uncertainty in Marlowe’s play, but it is one shaped by a more sophisticated concept of truth, for in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* the developing future shapes the past as we see the story of Troy taking its definitive shape in terms clearly conditioned by a very specific set of circumstances.¹⁷ We thus see it *become* truth even if we are not sure that it is true, and *Dido*, which of all Marlowe’s plays apparently does most to offer us the story of Aeneas, thus also does most to undermine it.

Arguably the most provocative example of a Marlowe play which evokes Aeneas is one which on the face of it does not (though given the state of the text it is of course impossible to be sure that it never did): *The Massacre at Paris*. However, this may well have been a rather speaking silence, for the play *does* openly mention Queen Elizabeth, and any conjunction of Elizabeth and Aeneas was potentially explosive. Yoking the two had clear potential to recall the fractious debate about the queen’s proposed marriage to the Duke of Alençon,¹⁸ a relationship which was often troped in terms of the story of Dido and Aeneas, as in the Siena Sieve portrait of Elizabeth where roundels on a column show the two classical lovers. It is usually *Dido, Queen of Carthage* which is associated with the Alençon marriage.¹⁹ There is however an intertextual link between *Dido* and *Massacre* in that the Guise says “Set me to scale the high Pyramides”²⁰ and Dido promises that if Aeneas himself will stay his ships shall have “Hollow pyramids of silver plate” (3.1.122). Moreover, Timothy D. Crowley suggests that “The Greeks’ battle cry here [in *Dido*]—‘kill kill’ (2.1.190)—resurfaces as the Guisians’ murderous cries in Marlowe’s dramatic account of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, and Priam’s death parallels the Huguenot leader Admiral Coligny’s mutilation.”²¹ Dido and Aeneas, then, seem to inhabit Marlowe’s imagination in this play too.

A notable feature of the use of the Dido and Aeneas story in conjunction with the Alençon marriage is that it is not always clear whether Elizabeth is to be identified with Aeneas or with Dido, a situation complicated by the fact that there were two separate myths of Dido, one in which she stayed chaste and one in which she did not. The story of Dido and Aeneas may have an obvious applicability to the story of Elizabeth and Alençon, but the polarities of that applicability are very far from obvious. The negotiations for the Alençon marriage find an echo in *The Massacre at Paris* in the fact that the marriage between Henry of Navarre and Margaret of Valois similarly crosses the confessional divide, and here too identities are troubled and blurred, because while possible paradigms and equivalences are readily apparent and obviously available, it is once again

not clear which should be applied to whom. There is clearly a parallel between the childless Henry III, whose heir is the king of a foreign country, and the childless Elizabeth, whose heir is the king of a foreign country, and the fact that Henry III before his death specifically tells the Agent for England to warn his queen about what has happened to him suggests that what happened in Paris could happen in London. There is also a bond between Navarre and Elizabeth, both Protestant successors of Catholic monarchs. At the same time, though, the echoes of the Alençon marriage negotiations and of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* inevitably work to prise Elizabeth apart from both Henry and Navarre and to reposition her as herself. Finally, there is a parallel between Henry III and James VI of Scotland, since both were known to have minions. If the old queen dies, as Jeanne d'Albret does in *The Massacre at Paris*, and a young king takes over, what happens then, and who will be who? Mythological paradigms may seem a familiar and attractive guide, but they are not a safe one, because in this strange new world we simply cannot be sure who represents whom.

Doctor Faustus, which shares *The Massacre at Paris*'s interest in the wars of religion, may appear much less concerned with the *Aeneid*. Valdes speaks of "the white breasts of the Queen of Love" (1.1.131), that is, Aeneas's mother Venus, and Faustus reminds Mephistopheles that in Naples

saw we learnèd Maro's golden tomb,
The way he cut an English mile in length
Thorough a rock of stone in one night's space.
(3.1.13–15)²²

Maro is Virgil, to whom we owe the *Aeneid*, but of Aeneas himself there seems to be no sign. However, the thing that Faustus and many of those around him most want is to speak with the dead. The Emperor says of Alexander the Great "It grieves my soul I never saw the man" (4.1.32), and Faustus, as we have seen, has apparently had Homer sing to him (2.3.26–27).

In this both the Emperor and Faustus resemble the Aeneas of the *Aeneid*, who cries to the ghost of Anchises "Where do you go in this haste, so soon? Where dart away? Whom are you hurrying to escape? And who denies you to my embraces?" and of whom we are told that on his way to Avernus to visit the Underworld "now there was no suspense, but only a sweet joyfulness thrilling through the heart of Aeneas the Chieftain."²³ Moreover, the dead person most compelling to Faustus himself is Helen of Troy, and not only is she associated with the story of Troy but Faustus addresses her in terms directly reminiscent of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, where Dido says of Aeneas "And he'll make me immortal with a kiss" (4.4.123): "Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss" (5.1.90). Nor is this the only textual echo of *Dido*: Jupiter's boast that he has "oft driven

back the horses of the night" (1.1.126) prefigures Faustus's "*O lente, lente currite noctis equi!*" (5.2.75); Dido's "I'll frame me wings of wax like Icarus" (5.1.243) is heard again when the Prologue in *Doctor Faustus* speaks of how "His waxen wings did mount above his reach" (21); and Dido's promise that "Aeneas may command as many Moors / As in the sea are little water drops" (4.4.62–63) is heard again in Faustus's despairing "O soul, be changed into little waterdrops" (5.2.117). "Helen's rape doth haunt thee at the heels" (1.1.144) says Aeneas to his companions; in this sense, the same remark could also be made to Faustus.

Ironically, the one play which offers no trace of Aeneas at all is *Edward II*.²⁴ Edward II, like his close comparator Richard II, is fond enough of appealing to the supernatural when he should be concentrating on the practical; he invokes, among others, Danaë (2.2.53), Phoebus (4.3.45), Pluto and Charon (4.7.89–90), but Aeneas is one hero who does not feature in his mental pantheon, and Rome, the city which Aeneas founded, is for him the seat of Catholicism rather than a site along the route of the *translatio imperii*.²⁵ It might be suggestive that this refusal of Aeneas echoes the perspective of William Warner, whose *Albions England* mischievously disavows the idea of the *translatio imperii*, so precious to early modern British monarchs, on the grounds that Ferrex and Porrex, who both died without issue, were the last surviving descendants of Brutus.²⁶ It would be absolutely in line with this refusenik attitude to keep the story of Aeneas out of the one play which Marlowe set in England, the place where, according to the story of the *translatio imperii*, it ought to be most prominent, and indeed perhaps it is partly in order to underline this omission that the figure of Aeneas is so insistently present elsewhere.

Another figure does appear in both *Edward II* and *Doctor Faustus*, though. That is Actaeon, and I want to argue that he is, for Marlowe, both an antitype of Aeneas and also a lens through which the cultural meanings of Aeneas can be negotiated. Patrick Cheney notes that "Marlowe finds his tragic ideology inscribed in Ovidian myths of daring, contestation and rivalry. The most important of these myths for our purposes are those of Phaethon, Icarus, Actaeon and Orpheus."²⁷ In *Edward II*, Gaveston plots how

Sometime a lovely boy in Dian's shape,
 With hair that gilds the water as it glides,
 Crowns of pearl about his naked arms,
 And in his sportful hands an olive tree
 To hide those parts which men delight to see,
 Shall bathe him in a spring; and there, hard by,
 One like Actaeon, peeping through the grove,

Shall by the angry goddess be transformed,
 And running in the likeness of a hart
 By yelping hounds pulled down and seem to die.
 (1.1.60–69)

I think it is no accident that Gaveston associates Actaeon with that defining characteristic of Greekness in early modern English drama, dramatic representation, and sophisticated dramatic representation at that.

Actaeon also features in *Doctor Faustus*, and there too he is connected to theatricality:

Knight. I'faith, that's as true as Diana turned me to a stag.
Faustus. No, sir, but when Actaeon died, he left the horns for you.
 (4.1.61–64)

It is clear that these lines serve as a prompt for the actor playing the knight to acquire a pair of horns or antlers, and it is equally clear that this must involve a piece of transparent and obvious theatrical trickery which the audience are expected to register extradiegetically but ignore intradiegetically, again testifying to a fundamentally metatheatrical sensibility. But both these references to Actaeon also perform cultural work of another kind, one more directly linked to the London outside the theatre than to the stage inside it. Actaeon, who as the Knight notes was transformed by Diana into a stag and killed by his own hounds, is connected to Aeneas by the story of Aeneas's grandson Silvius and Silvius's son Brutus, founder of Britain, which according to Geoffrey of Monmouth's rather cursory glance at it runs as follows:

the young man [Brutus] killed his father by an unlucky shot with an arrow, when they were out hunting together. Their beaters drove some stags into their path and Brutus, who was under the impression that he was aiming his weapon at these stags, hit his own father below the breast. As a result of this death Brutus was expelled from Italy by his relations, who were angry with him for having committed such a crime.²⁸

Like Aeneas, too, Actaeon was a descendant of Venus: Ovid describes how his grandfather Cadmus “was married to the daughter of Mars and Venus,” and also like Aeneas, Actaeon suffered the enmity of Juno.²⁹ The two men are cousins of a sort; they are connected by stories of stag-hunts and by trouble with the same goddess; but one is Greek and one is Trojan, and they also represent very different ways of telling stories.

To put Aeneas and Actaeon alongside each other is to introduce a clash of Ovid and Virgil. Critics have noticed in general how fond Marlowe is of playing these two giants of the classical past off against each other, but the coupling of Aeneas and Actaeon is a particularly resonant one. Patrick Cheney notes that

Ovid figures himself as Actaeon in reference to his banishment, implying that it was caused by his having seen power naked.³⁰ In Ovid's case, this refers to his apparent entanglement with Julia, daughter of the Emperor Augustus, so the power in question is imperial and secular; but given that his story involves a goddess the figure of Actaeon is obviously equally available to trope the perception of a perilous truth about religion, while the fact that the goddess was Diana made the story dangerously suitable for undermining the authority of the Virgin Queen herself, often figured as Diana or her equivalent Cynthia. To couple Aeneas with Actaeon, though, is to add still another layer. Separately and individually, the common feature of the cultural work done by Marlowe's representations of both Aeneas and Actaeon is that it does damage to received orthodoxies: "pius Aeneas" becomes, in Marlowe's hands, impious. Failing to connect Aeneas to Britain implicitly withholds any endorsement of the period's customary justification of the English colonial enterprise, and indeed if there is an heir of Rome in Marlowe's *oeuvre*, it is surely Tamburlaine, who declares that "My camp is like to Julius Caesar's host, / That never fought but had the victory."³¹ The possibility that it might be an Asiatic rather than a British ruler who inherited the grandeur of the past fed into a lively contemporary debate about what had really become of the Trojans, and whether their true heirs might be not the British but the Turks, who now lived in the lands once ruled by Troy; Marlowe's association of Aeneas and Tamburlaine intervenes in that debate and insidiously implies that if the *translatio imperii* went anywhere, it went to the east rather than to the west.

Marlowe's references to Actaeon work in ways similarly disturbing and destabilising to the cherished ideological projects of early modern England, and they do so in ways which glance slyly at the stories and traditions associated with Aeneas. Gaveston's "By yelping hounds pulled down and seems to die" posits Actaeon as figuring queer desire and "unnatural" transformation. But Actaeon also, and perhaps from Marlowe's point of view more powerfully and suggestively, tropes illegitimacy. Intriguingly, Shakespeare seems twice to have associated Marlowe and horns, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* where there is an odd little instance of textual overlap with *Doctor Faustus*³² and in *As You Like It*, where the jokes about "elegies on brambles" (3.2.347–48) and "honest Ovid" (3.3.6) appear to allude to the recent public burning of Marlowe's pioneering translation of *All Ovid's Elegies* and where the name Ganymede and the reference to a dead shepherd also point in the same direction. Here Duke Senior says of Jaques "I think he be transform'd into a beast, / For I can nowhere find him like a man,"³³ and Touchstone declares,

Notes

- 1 Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus* (A Text), in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), 2.3.26–27.
- 2 Neil Rhodes, “Marlowe and the Greeks,” *Renaissance Studies* 27.2 (2011): 199–218, pp. 206 and 209.
- 3 John Astington, *Stage and Picture in the English Renaissance: The Mirror up to Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 55 and 65.
- 4 See Anna Cox Brinton, “The Ships of Columbus in Brant’s Virgil,” *Art and Archaeology* 26 (1928): 83–86.
- 5 Vassiliki Markidou, “Performing Identity: Early Seventeenth-Century Travelers to the Ruins of Troy,” *Journeys* 19.2 (2018): 67–81, p. 76.
- 6 Amy Noelle Vines, “‘Thys ys her owne boke’: Women Reading the Middle English Prose *Brut* Chronicle,” in *Readers and Writers of the Prose Brut* (Trivium 36), edited by William Marx and Raluca Radulescu (Lampeter: Trivium, 2006), pp. 71–96, p. 80.
- 7 William Warner, *Albions England* [1612] (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971), p. 294.
- 8 Roy Eriksen, “Marlowe and Company in Barnfield’s *Greene’s Funeralls* (1594),” *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12.2 (2013): 71–80, p. 76.
- 9 See for instance Joan Pong Linton, *The Romance of the New World: Gender and the Literary Formations of English Colonialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 10.
- 10 This was brilliantly illustrated in the 2017 Royal Shakespeare Company production by covering the stage with sand, so that characters were constantly confronted with footprints made by people they had not seen.
- 11 David Beers Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith (1513–1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89.4 (December 1946): 543–60, p. 547.
- 12 Christopher Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), 2.1.79.
- 13 See “Tamburlaine and Julius Caesar,” chapter three of my *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
- 14 Virgil, *The Aeneid*, translated by W. F. Jackson Knight (London: Harmondsworth, 1956), p. 41.
- 15 Emma Buckley, “‘Live false Aeneas!’: Marlowe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and the Limits of Translation,” *Classical Reception Journal* 3.2 (2011): 129–47, p. 130.
- 16 Samuel Harding, *Sicily and Naples, or, The Fatall Vnion* (Oxford: printed by William Turner, 1640), 3.7.
- 17 As Timothy D. Crowley observes, “The play affirms that whatever Aeneas may do or not do on stage, he will ultimately become ‘Aeneas’ at least insofar as he leaves Carthage for Italy” (“Arms and the Boy: Marlowe’s Aeneas and the Parody of Imitation in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*,” *English Literary Renaissance* 38.3 [2008]: 408–38, pp. 430–31).
- 18 See for instance Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe’s Counterfeit Profession* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 105.
- 19 Jennifer M. Caro-Barnes, “Marlowe’s Tribute to His Queen, in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.” Online: <http://www.uta.edu/english/ees/carro-barnes.html>.
- 20 Christopher Marlowe, *The Massacre at Paris*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), Scene 2, 40.
- 21 Crowley, “Arms and the Boy,” p. 419.

- 22 For a full account of the so-called tomb of Virgil and an indication of what was known about it in Marlowe's England, see J. B. Trapp, "The Grave of Vergil," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 47 (1984): 1–31.
- 23 Virgil, *Aeneid*, pp. 12 and 144.
- 24 Pace Patrick Cheney's suggestion that Edward III calling for his funeral robes "recalls Dido's directive to Aeneas at the beginning of Marlowe's dramatic career" (Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*, p. 173).
- 25 Christopher Marlowe, *Edward II*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), 1.4.97.
- 26 Warner, *Albions England*, p. 68.
- 27 Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*, p. 90.
- 28 Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, translated by Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), p. 55.
- 29 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, translated by Mary M. Innes (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), pp. 77 and 80.
- 30 Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*, pp. 164–65.
- 31 Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great, Part One*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), 3.3.152–53.
- 32 See Robert A. H. Smith, "Doctor Faustus and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*," *The Review of English Studies* 43.171 (August 1992): 395–97.
- 33 William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, edited by Agnes Latham (London: Methuen, 1975), 2.7.1–2.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 2

Aeneas and the Voyagers

Marlowe's scepticism about Aeneas, and by implication too about the colonial enterprise which he was so often seen as authorising, was influential. I turn now to a group of texts which share three common characteristics: all are in various ways predicated on and intervene in the expansionist drive to export Englishness to colonies or enclaves overseas; all in one way or another recall or echo the story of the *translatio imperii*, usually with specific reference to the figure of Aeneas; and all adapt or appropriate Marlowe (and sometimes Shakespeare too). These plays include Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* (1631), Day, Rowley, and Wilkins's *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), (Heywood's?) *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (ca. 1596), Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (ca. 1588), Henry Burnell's *Landgartha* (1641), and Dabridgcourt Belchier's *Hans Beer-Pot* (1618), a little-known text but one which I think is of considerable interest, and to which I shall therefore devote the bulk of the discussion. I shall argue that all these plays interrogate the foundationality of that originary sea-voyager Aeneas to English myths of empire and probe the troublesome ambiguity of the template he embodies and implies, and that they do so in ways which recall one or both of two texts by Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Tamburlaine*. David McInnis, noting that "Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* plays (1587, 1588), if not the first exotic voyage dramas, were certainly the most influential and successful of the early exponents of the form," declares that "Marlovian desire and Faustian curiosity left an indelible print on subsequent voyage drama of the early modern stage."¹ *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, which centres on Aeneas's landfall in Africa on his way to Rome, told a story which was of immense importance to English ideas about colonialism because Aeneas is the *ur*-coloniser, the man who carried the cultural flame of Troy and lit it in Rome, from whence his great-grandson Brutus supposedly bore it to Britain. *Tamburlaine*, whom critics have read in terms of Hakluyt in general and of the Muscovy Company in particular,² offers an inverted picture of the English colonial enterprise in which conquered peoples are treated with a brutality which the English practised but preferred to displace rhetorically onto the Spanish and in which the trajectory is *to* not *from* "the British shore."³ Together, these twin narratives of classical authorisation and brutal conquest summed up both the theory and practice of colonialism, and set the terms of the cultural conversation in which my chosen texts participate.

Of Marlowe's two heroes, it might well appear that *Tamburlaine*, who openly craves world domination, would be the more obviously useful to discourses of colonialism, but it was in fact Aeneas who in some ways spoke more

urgently to the immediate concerns of the English colonial enterprise. A principal question implicit in all texts about colonies concerned who should do the colonising. The first governor of Jamestown, Lord Delawarr, trod a wary line between personal rule and a strictly limited nod at electoral representation because he was extremely anxious about the calibre of the colonists at his disposal, who included

not an hundred or two of deboisht hands, dropt forth by yeare after yeare, with penury and leysure, ill provided for before they come, and worse governed when they are heere, men of such distempered bodies and infected mindes, whome no examples dayly before their eyes, eithre of goodnes or punishment, can deterr from their habituall impieties, or terrifie from a shamefull death, that must be the carpenters and workers in this so glorious a building.

Delawarr therefore counselled that in the future a different sort of emigrant should be included:

Nor would I have it conceived that we would exclude altogether gentlemen, and such whose breeding never knew what a daye's labour meant, for even to such, this cuntry I doubt not but will give likewise excellent satisfaction, especially to the better and stayed spirritts; for he amongst us that cannot digg, use the square, nor practise the ax and chissle, yet he shall find how to imply the force of knowledge, the exercise of counsell, and the operation and power of his best breeding and quallitie.⁴

In fact, Mark Netzloff observes that “the proportion of gentlemen in Virginia, who were by definition excluded from labor, exceeded that of England by six times.”⁵ One very striking model for a man who could not dig personally but could plan and direct might be Aeneas, for in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, at the opening of 5.1, a stage direction is to be found: “Enter Aeneas, with a paper in his hand, drawing the platform of the city,” that is the city which he had been specifically directed to found in Rome but which he now briefly plans to erect in Carthage.⁶ We can learn from David Scott Wilson-Okamura that Marlowe is pointedly departing here from the contemporary tradition which had it that *Dido*, rather than Aeneas, was a builder: “Davies and Stanyhurst admire Dido because she was a builder, Carthage because it was industrious . . . When, however, Dido falls in love with Aeneas, she stops building.”⁷ Marlowe clearly draws on this idea, but recasts it to throw emphasis on the idea of the skilled, gentlemanly male coloniser of the kind whom Delawarr advocates, and of whom he himself had indirect experience given the sojourn in Roanoke of Thomas Hariot, whose name is coupled with Marlowe’s in the Baines Note.

Nor was this the only respect in which Aeneas might form a useful template for England’s colonising activities. Traditionally land was gendered feminine, to be husbanded by men, in discourses often borrowed from the classical.

When Sir Thomas Smith advised his son to build a city in Ireland he suggested that it should be called Elizabetha,⁸ and Virginia too was in essence named after Elizabeth in her capacity as Virgin Queen. Marlowe might be seen as drawing attention to the feminisation of land in the title of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Previous treatments of the story, such as Edward Halliwell's 1564 play and William Gager's 1583 one, had been called simply *Dido*, but Marlowe's is specifically and unusually *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, and the most famous classical mention of Carthage, Cato's "Carthago delenda est," serves as an unforgettable reminder that the name Carthage was gendered feminine and helps to boost the play's already strong hints of a parallel between Dido and Elizabeth. The play itself, though, offers a rather different model of nomenclature in which land is actually gendered masculine:

Cloanthus. Let it be termed "Aenea," by your name.

Sergestus. Rather "Ascania," by your little son.

Aeneas. Nay, I will have it called "Anchisaeon,"

Of my old father's name.

(5.1.20–24)

Tamburlaine, too, proposes to call "the provinces, cities and towns / After my name and thine, Zenocrate" (Part One, 4.4.85–86), which again proposes that land might be gendered either masculine or feminine. I do not suggest that we have here a direct precedent for the eventual naming of Jamestown, but this is a moment which does show the extent to which *Dido, Queen of Carthage* has its finger on the pulse of urgently contemporary debates about the practice and protocols of colonialism.

The reason Aeneas is in Carthage in the first place is that he has been wrecked and thus separated from the "wooden walls" (1.1.67) of his ship. All journeys of colonisation started at sea, and a ship, as the opening scene of *The Tempest* shows us, offered a particularly suggestive location for examining issues of government and rule. A ship emblematises its country of origin, as is made clear in *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, where much of scene 16 is taken up with the definition of a wreck, with Vernon and the ship's Master insisting that their temporary absence from it does not mean that the Lantado can proclaim their ship a wreck because as long as an Englishman is technically on board, the ship remains English.⁹ Ships also, however, took Englishmen to new environments in which the very idea of Englishness might be radically unsettled, since as Mary Floyd Wilson observes, "The environment—whether that meant the air, temperature, diet, and terrain, or the effects of education, rhetoric, or fashion—necessarily produced and destabilized early modern English selves."¹⁰ In the face of this threatening sense of destabilisation, allusion to the classical

past could provide a welcome and comforting antidote. In Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West*, for instance, the voyage of Bess Bridges's ship the *Negro* brings to the surface a previously unsuspected classicism in the world of the play when Bess says to Mullisheg,

Mighty Prince,
If you desire to see me beat my brest,
Poure forth a river of increasing teares,
Then you may urge me to that sad discourse.¹¹

Bess here closely parallels the preamble to Aeneas's tale to Dido, "Infandum regina iubes renovare dolorem" ("O queen, you bid [me] renew an unspeakable grief"), and the Virgilian echo is reinforced when Spencer, thinking that Bess has turned against him, laments that "I could be a new Sinon and betray / A second Troy, rather then suffer this" (Part Two, sig. L4r). Both Bess and Spencer are discussing their own emotions and identities, and both find the tale of Troy to be a useful aid in articulating this sense of self. This proves though to be a contested discourse of which the English by no means have a monopoly, for Mullisheg too speaks of "Nestor" (Part Two, sig. C3r), "Priam" and "Hellen" (sig. C3v), positioning himself as the Trojan and the English Bess as the Greek Helen. The story of Aeneas may be a potent icon of cultural and genealogical authority, but it is troublingly unclear who owns it.

The same cultural contest surfaces in other plays too, echoing the ways in which early modern Greece was poised uneasily on the edge of Christendom. In *The Battle of Alcazar* Abdelmelec calls the troops of the Bashaw "Picked soldiers comparable to the guard / Of Myrmidons that kept Achilles's tent,"¹² and in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* the Sophy himself intervenes in the struggle to map the modern world onto classically-authorised paradigms when he says to one of the three brothers,

Late Sherley knight, now Lord Ambassador,
To make a league 'twixt us and Christendom
For furtherance of sharp war against the Turk,
I'll send thee forth as rich as ever went
The proudest Trojan to a Grecian's tent.¹³

If the Sophy is in a position to furnish Sherley as a Trojan he himself is presumably in some sense to be identified as a Trojan, and it was certainly common knowledge that historically Troy was located in Asia, even if the idea of a continuity between ancient Trojans and contemporary Asiatics was culturally unpalatable. Moreover, in Anthony Nixon's 1607 prose pamphlet *The Three English Brothers* we are told how "the cousin Germaine to the King of Persia (beeing the widowe of a Duke in

that countrey) entred into such liking of his worthinesse, as shee resolved (with Andromache) to rest her whole estate vpon his prowess.”¹⁴ A royal Persian widow here has no trouble in identifying herself with a royal Trojan one.

It was however possible to develop a different and, to the English colonising mind, more acceptable equation by connecting the story of Aeneas not simply to Virgil but to a more recent literary paradigm which was itself inflected by the story of Aeneas. All the plays I have mentioned (and others too) are steeped in Marlovian memories, in ways which work to build an association not just with colonising classical-style heroes in general but specifically with colonising classical-style heroes as remembered by and mediated through Marlowe. It is not however Marlowe’s Aeneas himself who is typically evoked, but Tamburlaine, and without the negative inflections which attach to Aeneas as imagined by Marlowe. Martin Wiggins says of Captain Thomas Stukeley that “Like one of Marlowe’s heroes, he masters fortune by positive, aggressive action,”¹⁵ and Tom Rutter too points out the widespread debt to Marlowe in the Stukeley plays.¹⁶ Brian Lockey argues that, as was the case with Drake, “Early in his career Stukeley’s life was also subsumed into the national narrative,” but that “Posthumous evaluations of Stukeley’s contribution to the English national project are far less sanguine”; in particular, he says of the two Stukeley plays that “Both portrayals refuse Stukeley a settled role within the narrative of emerging English identity, neither presenting him as exclusively English nor as the typical traitor to the English crown who had severed any relationship to his native country . . . In fact, Stukeley’s Englishness is central to these plays, for the more Stukeley distances himself from his native loyalty to the English sovereign, the more his English identity is stressed,” though he notes of Peele’s Stukeley that “his allegiance to ‘emperey’ is not attached to England or to any other particular kingdom.”¹⁷ Stukeley’s Tamburlainian identity is part of this tension, for Tamburlaine, the Scythian in the mirror, was similarly both alien and yet a model for young Englishmen emulous of military success.

In *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* Sir Thomas Sherley tells the Great Turk that he will be “(as sometimes were thy ancestors) / Fed in a cage and dragged at conqueror’s heels” (12.117–18), an unmistakable reference to *Tamburlaine*. In *The Battle of Alcazar*, Muly Mahamet actually says “Convey Tamburlaine into our Afric here, / To chastise and to menace lawful kings” (1.2.35–36), and Stukeley demands,

Why should not I then look to be a king?
I am the Marquess now of Ireland made
And will be shortly King of Ireland.
King of a mole-hill had I rather be

Than the richest subject of a monarchy.
 Huff it, brave mind, and never cease t'aspire,
 Before thou reign sole king of thy desire.
 (2.2.78–82)

This clearly evokes Tamburlaine's belief in "aspiring minds" and the delights of "The sweet fruition of an earthly crown" (Part One, 2.7.20 and 29). Equally Sebastian speaks of "Spain, where all the traitors dance" (2.2.120), recalling Theridamas's "Nigra Silva, where the devils dance" (Part Two, 1.3.212) and Don de Meneses says Sebastian "storms as great Achilles erst" (3.3.40); Tamburlaine too is compared to Achilles (Part One, 2.1.24). In *The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley*, Stukeley proclaims that "Were it my fortune could exceed the clouds, / Yet would I bear a mind surmounting that" (5.118–19) and "I must have honour, honour is the thing / Stukeley doth thirst for" (6.48–50). Like Tamburlaine, too, Stukeley shows himself ignorant of the laws of war when he challenges the governor of a garrison town to a duel (10.19–21) and "scorn[s] to be controlled / Of any man that's meaner than a king" (11.95–96), echoing Tamburlaine's "Is it not passing brave to be a king / 'And ride in triumph through Persepolis'?" (Part One, 2.5.53–54). Above all, this, like the world of *Tamburlaine*, is a world of *realpolitik*: when Philip declares that "The right is in Molocco" (14.32) Botellio blandly explains that Sebastian is not interested in right but does this "for honour's sake" (14.45), before adding as a bit of an afterthought that he also aims to evangelise Morocco.

In all these plays, then, Tamburlaine serves as an image of unqualified aspiration and ambition, but he also serves to anchor the *translatio imperii* firmly to England by connecting the narrative of the voyaging hero specifically to Marlowe. Another way of doing this is to evoke not only Aeneas but also Dido, from whom Marlowe's play takes its name. In *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, a suggestive exchange between the Sophy's Niece and her maid Dalibra positions the Niece as Dido and thus allows Robert Sherley to assume unchallenged the cultural mantle of Troy:

Dalibra. What, dreaming, madam?
Niece. Yes, and my dream was of the wandering knight, Aeneas.
Dalibra. O, the true Trojan.
Niece. Yet he played false play with the kind-hearted queen of Carthage.
 (3.118–23)¹⁸

Bernadette Andrea observes that there is some historical warrant for this interest in the ancient world, for the "real" "Niece," the historical Lady Sherley, "chose to be remembered as an Amazon in her funeral inscription: 'Theresia Samsonia Amazonitis, Sampsuiffi Circassiae Principis filia,'"¹⁹ but Laurence Publicover

reads it more generally as evidence for the fact that “The tale of Dido and Aeneas, like that of Jason’s quest for the Golden Fleece, is a continual reference for early modern English drama concerned with the wider world,” and he also notes that one of the play’s strategies is “to align the Sherleys’ actions with those of previously staged plays,” including *Tamburlaine*.²⁰

In the case of both *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* and *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, non-English characters may seek to appropriate the cultural authority of Troy, but ultimately an English character wrests it back (Dalibra may be Persian, but she will adopt an English identity on her marriage). The point is underlined even more sharply in *The Battle of Alcazar*, where there is a sustained insistence on the extent to which it is English (and to a lesser extent British) characters who are to be identified with Aeneas, and again mention of Dido is used to achieve this. The Irish bishop notes that he and his companions were *en route* for Ireland when, Aeneas-like, they got lost and ended up in Africa, the home of Dido (2.2.12–21). The Prologue to the fifth act spells out the similarity even more clearly when we hear of how “At last descendeth Fame, as Iris / To finish fainting Dido’s dying life” (9–10) before in his own dying speech Stukeley recalls how he embarked at Ostia (5.1.162), the port of Rome, from which we can assume that Aeneas’s great-grandson Brutus fled from Rome on his way to found Britain.

Allusion to Marlowe can however complicate narratives as well as support them. Another play to couple Marlovian texts and colonial exploration is Robert Daborne’s *A Christian Turned Turk*.²¹ Jane Hwang Degenhardt notes of *A Christian Turned Turk* that “Two contemporary news pamphlets that describe the piratical activities of John Ward (along with another notorious Christian renegade named Simon Dansiker) suggest that the play’s performance joined other ventures aimed at capitalizing on Ward’s popularity,”²² but that the play changes the real story: the Chorus insists that the audience must “Giue patience to our Scoene, which hereto tends, / To shew the world, blacke deeds will haue black ends” (sig. F3r), and the Governor ordains “His monument in brasse wee’le thus ingraue, / Ward sold his country, turn’d Turke, and died a slaue” (sig. I4v). That is not, though, what happened; Degenhardt explains that “the news pamphlets, which do not mention a Muslim love interest, acknowledge that the real-life Ward continues to thief and enjoy a pleasant life of luxury in Tunis even at the time of the play’s performance.”²³ The Tunis of the play is a multicultural hotchpotch. The cast includes a Jew turned Turk; his servant, wife, and sister who seem to be still Jews; Dutch, English, and French pirates; and civic and spiritual officers of Tunis (the governor and mufti). The play works hard to insist on a rigorous distinction between the Christian and the Turk of its title, but that distinction is consistently undermined. Location is established

when Gallop tells us “’Tis not ten leagues / To Tunis, where entered, we are as safe / As in a tower of brass” (Scene 3, 74–75); in other plays, as I have explored elsewhere, it is *England* which is imagined as walled with brass.²⁴ An elaborate conversion ceremony is staged for Ward involving priests and wine, which suggests Catholicism rather than Islam, and the Prologue “To the Knowing Reader” provocatively deploys the language of contemporary Catholicism when it speaks of “this oppressed and much martyred tragedy” and goes on “I write this, led by no mercenary hopes to share in their fortunes, which hath so put out some’s eyes, that measuring others’ sight by their own weaknesses gave her out for blind”; the assertion that “I live under too safe a law to fear the stab of a knowing boy” (pp. 151–52) looks even more pointed, as if it referred to some specific incident. Ward is reluctant “to abjure / My name—and the belief my ancestors / Left to my being!” (Scene 7, 74–76), but that is in fact what all English Protestants had already done, since their faith was not the same as that of their grandparents.

Ward himself sounds like nothing so much as Tamburlaine:

Injurious heaven, that with so excellent matter
As is our soul, didst mingle this base mould,
So frail a substance earth, as if thou hadst framed man
The subject of thy laughter, gav’st him a spirit
Free, unbounded, whose fiery temper breaks
Through all the clouds of danger, dares even heaven.

(Scene 3, 4–9)

He certainly has a Tamburlainian level of ambition:

The sway of things
Belongs to him dares most. Such should be kings,
And such am I. What Nature in my birth
Denied me, Fortune supplies.

(Scene 3, 83–86)

Tamburlaine, though, is not the only play informing and predicting the narrative. When Ward asks of Francisco “What’s his weapon?” (Scene 4, 52) he is told “His weapons are sword and dagger” (Scene 4, 54), potentially glancing at Hamlet’s “That’s two of his weapons,”²⁵ and Alizia in disguise as Fidelio says of conversion, “The very thought whereof methinks should turn / Your hair to quills of porcupines” (Scene 7, 197–98), echoing the Ghost. In addition, Rabshake says “I have seen the play of Pedringano, sir” (Scene 16, 128), both evoking *The Spanish Tragedy* and also exactly foreshadowing what is about to happen.

Allegiances and affiliations become particularly muddled when it comes to the play's Jewish characters. Benwash echoes one stage Jew, Shylock, when he exclaims "My bags, my obligations, my wife!" (Scene 11, 4) and Dansiker recalls another, Marlowe's Barabbas, when he says his intention

was to have conveyed
This Jew from hence, have made a massacre
Of the whole town, dashed out the miscreant brains
Of your young infidels.

(Scene 16, 221–24)

Dansiker is not himself a Jew, but Benwash was central to his plot:

The renegado Jew,
You know, gives free and open entertain
To all of our profession. In some out-house of his
I will convey a pot of wildfire to it.
I'll make a train of match, that at three hours
Shall give it fire.

(Scene 5, 37–42)

The parallel is complete when Dansiker's body is taken to the same place as the Jew's (Scene 16, 237–38), underlining the extent to which the multiculturalism of *The Jew of Malta*, and its blurring of the distinctions between the various peoples of the book, obtains here too. Whatever differences there may appear to be between members of different faiths are purely superficial, and if anything the moral high ground is claimed by the non-Christian characters. The Jew accuses Gallop "Insatiate goat, thou thinkst our wives are such, / As are your holy sisters" (Scene 6, 420–21) and Rabshake is scornful of the idea of conversion because "I turn Christian? They shall have more charity amongst 'em first!" (Scene 6, 24–25); he is shown to have a point when we hear that Dansiker is pardoned by Henri IV but then cannot return to France once Henri has been assassinated by a religious fanatic. By the end of the play it is impossible to distinguish between religions: Gallop calls the Turkish Voada, whose sister is married to a Jew, "an Eve" (Scene 6, 340), and Voada is in any case a name normally associated with ancient British women rather than with Turkish ones (it is a form of Boadicea and is found in R. A.'s play *The Valiant Welshman*). Marlovian memories work here to consistently undermine any secure sense of religious or national difference, and to erode all suggestion that anyone might have any justification for conquering anyone else.

The most sustained and systematic use of Marlovian memories to bolster a sense of an English colonial identity comes in a very different context from either Tunis or Morocco, and in this case I want to argue that the aggressive figure

of Tamburlaine acts as the armed guard to enforce rather than undermine the authority of Aeneas as paradigm for English colonial identities. In Dabridgcourt Belchier's *Hans Beer-Pot his inuisible comedie, of see me, and see me not* (1618),²⁶ the backdrop is that of the "cautionary towns" held by the English in the Netherlands as part of their campaign to assist the Protestant Dutch against their Catholic Spanish overlords and occupiers; as the Earl of Essex explained in his *Apology*, "her Maiestie hath bestowed in the action in the Low Countries at the least 4 millions of crownes, and shee hath in pawne for the debt which the states owe~ her, the townes of Flushing and the Brill."²⁷ In its capacity as effectively a little bit of England abroad, Flushing in particular became the scene of several notable events in English history (not least the arrest for coining of Marlowe himself), and the home of a community demonstrating many of the characteristic features of modern expatriate life, although not, it seems, a habitual contempt for the "natives," whose cultural difference was generally felt to confine itself to the not unappealing forms of drinking a lot of alcohol and eating a lot of butter. (The common appellation of the Dutch as "butter-boxes" is well attested in Renaissance drama.) Marjorie Rubright argues that in Renaissance drama in general "The Low Countries is at once represented as an extension of London's sexual and commercial geographies and as a space beyond home and homeland" and that "imagining and representing London involved imagining and representing the Low Countries."²⁸ Flushing and other such towns also, however, provided an unexpectedly potent stimulus not only for reflection on England but also for investigation of a question of considerable interest to the early modern English: the supposed classical origins of their country, what if anything those really meant to contemporary English senses of self, and the extent to which literature in general and plays in particular were involved in forming and maintaining those senses of self.

Despite their relative nearness to home and an apparently general sense that the Dutch were worth fighting for, the cautionary towns did not enjoy the best of reputations: in 1592 the imprisoned Charles Chester, pleading with Robert Cecil to release him, begged pitifully, "If I am grievous in your honour's hearing or sight let me bannished in the Brill, Flushing, Lincolnshire or in the worst place of her Majesty's dominions, or to some vile war without pay, so I am not left in this cage of misery,"²⁹ and Arthur Golding in *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe* speaks of "the abilitie of the towne of Flushing (whiche is none of the greatest)."³⁰ In 1605 one hundred and fifty members of the lawless Border clan of Graham were deported there, though most did not stay long.³¹ In Marston's *The Malcontent* Passarello says of Maquerelle, "Faith, I was wont to salute her as our English women are at their

first landing in Flushing: I would call her whore”; the Revels editor’s note says “Flushing was the most famous English garrison-town of the period and the usual landing-place for volunteers for the Dutch war; hence no doubt the tone of the place, and the expectations formed about women who went there.”³² In another play, *Arden of Faversham*, the villainous Black Will, who has already recalled his time at Boulogne in the service of Henry VIII, flees to Flushing in the hope of escaping justice, but is ultimately hanged there (though it is not made clear in the play whether this is for his murder of Arden in Kent or for a different crime committed in Flushing itself, so we cannot be quite sure that Flushing might never offer a safe haven for fugitives from English justice).³³

Hans Beer-Pot does not name its setting but certainly takes place in the Netherlands, whether in Flushing or in Utrecht, where Belchier himself served. From it we get a clear sense of such a territory’s distinctive identity, situated as it was in a war zone and potentially subject to recapture and sacking. For all its disingenuous introduction of itself as nothing more than a play “acted . . . by an honest company of Health-Drinkers,” *Hans Beer-Pot* is in fact an unexpectedly sophisticated piece of work which responds powerfully to this sense of threat and danger. I want to suggest that it uses both Marlowe and Shakespeare to do so, and that it boosts the audience’s sense of the importance of the cautionary towns by connecting them to Greece. In the dedication to Sir John Ogle, Belchier cheerfully declares that “Mine honoured Lord, I here present vnto your view, nor Comedie, nor Tragedie, as wanting first the iust number of Speakers: Secundarily, those parts or Acts it should haue, which should bee at the least fiue” (sig. A3r [first of the two so numbered]). There is a touch of the Ciceronian here in the statement which acknowledges even as it disavows, and certainly one is left in no doubt that any deviations from standard dramaturgical practice are in fact attributable to choice rather than to ignorance. Moreover, Belchier turns on its head the usual disclaimer of topicality or unduly pointed specificity by briskly advising that “If any man thinkes himselfe touched in any thing that is amisse, let him endeauour by Gods helpe to amend it” (sigs A3r–v [first of the two so numbered]), transferring responsibility squarely onto the shoulders of the reader or audience member and implicitly aligning himself with the homiletically-driven aesthetic of Jonson in which drama is in itself a civilising force. A similar assigning of responsibility to the reader underlies his remark that “And for the names which are significant, if you take them according to their Dialect, as lesse materiall, I leaue your Lordship, at your leasure to guesse at” (sig. A3v [second of the two so numbered]); this is no spoonfeeding mode of dramaturgy but a self-consciously rough and ready one, summoning the reader to a state of alertness and self-sufficiency which chimes well with the ethos of a town on guard.

Belchier feels himself able to expect this much from his readers because he is acutely aware of the lifelong effects of a good education, and the extent to which an early initiation into literary cultures can enable the ongoing maintenance of a selfhood deliberately crafted as civilised, even in circumstances which may not be conducive to that. When the Sergeant surprises his interlocutors by his erudition he says simply “I doe remember what I learn’t at Schoole / In Ouid” (sig. C4v), and Hanneke says to Cornelius of their son “you did your part / To giue him learning, which will make him know / The good from euill” (sig. B4v): an early grounding lays the foundation of a life well lived and of the maintenance of core values even when amongst those who do not share them. As a result of such educations the denizens of this rather rough garrison town show themselves to have a surprisingly fine ear for poetry: when the sergeant recites what he claims are verses he has composed, Younker Harmans is quick to spot the attempted plagiarism, remarking dismissively that the sergeant

Did neere make that, that famous learned Knight,
Sir Philip Sidney, Scholers, souldiers pride
 Was his, not yours.

(sig. D1r)

Obviously Sidney was something of a local hero in Flushing and presumably by extension in the Netherlands in general, so his works might be particularly recognisable, but he is not the only writer who seems to be remembered by the characters in the play. Hans at one point sings

*As I went to Walsingham,
 To that holy Land,
 Met I with an olde balde Mare,
 By the way as I came.*

(sig. B3r)

Later, he says “he lookt so reechilie, / Like Bacon hanging on the Chimnies roofe” (sig. C3v). The famous Walsingham ballad is also echoed by Ophelia in *Hamlet*,³⁴ and “reechy” is Hamlet’s term for the kisses his uncle gives his mother (3.4.186); it might even be possible to hear in Younker Harmans’s description of Sidney as “*Sir Philip Sidney*, Scholers, souldiers pride” an echo of Ophelia’s description of Hamlet as having “The courtier’s, soldier’s, scholar’s, eye, tongue, sword” (3.1.153). Another Shakespeare play appears to be evoked when Younker Harmans says,

Each body well composde, it doth consist
 Of diuers members, framde by art, yet naturall;

The body where are lodge the chieftest parts,
 I liken it vnto the Infanterie;
 The exterior parts to the Cauallerie.
 The heart commaunds, the members execute;
 So they to vs, not we to them giue way.

(sigs E3r–v)

This recalls Menenius's fable of the body in *Coriolanus*, albeit given a distinctive slant in support of the play's sustained discussion of the differences between horsemen and foot soldiers.

Shakespeare is not, though, always useful. Inevitably in an expat community myths about "the old country" spring up, and on one occasion we actually catch that happening:

Pasquil.

I haue no manners: had I such an one
 As Amptill is, to which seuen Parkes belong,
 I would keepe thee to be my worships foole.

Hans.

Why? where is Amptill.

Pas.

In the Fayery land.
 Where men eate mutton, pigge, and goose, and beefe,
 Rabbets and chickens, partridge, pheasants, quailles,
 And drinke rich wine, that France or Spaine sends in,
 And strong March Beere, of fiue or sixe yeeres old,

(sigs D3v–D4r)

Pasquil's apparently throwaway pun on "manners" and "manors" inaugurates a bizarre fantasy sequence in which Ampthill in Bedfordshire becomes the improbable location of the land of milk and honey. However, it could be that this association is introduced to mask another, because as Shakespeare and Fletcher's *Henry VIII* reminds us, Ampthill was where Catherine of Aragon was banished to,³⁵ so telling a new story about it might be a way of overwriting an image of England as troubled and divided and presenting it instead as a home of plenitude. Here, a Shakespearean memory may actually need to be shed.

More tantalisingly, there seem to be faint but suggestive indications of an interest in Marlowe, and Marlovian memories do, I think, prove useful to the play's ideological projects. When Hans asks "But whats Meander? man, or mayde, or wife," Pasquil says, "A riuer foole, didst neuer see a play" (sig. D3r). On the face of it this appears to be a joke about Hans's ignorance, but could it also be a joke about Pasquil's? General geography could inform anyone that Meander was the name of a river, but only a play could tell you that it was also that of a character in

Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, where there are sufficient hints about the potentially homoerotic nature of the relationship between Meander and Mycetes to give a rather sharp point to the seemingly innocent question about whether he is "man, or mayde, or wife." *Tamburlaine* also anachronistically mentions the battle of Varna, which, as we shall shortly see, Younker Harmans discusses at length. Finally, when Hanneke says "Away you Knaue, / Take that Dutch shilling, drinke mongst your Comrades" (sig. B3r) it is tempting to hear an echo of the occasion on which Marlowe had been arrested in Flushing and brought before Sir Robert Sidney on suspicion of minting a fake Dutch shilling.³⁶ I have been arguing implicitly here and explicitly elsewhere that Marlowe's plays are interested in the connection between shifting geographical location and nationhood,³⁷ and that his exploration of the English colonial endeavour uses the image of Trojans to examine whether Englishness can survive if transplanted abroad; both these concerns chime with what Belchier is exploring in this play.

The play's interest in the ways in which identity is discursively constructed through memories of texts arises partly because of the status of this garrison town as a community of expats, where the fundamental difference proves not to be between English and Dutch but between those who have seen England and those who have not. The Dutch but highly Anglophile Cornelius in particular, whose daughter is married to an English merchant, likes

To thinke vpon the times forepast, I saw
 In *Englands* Court so famous and renowmde
 Of great *Elizaes* blessed memory.
 That ayded so these troubled Netherlands
 With men and money; still oh, oh still me thinkes
 I see those Worthies marching on earthes stage;
 The famous *Essex*, *Norreis*, *Sidney* too,
 And wisest *Uere*, that held *Ostend* so long.

(sig. B4r)

Cornelius in the seventeenth century strikes the unfailing note of the London taxi driver in the twenty-first as he seeks to impress a fare: "I had that Earl of Essex in the back of my cab once." Rather less plausibly, Cornelius also claims that "Twas strange to see a younker once but drunke / In *Englands* Kingdome, when I liued there" (sig. B4r), and takes delight in English imports, saying to his English son-in-law Garland,

To morrow I enuite you to my house
 To eate some venison, here tis nouelty;
 It came from England, baked in Rye paste.

(sig. F3r)

Cornelius himself may be Dutch, but his values, his memories, and even what he eats are English. For him, England is clearly the metropole.

The English garrison towns in the Netherlands, by contrast, are repeatedly equated with the edge of civilisation. During the course of the play, Younger Harmans tells two long stories, both of which are about a famous historic battle whose outcome impacted on the whole of Christendom. Ostensibly these are adduced as evidence in a debate about whether infantry or cavalry is superior, but each also registers a rather different concern. The first describes

those three dayes cruell fight
 Huniades maintaind gainst mighty Amurath
 The second: in Cossoas fatall plaines.
 He kept an hill with thirty thousand men;
 Ten thousand horse, the rest were all on foot
 Against the Turkes that lay like Grashoppers,
 Filling those plaines, eight miles in compasse round:
 This little handfull, roulde and turnde about,
 On that hils top in strong and close array,
 Flamde like a Candle mongst a world of flyes,
 That burnt themselues, ere they could put it out:
 At length with trauell tyrde, with blows & wounds
 All rent and torne, choakt vp with smoake & stench
 Of bodies dead: match, poulder, bullets spent
 This light did glimmer, flasht, and so went out.

(sig. E3v)

This describes the Turkish victory at the Battle of Kosovo in 1448, which was seen as a landmark defeat for Christendom in general and for the frontier territory of Hungary in particular, and as enabling the seemingly relentless march of the Ottoman Empire into Europe. However, the extended simile of the candle also makes it stand for more than this, as the gallant band of Jan Hunyadi, the White Knight of Wallachia, becomes a richly emblematic beacon of light and hope against an enemy as numerous but also as contemptible as grasshoppers or flies.³⁸ The light that “did glimmer, flasht, and so went out” thus becomes the flame of civilisation *per se* rather than simply an individual manifestation of it, as the imagery touches for a moment on the grandeur of myth or of epic before itself flickering out again.

Events in Hungary might seem a long way away from those in either England or the Netherlands, but in fact the Ottoman campaign in Hungary in 1566 had received as much public attention in England as the Siege of Malta had the year before, leading the two indeed to become in some sense coupled, since the attack on Hungary

was seen by many observers as a consequence of the previous year's defeat, the "turke" "beyng inflamed with malice and desyre of vengeance." An order of service that follows those of the previous year word for word confirms the continuity.³⁹

Moreover, Philip Sidney had visited Hungary and expressly mentions hearing stories of the past there: "In Hungary I have seen it the manner at all feasts, and other such meetings, to have songs of their ancestors' valour, which that right soldierlike nation think the chiefest kindlers of brave courage."⁴⁰ It is perhaps just conceivable, then, that the play's explicit evocation of Sidney is coupled with evocation of something he had been heard to talk about, but it is in any case clear that there is a particular appropriateness in telling this story in this setting because there is an obvious parallel between the beleaguered Christians at Kosovo and the beleaguered Protestants of the garrison towns.

Younker Harmans's second narrative also features Jan Hunyadi, and it too speaks to its setting. Asked to explain what happened at the Battle of Varna, Younker Harmans recounts how

The Cardinall *Iulian* mooude this lucklesse Warre,
 Causing the King and States of Hungarie
 To breake their truce; which they had solemne sworne;
 The Pope dispenc't with them, so would not God,
 If he be wnesse: he wils faith be kept
 Without exception, be it with Infidels,
 As this was here; the sequell proude it true,
 In manner thus: *Huniades* that mannadgde all,
 Dislikte this warre: yet *Vladislaus*
 This youthfull King, eggde on by *Iulian*,
 Would needs breake faith with mighty *Amurath*,
 And neere to *Varna* both their armies met,
 Where he so plac't his battels as a Lake,
 Flanckt the left side; a wood was on the reere:
 And on the right hand all their waggons went:
 Had they kept so, *Byzantium* had beene ours:
 And Greece once more it had beene Christendome.

(sigs E4v–F1r)

Once again, Christian faces Turk, and is once again defeated, as we catch a glimpse of a moment that changed history. This is a battle which in Harmans's account led directly to the fall of the eastern empire and the final loss of all that had been Rome as well as preventing the recovery of Greece, with the trauma being thus doubled by the severing of the link to the classical past as well as the danger to the Christian present.

The obvious Marlovian memory in this passage is of *Tamburlaine* Part Two, where the Battle of Varna features importantly, but in fact the more closely

analogous moment in his works would be that in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* when Aeneas, describing the Trojan horse, says “O, had it never entered, Troy had stood!” (2.1.172). The rhythms of Aeneas’s lament are closely echoed in “Had they kept so, *Byzantium* had beene ours,” and actually this would be no opportunist comparison but one that casts light on a fundamental characteristic of early modern attempts to maintain an English expatriate identity. In the first place, Belchier would not be the only playwright to connect Marlowe’s narrative of the classical fall of *Troy* to the mediaeval fall of *Greece*. In Henry Burnell’s 1641 play *Landgartha*, which clearly remembers Marlowe when the king of Sweland declares that “Religion is but a toy, and first invented / By politicke states, to keepe fooles in awe,” Landgartha when she weeps at Reyner’s departure becomes a new Dido (especially since he then takes a second wife as Aeneas did) and Phoebus prophesies that in the future her son

shall (by’s right) enjoy
The Land of Danes; and in this place where Troy
Now stands, shal Conquer, and build it againe.
Will also conquer Greece, and there restrayne
Th’impieties of wicked men.⁴¹

The descendant of Trojan Aeneas, then, is the destined liberator of Greece.

In the second place, the idea of a connection to the world of epic lays bare something fundamental to the identity of the English garrison towns in the Netherlands and to the sense of self of the English community living there. Flushing’s myth of origins linked it directly to the classical world: popular etymology derived its Dutch name of Vlissingen from Ulysses, as when Thomas Coryate in *The Odcombian Banquet*, drawing a sustained series of comic comparisons between himself and Ulysses, writes of how

Vlysses in his trauel builded Flushing,
Where *Coryate* ending, or’e the Sea came brushing.⁴²

Elsewhere in the Netherlands, the long siege of Ostend led to the city being known as “the new Troy,” as noted in *The Triumphs of Nassau*, translated into English by William Shute in 1613, where we hear of “their intrenched workes called New Troy”⁴³ (the dedicatee of Belchier’s play, Sir John Ogle, had in 1601 been serving under Sir Francis Vere at the defence of Ostend). There was in fact a general structural association between ancient and modern sieges in that, as James Black notes, “The *Troy Book* illustrations depict ‘incidents’ from the Troy siege, with men in medieval or Renaissance armour using cannon and mortars”;⁴⁴ it is therefore no surprise that Doctor Faustus’s imagination couples the siege of Antwerp and Helen of Troy, and the stories which Younker

Harmans tells are thus ones which had a direct relevance to the place in which he tells them, for in a dizzying realignment of identities the Greece which might still have been part of Christendom becomes the emblem of the classical past, defended by a Huniades whose very name echoes Greek patronymics such as Alciades and Teucrides.

Belchier's play thus throws the spotlight onto the importance of cultural memory in the construction of national identity, as we watch an English-identified community cling on to an English identity by reciting Sidney and by remembering Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the glories of the past. This is a moment when, poised on the edge of empire, identities are threateningly blurred and civilisation itself is at stake; the only remaining point of certain access to it lies in the act of recalling it, and recalling it particularly as it had been mediated through Marlowe in his repeated revisitings of the story of Aeneas. Collectively, then, the plays I have discussed here touch on questions of gender, of choice of appropriate colonists, and of the importance of cultural memory and heritage, and for treatment of all these topics they find in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, either alone or in conjunction with the Tamburlaine plays, a powerful and flexible discourse. More fundamentally, they also allow us to glimpse something of the ongoing cultural importance of both Troy and Greece, and to see how the ancient loss of Troy had been echoed and redoubled by the more recent fall of Greece.

Notes

- 1 David McInnis, *Mind-Travelling and Voyaging in Early Modern Drama* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 50–51.
- 2 See Richard Wilson, “Visible Bullets: *Tamburlaine the Great* and *Ivan the Terrible*,” in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, edited by Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1996), pp. 51–69.
- 3 Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great*, in *The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), Part One, 3.3.259.
- 4 Edward D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London with Letters to and from the First Colony Never Before Printed* (Albany, NY: Munsell, 1869), p. 45.
- 5 Mark Netzloff, *England's Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), pp. 120, 110, and 112.
- 6 Christopher Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays and Poems*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: J. M. Dent, 1999).
- 7 David Scott Wilson-Okamura, “Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare's *Tempest*,” *ELH* 70.3 (Fall 2003): 709–37, pp. 719–20.
- 8 David Beers Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith (1513–1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89.4 (December 1946): 543–60, p. 547.

- 9 Anonymous, *The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley*, in *The Stukeley Plays*, edited by Charles Edelman (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), scene 16.
- 10 Mary Floyd Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 3–4.
- 11 Thomas Heywood, *The Fair Maid of the West* (London: Richard Royston, 1631), sig. H4v.
- 12 George Peele, *The Battle of Alcazar*, in *The Stukeley Plays*, edited by Charles Edelman (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 1.1.15–16.
- 13 John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins, *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, in *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*, edited by Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 2.267–72.
- 14 Anthony Nixon, *The Three English Brothers* (London: John Hodgets, 1607), sig. K4r.
- 15 Martin Wiggins, “Things that Go Bump in the Text: *Captain Thomas Stukeley*,” *PBSA* 98.1 (2004): 5–20, p. 13.
- 16 Tom Rutter, “Marlovian Echoes in the Admiral’s Men Repertory: *Alcazar*, *Stukeley*, *Patient Grissil*,” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1 (Spring 2009): 27–38.
- 17 Brian C. Locky, “Elizabethan Cosmopolitan: Captain Thomas Stukeley in the Court of Dom Sebastian,” *English Literary Renaissance* 40.1 (2010): 3–32, pp. 4 and 11.
- 18 Bernadette Andrea points out that there is similar language to be found in Purchas, who speaks of Sir Robert’s “Ulyssean twentie yeeres travell, and getting both Troies Palladium and Achilles his Armour; as also for Jasonian sowing the Dragons teeth” (“Lady Sherley: The First Persian in England?,” *The Muslim World* 95.2 [April 2005]: 272–95, p. 284).
- 19 Andrea, “Lady Sherley,” p. 287.
- 20 Laurence Publicover, *Dramatic Geography: Romance, Intertextuality, and Cultural Encounter in Early Modern Mediterranean Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 13, 144 and 153.
- 21 Robert Daborne, *A Christian Turned Turk*, in *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England*, edited by Daniel Vitkus (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
- 22 Jane Hwang Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), pp. 14–15.
- 23 Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage*, p. 16.
- 24 Lisa Hopkins, “Profit and Delight? Magic and the Dreams of a Nation,” in *Magical Transformation on the Early modern Stage*, edited by Lisa Hopkins and Helen Ostovich (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 139–51.
- 25 William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, edited by Harold Jenkins (London: Methuen, 1980), 5.2.112.
- 26 Dabridgcourt Belchier, *Hans Beer-Pot his inuisible comedie, of see me, and see me not* (London: Bernard Alsop, 1618).
- 27 Robert Devereux, *An apologie of the Earle of Essex* (London: J. Smethwick?, 1600), sig. D2r.
- 28 Marjorie Rubright, *Doppelgänger Dilemmas: Anglo-Dutch Relations in Early Modern Literature and Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), pp. 2–3.
- 29 “Cecil Papers: July 1592,” *Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House*, vol. 4: 1590–1594 (1892), pp. 216–33. Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=111583>.
- 30 Arthur Golding, *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe* (London: William Ponsonby, 1592), sig. B2v.
- 31 Graham Robb, *The Debatable Land: The Lost World between Scotland and England* (London: Picador, 2018), p. 171.

- 32 John Marston, *The Malcontent*, edited by George Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), 1.1.34–36.
- 33 Anonymous, *Arden of Faversham*, in *Five Elizabethan Tragedies*, edited by A. K. McIlwraith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938), 6.24–25.
- 34 Gary Waller, “An Erasmian Pilgrimage to Walsingham,” *Peregrinations* 2.2. Online: <http://peregrinations.kenyon.edu/vol2-2/current.html>, 2.
- 35 William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *Henry VIII*, edited by A. R. Humphreys (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 4.1.28.
- 36 See Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992), pp. 234–39, for details of this.
- 37 Lisa Hopkins, “Englishmen Abroad: Mobility and Nationhood in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Edward II*,” *English* 59 (Winter 2010): 324–48.
- 38 See Misha Teramura, “The Admiral’s *Vayvode* of 1598,” *Early Theatre* 18.1 (July 2015): 79–99, for the suggestion that Admiral’s play *Vayvode* (1598) was about Hunyadi.
- 39 Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 70.
- 40 Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, edited by R. W. Maslen, 3rd edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 99.
- 41 Henry Burnell, *Landgartha* (Dublin, 1641), sigs B4v and F2v.
- 42 Thomas Coryate, *The Odcombian Banquet* (London: Thomas Thorp, 1611), sig. F4v. The verses by “Iohannes a Grandi-Bosco” which appear in *Coryates Crambe* note that “Compar’d by many th’are to Odysseus” (Thomas Coryate, *Coryates Crambe, or his colwort twice sodden and now serued in with other macaronicke dishes, as the second course to his Crudities*, sig. A3v), and in *The Odcombian banquet* John Davies of Herefordshire calls him “our Brittain-Vlysses” (sig. N3v).
- 43 Jan Jansen Orlens, *The Triumphs of Nassau* . . . , translated by William Shute (London: Adam Islip, 1613), p. 332.
- 44 James Black, “Hamlet hears Marlowe; Shakespeare reads Virgil,” *Renaissance and Reformation* 28.4 (1994): 1–27, p. 23.

Part II: The Ruins of Troy

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 3

***Troilus and Cressida*: Shakespeare's Wooden World**

Of all Shakespeare's plays, *Troilus and Cressida* is arguably the most baffling and troubling. It has characters who are impossible to like, it tells its story in a way so arch that it consistently defies any attempt to take events seriously, and its saturation in the language of venereal disease leaves an unpleasant taste in the mouth. Douglas Cole notes that "What Shakespeare does with Helen is emblematic of what he does with the heroic strain of the Trojan War in general and with the romantic strain of the war-crossed lovers in this love-crossed war, Troilus and Cressida. Figures and events from myth and legend are set forth in a context which distorts whatever values they may have traditionally embodied";¹ indeed, Rob Maslen says of the play that "its chief target is the humanist doctrine of exemplarity."² There is also nothing resembling suspense: Linda Charnes observes that "No other Shakespeare play gives as strong a sense of being over before it has even begun" because "unlike other plays in which historical figures make unwitting references to their own historicity . . . this play afflicts the characters with an historical 'knowledge' that contaminates most, if not all, of their verbal intercourse."³ In addition, for all its ostensible focus on the grand and noble theme of the Trojan War, *Troilus and Cressida* creates a strong impression of really having its mind on something else entirely, since it is so obviously an episode not so much in the war of Troy as in the war of the theatres.⁴

Nevertheless, behind the irony and archness of *Troilus and Cressida*, the gravity and nobility of what it pastiches are still clear; as Jill Levenson has it, Shakespeare's differences from the original "measure the breach between the ideals we value and the deeds we accomplish, and in the process they betray nostalgia for the imaginary kingdom where heroic virtues almost flowered."⁵ I am going to argue that one of the reasons for the strength of this sense of Troy is the play's sustained interest in wooden objects, which for all its topicality helps it to create a real sense of a world which is pre-modern and tantalisingly suggests that we are catching a genuine glimpse of Troy. Heather James suggests that one of the reasons the play makes its audiences and readers uneasy is that "Shakespeare refuses to privilege or adjudicate among versions of the Troy legend,"⁶ but I shall suggest that in one respect at least he does take sides: even if he does not take much stock in Trojans, he does seriously imagine Troy, and invites us to register the pity of its loss.

What did early moderns think Troy was like? As we saw in the introduction, some people thought they had been there. Barry Strauss notes that Alexandria Troas, which was confidently though mistakenly identified as Troy, “was the premier tourist attraction of the ancient world; its soil was dug up in search of relics for such VIP tourists as Alexander the Great and the Emperor Augustus.”⁷ Mediaeval and early modern Englishmen had further to travel than Alexander and Augustus, but that did not stop some of them visiting what they thought was Troy. The inscription on the tomb of Sir Hugh Johnnys and his wife Maude in St. Mary’s Church, Swansea, proudly announces that the man who lies there was knighted in Jerusalem in 1441 after “the said Sir Hugh had continued in the wars there long time before by the space of five years, that is to say, against the Turks and Saracens in the parts of Troy, Greece and Turkey under John that time Emperor of Constantinople,” and Terence Spencer observes that “A considerable number of Shakespeare’s contemporaries had visited Troy (at least, they visited what were supposed to be the ruins of Homer’s Troy; they were really standing on St. Paul’s Alexandria Troas)” because “nearly every boat that went to Constantinople had to wait off Tenedos, days or even weeks, for a favourable wind in order to navigate the Dardanelles and the Propontic,”⁸ so there was time for a spot of tourism. Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou note that Thomas Coryate visited what he took to be Troy,⁹ and this was probably common knowledge because of Coryate’s fame; Thomas Tomkis’s 1615 play *Albumazar*, for instance, has two characters who are purportedly experimenting with a telescope apparently glimpse Coryate making landfall after his travels:

Pandolfo. I see Douer Peere, a man now landing
 Attended by two Porters that seeme to grone
 Vnder the burthen of two loades of paper.
Ronca. That’s Coriatus Persicus, and’s obseruations
 Of Asia and Affrick.¹⁰

Anyone who spoke to Coryate after his return, or who read the account of his travels published in 1614,¹¹ might well have believed that they were glimpsing Troy at second hand.

There were also occasional claims that something concrete had survived from Troy. George Peele’s *The araygnment of Paris* does not have much in the way of what we might consider a credible Trojan atmosphere—Helen, who “entreth in her brauerie,” sings in Italian¹²—but the play does strike a note that would have been very evocative of Troy in the stage direction “The storme being past of thunder & lightning, & Ate hauing trundled the ball into place crying Fatum Troie, Iuno taketh the bal vp and speaketh” (sig. B3r), for Troy was strongly associated with a

ball game. In his *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*, William Strachey said of the native Americans,

A kynd of exercise they have often amongst them much like that which boyes call bandy in English, and maye be an auncient game, as yt seemeth in Virgill; for when Aeneas came into Italy at his marriage with Lavinia, the King Latinus's daughter, yt is said the Troyans taught the Latins scipping and frisking at the ball. Likewise they have the exercise of football, in which they only forceably encounter with the foot to carry the ball the one from the other, and spurned yt to the goale with a kind of dexterity and swift foot-manship, which is the honour of yt.¹³

Thomas Phaer, translating Virgil, expressly declared that this ball game still existed in Wales, a tangible survival of Trojan heritage: a marginal note in the seventh book of his *Aeneidos* identifies it with the Welsh game of knappan,¹⁴ in which case the ball that was used in knappan would have had symbolic continuity with balls once used in Troy, in keeping with the idea that Welsh (or "British") represented the language once spoken in Troy. There may also have been a legend that the London Stone was the Palladium, though it is impossible to trace this back definitively to the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries; Stow's *Survey of London* claims nothing more than that "in the end of a fair written Gospel book given to Christ's Church in Canterbury, by Ethelstane, King of the West Saxons, I find noted of lands or rents in London belonging to the said church, whereof one parcel is described to lie near unto London Stone."¹⁵ Stow knows where the stone is and what it is called, but he says nothing that would connect it to Brutus. In Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London*, Eustace wishes,

Oh that I had with mee
As many good lads, honest Prentises,
From Eastcheape, Canwicke-streete, and London-stone,
To end this battell, as could wish themselues
Vnder my conduct if they knew me heere.¹⁶

Again, though, this testifies merely to the stone's status as a landmark; there are references to Greece and Troy in Heywood's play, but there is no attempt to connect them to the Stone.

Many people had seen pictorial representations of Troy, though it is impossible to know how accurate they might have believed these to be. David McInnis's *Lost Plays Database* account of the August 1605 performance of *Ajax Flagellifer* at Magdalen College Oxford describes how Philip Stringer, visiting from Cambridge, noted that "yt was not acted soe well by many degrees as I have seene yt in Cambridge, the kinge was verye weary before he came hither, but much more wea-

ried by that, and spake manye words of dislike.” However, Sir Isaac Wake’s 1607 account of the performance makes it clear that it did have something going for it:

on account of the variety of the matter, the whole fabric of the stage and the artful apparatus of the embroidered hangings were renewed again and again to the amazement of all. Where just now you had gazed on the living image of Troy and the Trojan shore, soon afterwards you would see woods and deserts, horrific caves and the dwellings of the Furies, and while these were immediately vanishing, (you would see) unexpectedly the very agreeable appearance of tents and of ships.¹⁷

Ajax Flagellifer showed, it seemed, “the living image of Troy” depicted in embroidery. As I shall discuss further in chapter 5, where I consider the needlework projects overseen by Bess of Hardwick, the Trojan War was in fact a common subject for tapestries, something which seems to be gestured at in *Troilus and Cressida* in Pandarus’s line “Good traders in the flesh, set this in your painted cloths.”¹⁸ In Jasper Mayne’s *The City Match*, the name of one of the characters, Penelope Plotwell, suggests both embroidery and the tale of Troy, something which might in fact be connected to the legacy of the Hardwick embroideries, since Matthew Steggle points out that “Mayne knew [Bess’s grandson William] Cavendish in the 1630s, and was later employed by Cavendish as a personal chaplain.”¹⁹

The City Match also contains a striking exchange between Aurelia and Timothy:

Aurelia.

O prodigie to heare an Image speake.
Why, Sir, I tooke you for a Mute ith’ Hangings.
Ile tell the faces.

Timothy.

Gentlemen doe I
Look like one of them Trojans?²⁰

Timothy apparently assumes that if he looks like someone in a tapestry he must look like a Trojan, as if all tapestries are connected to Troy. John Astington notes that “the large tapestry cycle of the [Trojan] war first produced in 1472 was acquired by several European courts, including that of the first Tudor king, Henry VII; in Shakespeare’s time it was to be seen at Windsor Castle, still probably the grandest and most spectacular display of the Trojan myth to be seen in England, even if its style appeared decidedly antique by the later Elizabethan period.”²¹ The Windsor tapestries do not survive, but there are four panels of the same set in Zamora’s Cathedral Museum, from which it is clear that the series makes no attempt to imagine historical period and is instead resolutely contemporary in costumes, armour, and tent design. These were not the only

images of Troy to be found at the English court: Jill Levenson observes that “Henry VIII possessed more than two thousand pieces, dozens of them depicting the Nine Worthies, Hector, the history of Helen and Paris, and the siege of Troy” and that “some of these crown tapestries about the Trojan legend lasted until the reign of Charles I.”²² People who saw them might well have realised that this was not really how an ancient city was likely to have looked, but they would probably still have been impressed: as Levenson has it, “the world of the ancients appeared vast and splendid in both tapestries and the grand medieval romances. The heroes and heroines of legend impressively occupied large expanses of space in the wall hangings and line after imposing line in the enormous literary recitals.”²³

There were also several attempts at written descriptions of Troy. What might be described as the horse's mouth as far as early modern England was concerned, Chapman's Homer, echoes the logic of Troy tapestries by patterning its ancient city on the early modern world. In particular, and in implicit contradiction to our present association of Homer's heroes with bronze, Chapman shows us a society in which many different metals are used. A few objects are made of wood: Achilles swears

Even by this sceptre, that as this never again shall bear
Green leaves or branches, nor increase with any growth his size.²⁴

There are tamarisk trees (*Iliad*, Book 6, line 37), and a wild fig-tree is a vulnerable point because it makes it easier to scale the walls (*Iliad*, Book 6, lines 471–72); a tree also proves the downfall of Priam's son Lycaon, who is captured at night

as in a wood of Priam's he had cut
The green arms of a wild fig-tree, to make him spokes to put
In naves of his new chariot.

(*Iliad*, Book 21, lines 36–39)

We also get a sense of a simple, agricultural community with little or no technology from the mention of “gleby Troy” (*Iliad*, Book 3, line 81), the fact that the Greeks make sacrifice of lambs (*Iliad*, Book 3, lines 107–9), and the mention of “The oracles advising Troy, for fear of overthrow, / To meddle with no sea affair but live by tilling land” (*Iliad*, Book 5, lines 72–73).

There is also, however, a lot of metal. We hear of “brass-arm'd Greeks” (*Iliad*, Book 3, line 269) and steel (*Iliad*, Book 3, line 211); Menelaus's sword has a silver sheath (*Iliad*, Book 3, line 374) and Adrestus pleads, “Take me alive, O Atreus' son, and take a worthy weight / Of brass, elaborate iron, and gold” (*Iliad*, Book 6, lines 47–48). At Patroclus's funeral games iron is an important prize: Achilles promises that whoever wins

For five resolved years no need shall use his messages
 To any town to furnish him, this only bowl shall yield
 Iron enough for all affairs.

(*Iliad*, Book 23, lines 722–26)

Perhaps most surprisingly, Priam and Nausicaa both have coaches (*Iliad*, Book 3, line 325; *Odyssey*, Book 6). All in all, Troy is an important and sophisticated settlement, though we can see that it has fallen on hard times when Hector says,

Before time, Priam's town
 Traffick'd with divers-languaged men, and all gave the renown
 Of rich Troy to it, brass and gold abounding: but her store
 Is now from every house exhaust, possessions evermore
 Are sold out into Phrygia, and lovely Maeonie,
 And have been ever since Jove's wrath.

(*Iliad*, Book 18, lines 254–59)

What was once a great city is now reduced to a series of car boot sales in Asia Minor, and all the brass and gold have gone from the city.

Shakespeare could have read Chapman before writing *Troilus and Cressida*, or at least he could have read parts of the *Iliad*, which began appearing in instalments in 1598 and presumably existed in manuscript before then. Heather James suggests that when considering Shakespeare's turn to Troy "Explanations may begin with the appearance of Chapman's Homer and the fall of the Earl of Essex."²⁵ However, Shakespeare's story of Troy is different from Chapman's both in tone and content, so much so that Andrew Griffin has suggestively claimed that its ultimate concern is with the banal, the underclasses, and the quotidian rather than the heroic or exceptional.²⁶ Jessica Wolfe argues that "the earliest instalments of Chapman's Homer . . . animate Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*," though the play "diverges radically in its tone and outlook from Chapman's translation as well as from Homer's Greek original."²⁷ The question of materials is one instance of such divergence. In *Troilus and Cressida* there are no new arms for Achilles; no gods; no foreshadowing; no horses; no friendship; no Polyxena-Achilles romance. Shakespeare's *Troilus* is also very different from Chapman's, whose Priam laments that

All my good sons are gone; my light the shades Cimmerian
 Have swallow'd from me: I have lost Mestor, surnam'd the fair;
 Troilus, that ready man at arms, that made his field repair
 Ever so prompt and joyfully; and Hector.

(*Iliad*, Book 24, lines 250–54)

Chapman's *Troilus* can be mentioned in the same breath as Hector, and actually warrants more description. There is no sense that Shakespeare's hero is in

any way comparable to his splendid brother. Levenson points out that many of the personages of the Trojan War were presented as the supreme example of one or other quality or attribute but Shakespeare “diminishes the uniqueness of each character”;²⁸ his *Troilus* is in a way an exception, but his distinctiveness lies solely in his degree of dolefulness.

Chapman's is not the only version of Troy that Shakespeare might possibly have had in mind. Thomas Heywood's *The Iron Age containyng the rape of Hellen: the siege of Troy: the combate between Hector and Ajax: Hector and Troilus slayne by Achilles: Achilles slaine by Paris: Ajax and Vlisses contend for the armour of Achilles: the death of Ajax, &c* offers, as it says on the tin, more of the story than *Troilus and Cressida* does, and also probably postdates it (Martin Wiggins's best guess is 1613),²⁹ but Douglas Arrell argues that the play called *Troye* which was first acted at the Rose on 22 June 1596 was reworked as *1 and 2 Iron Age* and that *Troilus and Cressida* borrows from it.³⁰ *1 and 2 Iron Age* are worth taking note of in any case because of their popularity, if the preface “To the Reader” is to be believed: “these were the Playes often (and not with the least applause,) Publickely Acted by two Companies, vppon one Stage at once, and haue at sundry times thronged three seuerall Theaters, with numerous and mighty Auditories.”³¹ Although John Astington notes that “both printed editions have illustrated title pages, one showing the fall of Troy,”³² Heywood's play makes no serious attempt to imagine what Troy might have been like. Diomedes refers to the crown of Crete as “The Christian Scepter” (sig. B4v), an obvious anachronism given that Troy significantly predates Christianity, while Thersites seems to think he is in Sherwood Forest when he claims that he “might passe / Perhaps for some maide-marrian” (sig. F2v); he also asks of Achilles “Where's this great sword and buckler man of Greece? / Wee shall haue him one of sneakes noise” (sig. G3r), a reference to a contemporary group of musicians. Helen is surprised “at shrift” (sig. E4r), that is at Christian confession, the Trojan prince Chorebus speaks Latin (sig. E2v) (in fact he is quoting from the *Aeneid*), and there are also some other noticeably postclassical literary influences at work: Thersites has a limp and in the second part Sinon calls “A horse, a horse” (sig. C3v), evoking *Richard III*, and at the very end Hermione brings Helen a looking glass which prompts her to ask whether this is “the beauty / That launch'd a thousand ships” (sig. K4r), directly quoting *Doctor Faustus*. For Heywood, there is simply no question of bringing a historical imagination to bear on Troy, and indeed Robyn Bolam notes that the plays incorporate “aspects preserved from civic pageantry or the earlier mystery plays; properties such as Pluto's chariot or the two dragons, bull's head, boar's head and golden fleece of *The Brazen Age*—not to omit the apparently medieval representation of Hades and the devils.” She points in particular to the importance of altar settings in the Ages plays,³³ which again works to present them as Christian rather than classical.

There are some occasions when *Troilus and Cressida* too is openly anachronistic. Hector refers to “young men, whom Aristotle thought / Unfit to hear moral philosophy” (2.2.166–67),³⁴ as if this bronze age Trojan postdated the fourth-century BC Aristotle (something which has bothered critics and editors since the days of Pope and Rowe), and Troilus says he cannot “heel the high lavolt” (4.4.85), a dance much beloved of Elizabeth I. Much more often, though, there is an attempt to create a sense of the past. Particular attention is devoted to giving the impression of an agricultural community. Pandarus says “He that will have a cake out of the wheat must tarry the grinding” (1.1.14–15), and later calls the common soldiers “chaff and bran, chaff and bran” (1.2.233–34). Ulysses asks,

When that the general is not like the hive,
To whom the foragers shall all repair,
What honey is expected?

(1.3.81–83)

In particular, there is a sustained ambiguity about the play’s repeated use of the word “field.” This is first introduced when Troilus asks “What news, Aeneas, from the field today?” (1.1.104); “the field” of course means the field of battle, but there is also a strong sense that it is not all that different from other, more agricultural fields. When Troilus hears that Paris has been wounded by Menelaus, he jokes that “Paris is gored with Menelaus’ horn” (1.1.108), as if this were a field with a bull loose in it. Cressida’s servant Alexander directly parallels warfare and agriculture when he says “like as there were husbandry in war” (1.2.7), and he declares of Hector,

Before the sun rose he was harnessed light,
And to the field goes he, where every flower
Did as a prophet weep what it foresaw
In Hector’s wrath.

(1.2.8–11)

Simon Palfrey and Emma Smith comment of this passage,

The great Trojan warrior Hector, “harnessed” for battle, is imagined here as a wrathful mower, preparing to level the field in anger. It is early in the morning and the flowers are wet with dew. The dew becomes the tears of the flowers, weeping for their own imminent destruction, which also foretells the numberless victims of a battle about to recommence. Death is no longer something distant, no longer a statistic: “every flower” is weeping.³⁵

With the possible exception of Hector, we may not think much of the people of Shakespeare’s Troy, but we are acutely aware of its vegetation, and of a simple, almost pastoral, sense of place. And yet even the signs of fertility are also signi-

fiers of loss, for Eterpi Mitsi notes that "The same quotations from ancient authors emerge in many accounts of Troy, the most prominent being Ovid's line 'iam seges ubi Troia fuit' [where Troy used to be, corn now grows]";³⁶ thus William Lithgow observes that "Where the pride of Phrygia stood, it is a most delectable plains abounding now in Cornes, Fruites, and delicate Wines, and may be called the garden of Natolia."³⁷ This is a pastoral world, but it is one which speaks mutely of its own passing.

The sense of a life lived close to nature continues when Alexander says of Ajax "This man, lady, hath robbed many beasts of their particular additions" (1.2.19–20), when Thersites says of Achilles "I had rather be a tick in a sheep than such a valiant ignorance" (3.3.312–13), and when Pandarus asks Troilus and Cressida "How now, lambs?" (4.4.22). Cressida says that Troilus smiles "an 'twere a cloud in autumn" (1.2.121), and in an exchange between Pandarus and Cressida, emotions are figured in terms of the weather:

Pandarus. . . . He will weep you an 'twere a man born in April.

Cressida. And I'll spring up in his tears, an 'twere a nettle against May.
(1.2.168–71)

Details such as these make it less surprising than it might seem that Rebecca Bushnell should pick *Troilus and Cressida* for a specimen ecocritical reading.³⁸ There is none of the sense of escape usually associated with the green world, though; indeed the closest we come to the idea of green is when Cressida says of the white hair on Troilus's chin "An't had been a green hair I should have laughed too" (1.2.147–48). Andrew Hiscock observes that "there is every reason to believe that the *immured* space of the *Priam's six-gated city* may have generated a much greater breadth of response in Tudor and Stuart society than signaling a powerful site of cultural belonging . . . *immured* spaces might constitute on certain occasions the precise *inverse* of the early modern subject's desired state of well-being."³⁹ Here, though, the only alternative to the city is a field which is primarily a battlefield. This may be an agricultural society, but it is one in which there is neither leisure nor opportunity for the sense of renewal and refreshment which the green world normally affords.

There are however plants. Troilus asks,

Tell me, Apollo, for thy Daphne's love,
What Cressid is, what Pandar, and what we?
(1.1.94–95)

Daphne was originally a nymph, but she was changed into a flower. Pandarus says of Aeneas "He's one of the flowers of Troy" (1.2.180–81) and Ulysses speaks of Achilles's "crest that prouder than blue Iris bends" (1.3.381); he might

mean the goddess of the rainbow, but the insistence on the colour blue makes that unlikely given that the rainbow is famously multi-coloured, and it seems therefore more likely that he means the flower, which was popular in early modern England (we know that bearded irises were a special favourite of Bess of Hardwick, and indeed one member of the genus is now named after her), especially since he makes other references to irises.⁴⁰ Ulysses says “come knights from east to west, / And cull their flower, Ajax shall cope the best” (2.3.257–58). Troilus begs,

O, be thou my Charon,
And give me swift transporance to those fields
Where I may wallow in the lily-beds
Proposed for the deserver!

(3.2.9–12)

When he is actually about to reach those metaphorical lily-beds, Pandarus says to him, “Walk here i’t’h’orchard. I’ll bring her straight” (3.2.15). Collectively, these mentions of plants and flowers build a sense of Troy as a real and specific location, rich in vegetation and sustained by an agricultural lifestyle in a working pastoral landscape.

Most notable is an emphasis on wood. Vim Nardizzi’s *Wooden Os: Shakespeare’s Theatres and England’s Trees* does not mention *Troilus and Cressida* but notes that “timber was early modern England’s most ubiquitous building material. As William Harrison observed in 1577, it was the fabric of early modern English life: ‘The greatest part of our buylding in the cities and good townes of Englande consisteth only of timber’”; Nardizzi also observes that “The Globe was unique among rival theatrical ventures in that its frame consisted entirely of old timbers.”⁴¹ Wood is a recurrent motif in the play. The Prologue speaks of how

Priam’s six-gated city—
Dardan and Timbria, Helias, Chetas, Troien
And Antenorides—with massy staples
And corresponsive and fulfilling bolts,
Spar up the sons of Troy.

(15–20)

“Spar” is “Stirre” in F; “spar” was proposed by S. W. Singer in 1856, and its connotation of a piece of wood makes it a very credible emendation in a passage about six heavy wooden gates. Other wooden objects are also evoked. Sometimes these are boats. Troilus says of Helen, “she is a pearl / Whose price hath launched above a thousand ships” (2.2.81–82), and of Cressida that

Between our Ilium and where she resides,
 Let it be called the wild and wand'ring flood,
 Ourself the merchant, and this sailing Pandar
 Our doubtful hope, our convoy and our bark.

(1.1.97–100)

Here Pandarus himself is figured as a boat, a small wooden object precariously afloat on a wild sea. Nestor, speaking of when the wind rises, asks,

Where's then the saucy boat
 Whose weak untimbered sides but even now
 Co-rivalled greatness? Either to harbour fled
 Or made a toast for Neptune.

(1.3.42–45)

(The boat is untimbered not in the sense that it is not made of wood but in that it is frail: OED 1.) A particularly interesting use of wood is when Agamemnon speaks of how

Distinction, with a broad and powerful fan,
 Puffing at all, winnows the light away.

(1.3.27–28)

We know (and Shakespeare probably knew) that Greek winnowing fans were made of wood because in the *Odyssey* a man who lives inland mistakes the oar Odysseus is carrying for a winnowing fan; in Chapman's translation, the person who doesn't know what an oar is calls it a wan, for which this is OED's only example (*Odyssey*, Book 11, line 163), but the second time it is mentioned it is "a corn-cleanse fan" (*Odyssey*, Book 23, line 415), which leaves no room for doubt. Agamemnon also mentions wood in its raw state:

Checks and disasters
 Grow in the veins of actions highest reared,
 As knots, by the conflux of meeting sap,
 Infects the sound pine and diverts his grain
 Tortive and errant from his course of growth.

(1.3.5–9)

So too does Nestor when he speaks of "when the splitting wind / Makes flexible the knees of knotted oaks" (1.3.49–50), and Ulysses uses wood as a symbol of strength: "strong as the axletree / On which the heavens ride" (1.3.66–67). Together, these evocations of wood or of objects made of wood work to create a sense of a simple society, close to nature and dependent on tools made from organic materials.

The idea of wood also lurks in some more unexpected places. When Ulysses says “Take but degree away, untune that string, / And hark what discord follows” (1.3.109–10) he is implicitly imagining a stringed instrument, whose frame will certainly be of wood. Other wooden instruments are also evoked: Thersites says of Ajax “What music will be in him when Hector has knocked out his brains, I know not; but I am sure, none, unless the fiddler Apollo get his sinews to make catlings on” (3.3.303–5), and Agamemnon says “Beat loud the taborins” (4.5.275). Performance of a different kind is evoked when Ulysses says Patroclus is

like a strutting player, whose conceit
Lies in his hamstring, and doth think it rich
To hear the wooden dialogue and sound
’Twixt his stretched footing and the scaffoldage.
(1.3.153–56)

Wood surfaces here in both a metaphorical and a literal sense: the dialogue is wooden, and so is the scaffolding which supports the stage. Ulysses also speaks of “the ram that batters down the wall” (1.3.206) and says,

Blunt wedges rive hard knots; the seeded pride
That hath to his maturity blown up
In rank Achilles must or now be cropped
Or, shedding, breed a nursery of like evil
To overbulk us all.
(1.3.316–20)

Here Achilles becomes a tree, one which grows too fast and spreads its branches too far, and he is connected to wood again when Ulysses declares that “the hart Achilles / Keeps thicket” (2.3.252–53) and implicitly when Agamemnon says,

Go we to council. Let Achilles sleep.
Light boats sail swift, though greater bulks draw deep.
(2.3.259–60)

Here the alert, vigilant leaders of the Greeks are clearly the light boats, while the somnolent Achilles is the bigger, less manoeuvrable craft. Thersites too is figured as made of wood when Ajax calls him “Thou stool for a witch!” (2.1.41). In a similar vein, Cassandra declares, “Our firebrand brother Paris burns us all” (2.2.110), an image picked up when the stage direction at the beginning of act four calls for torches (4.1.0 s.d.), which would have been made of wood.

Other things too are made of wood. We hear of “The dreadful Sagittary” (5.5.14), who shoots with a bow, and arrows are evoked again when Pandarus’s song includes the lines,

For, O, love's bow
 Shoots buck and doe.
 The shaft confounds
 Not that it wounds,
 But tickles still the sore.
 (3.1.110–14)

Pandarus says to Troilus “So, so, rub on, and kiss the mistress” (3.2.48), a reference to the woods used in bowling, and immediately adds, “Build there, carpenter, the air is sweet” (3.2.49–50); the idea of a lover as a carpenter would sit oddly in a play in which wood was less important, but is wholly apposite here. Thersites expects Ajax to receive “an heroical cudgelling” from Hector (3.3.250), and Pandarus calls Helen “poor *capocchia*” (4.2.32), which according to Theobald is the head of a (wooden) club.

The wooden city is however doomed. It is clear that there is already some stone in Troy: Hector says “modestly I think / The fall of every Phrygian stone will cost / A drop of Grecian blood” (4.5.223–24). But there will be a lot more in future: Troilus says of Hector's death,

There is a word will Priam turn to stone,
 Make wells and Niobes of the maids and wives,
 Cold statues of the youth, and, in a word,
 Scare Troy out of itself.
 (5.11.18–21)

The primary sense in which Troy will be scared out of itself is of course that it will fall and ultimately cease to exist, but it will also lose its identity in another way too, because the wooden world it represents will be displaced by the different materials of different successive societies; Thomas Dallam, sailing to Constantinople in 1599 in a ship called the *Hector*, landed at Alexandria Troas and “saw some monimentes in Troy, peecis of wales, sutchins, and marble pillars.” He brought away “a peece of a whyte marble piller, the which I broke with my owne handes.”⁴² The irony, of course, is that the destruction of the city will be effected by an object which is itself made of wood, the Trojan Horse, which the early modern theatre probably showed its audiences: Bolam argues that the wooden horse in Heywood's play needs to be real.⁴³ Because of that the play's references to wood not only serve to create a sense of Troy's wooden world but are also darkly proleptic of its imminent fall. They also, though, serve a third and final purpose, for even as they remind us that the wooden world of Troy is doomed, they also make it live again within the wooden O of Shakespeare's theatre, to whose identity they speak in any case because Stow's *Survey of London* insists that London itself was originally a wooden town.⁴⁴ For

Plato, Heraclitus, and Aristotle, it was a question whether the ship preserved by the Athenians as Theseus's ship was so indeed, since it had been subject to restoration as its wooden planks decayed. For Shakespeare, the insistence on the wooden fabric of Troy within the wooden fabric of the Globe (itself reconstituted from the timbers of the Theatre) made the city forever lost and yet still hauntingly present. *Troilus and Cressida* may give us little to admire in its main characters, but no play of the period offers so strong and resonant a sense of Troy itself, or makes it seem so real to us.

Notes

- 1 Douglas Cole, "Myth and Anti-Myth: The Case of *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (Spring 1980): 76–84, pp. 76–77.
- 2 Rob Maslen, "The Decay of Exemplarity in *Troilus and Cressida*," in *Troilus and Cressida: A Critical Reader*, edited by Efterpi Mitsi (London: Bloomsbury, 2019), pp. 107–28, p. 108.
- 3 Linda Charnes, "'So Unsecret to Ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1989): 413–40, pp. 419–20.
- 4 See, for instance, James Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), and my own "Harington, *Troilus and Cressida* and the Poets' War," in *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*, edited by Michele Marrapodi (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 127–40.
- 5 Jill L. Levenson, "Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Monumental Tradition in Tapestries and Literature," *Renaissance Drama* 7 (1976): 43–84, p. 84.
- 6 Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 89.
- 7 Barry Strauss, *The Trojan War* (London: Arrow, 2008), p. 10.
- 8 Terence Spencer, "Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance," *Modern Language Review* 47.3 (July 1952): 330–33, p. 333. One example of such a visitor is Thomas Coryate, who called on his way to Constantinople and was termed by a companion "the first English Knight of Troy" (Michael Strachan, "Thomas Coryate," *NDNB*).
- 9 Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, "Introduction," in *Shakespeare and Greece* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 1–44, p. 31.
- 10 Thomas Tomkis, *Albumazar* (London: Nicholas Okes for Walter Burre, 1615), sigs B4r–v.
- 11 On Coryate's Troy see for instance Efterpi Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing, 1596–1682* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 142–44.
- 12 George Peele, *The araygnment of Paris* (London: Henrie Marsh, 1584), sig. C1r.
- 13 William Strachey, *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1849), pp. 77–78.
- 14 Virgil, *The whole xii bookes of the Aeneidos of Virgil*, translated by Thomas Phaer (London: William How for Abraham Veale, 1573), EEBO doc. image 80.
- 15 John Stow, *A Survey of London Written in the Year 1598*, introduced by Antonia Fraser (London: The History Press, 2009), p. 201.

- 16 Thomas Heywood, *The Four Prentices of London* (London: Nicholas Okes for John Wright, 1615), sig. D4v.
- 17 David McInnis, "Ajax Flagellifer (Oxford)," *Lost Plays Database*. Online: [https://www.lostplays.org/index.php?title=Ajax_Flagellifer_\(Oxford\)](https://www.lostplays.org/index.php?title=Ajax_Flagellifer_(Oxford)).
- 18 William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, edited by David Bevington (London: Thomson Learning, 2001), 5.10.45.
- 19 Matthew Steggle, "William Cavendish: Amateur Professional Playwright," in *A Companion to the Cavendishes: Writing, Patronage and Material Culture*, edited by Lisa Hopkins and Tom Rutter (Leeds: ARC Humanities Press, 2020).
- 20 Jasper Mayne, *The City Match* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1639), sigs E2v–F1r.
- 21 John Astington, *Stage and Picture in the English Renaissance: The Mirror up to Nature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 21 and 60.
- 22 Jill L. Levenson, "Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Monumental Tradition in Tapestries and Literature," *Renaissance Drama* 7 (1976): 43–84, pp. 47–48.
- 23 Levenson, "Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*," p. 75.
- 24 George Chapman, *Chapman's Homer: The Iliad and the Odyssey* (London: Wordsworth, 2000), *The Iliad*, Book 1, lines 332–33.
- 25 James, *Shakespeare's Troy*, p. 113.
- 26 Andrew Griffin, "The Banality of History in *Troilus and Cressida*," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 12.2 (September 2006). Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/12-2/grifbana.htm>.
- 27 Jessica Wolfe, *Homer and the Question of Strife from Erasmus to Hobbes* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), p. 299.
- 28 Levenson, "Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*," p. 76.
- 29 Martin Wiggins and Catherine Richardson, *British Drama, 1533–1642: A Catalogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), vol. 6, p. 297.
- 30 Douglas Arrell, "Heywood, Shakespeare, and the Mystery of Troye," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 19.1 (2016). Online: <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/journal/index.php/emls/article/view/267>.
- 31 Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age containyng the rape of Hellen: the siege of Troy: the combat between Hector and Aiax: Hector and Troilus slayne by Achilles: Achilles slaine by Paris: Aiax and Vlisses contend for the armour of Achilles: the death of Aiax, &c.* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1632), sig. A4v.
- 32 Astington, *Stage and Picture in the English Renaissance*, p. 56.
- 33 Robyn Bolam, *Stage Images and Traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 24–25 and 27.
- 34 William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, edited by David Bevington (London: Thomson Learning, 2001), 2.2.166–67.
- 35 Simon Palfrey and Emma Smith, *Shakespeare's Dead* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2016), p. 139.
- 36 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, pp. 140–41.
- 37 William Lithgow, *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632), p. 123.
- 38 Rebecca Bushnell, "Shakespeare and Nature," in *Shakespeare in Our Time: A Shakespeare Association of America Collection*, edited by Dymphna Callaghan and Suzanne Gossett (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 327–34.

39 Andrew Hiscock, “‘Will You Walk In, My Lord?’: Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida* and the Anxiety of *Oikos*,” in *Shakespeare and Hospitality: Ethics, Politics, and Exchange*, edited by David B. Goldstein and Julia Reinhard Lupton (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 17–38, p. 24.

40 Vivian Thomas and Nicki Faircloth, *Shakespeare’s Plants and Gardens: A Dictionary* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 192–93.

41 Vim Nardizzi, *Wooden Os: Shakespeare’s Theatres and England’s Trees* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), p. 16.

42 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 75.

43 Bolam, *Stage Images and Traditions*, p. 33.

44 He declares that “the Britons call that a town, with Caesar, when they have fortified a cumbersome wood with a ditch and rampart,” and that when Caesar came “the cities of the Britons were in those days neither artificially built with houses, nor strongly walled with stone, but were only thick and cumbersome woods, plashed within and trenched about” (Stow, *A Survey of London*, pp. 26–27).

Chapter 4

Where Is Hector Now?

Nothing about Troy spoke as loudly to the early modern world as its fall. Whether or not Priam, Hecuba, Andromache, Cassandra, or Polyxena ever existed, constant revisiting of their harrowing stories made them important and influential presences in the culture of virtually every nation in Europe. In this chapter, I consider the way in which Hector, like Aeneas, led a literary and political afterlife, particularly in the context of the Princess Elizabeth's 1613 marriage to the Elector Palatine, which prompted a quest to find cultural connections between England and Germany in which the apparently unlikely figure of the Trojan warrior proved surprisingly useful.

I noted in the introduction that although Troy was lost, every self-respecting European country claimed its Trojan connection. It is therefore unsurprising that though Troy was important to everyone, it is particularly important in plays set on the Continent or treating of Britain's relationship with the Continent. A number of such plays clearly suggest that though Troy itself may be gone, its values and spirit live on, and do so particularly in Germany. Heywood's *The Iron Age* covertly associates both sides in the Trojan War with Germany when Troilus speaks of "Ajax the bigge-bond Duke of Salamine" and Hector declares that "Arch-dukes and Kings haue shrunk beneath this arme, / Besides a thousand Knights haue falne this day."¹ The idea that Germans were big-boned is found in many texts,² and Archduke (Erzherzog) is a distinctively Germanic title. Hugh A. MacDougall notes the extent of English interest in Germany throughout the period, especially in the context of the Reformation,³ but when King James's daughter Elizabeth married Frederick, Elector Palatine, often known as the Palsgrave, in 1613, Germany became suddenly and urgently important, and the idea of a shared Trojan ancestry offered a powerful tool for asserting a fundamental connection between English and Germans. For English audiences who wanted to know whom their princess was marrying and where she was going, the Trojan Hector, in particular, suddenly acquired a new role as tour guide.

The reason that a guide to Germany was necessary was a radical geopolitical reorientation. For much of the mediaeval period roughly half of what is now France was held by various kings of England, first as descendants of William the Conqueror in his capacity as Duke of Normandy and subsequently as the inheritors of Geoffrey of Anjou and self-proclaimed heirs to Philippe IV of France through his daughter Isabella, wife of Edward II and mother of Edward III. This vast territory, known at its height as the Angevin Empire, reached from Hadrian's Wall to the Pyrenees, and its French element included Normandy,

Gascony, Aquitaine, Poitou, Maine, Touraine, Saintonge, Périgord, and Limousin as well as Anjou itself; various other territories such as the Vexin were also under its sway for some or all of the period of its heyday. Marlowe's *Edward II* glances directly at the role of Isabella in transferring to the English monarchy a claim to the crown of France, while a number of Shakespeare's plays including *Henry V*, the three parts of *Henry VI*, and *Edward III*, of which Shakespeare is generally accepted to have written at least part, all take as a central concern the ebb and flow of England's attempts to cling on to the territorial possessions in France inherited from the Conqueror and the Angevins. Once the loss of Calais made that impossible, and in the wake of the failure of the Earl of Essex's 1596 attempt to compensate for that loss by capturing Cadiz instead, attention began slowly but with mounting intensity to shift decisively towards a new centre of gravity, focused now on western Germany rather than on northern France, and specifically on Aachen, traditional coronation site of the Holy Roman Emperors, in the light of first the possibility and then ultimately the fact that James I's daughter would make a German marriage which might just conceivably win her an imperial crown. Thus a second Elizabeth might achieve what the first had not been able to, and a virtue could be made out of necessity by suggesting that there was a genuine affinity between England and Germany whereas England and France had only ever been enemies.

I want to begin by tracing the unfolding of this narrative through a number of plays from *Edward II*, the earliest in chronological sequence, through *Edward III*, the *Henriad*, Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London*, *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, which was possibly though not certainly written by George Chapman, and William Smith's *The Hector of Germany. Or The Palsgrave, prime Elector*. Collectively, the plays I discuss plot the changing contours of England's attempt to carve an empire for itself in Europe and the consequences of these for political, religious, and national identities as they tell a story of how a desperate determination to own territory overseas underwent an enforced modulation into a tamer and more achievable aspiration to exert political influence, and how the terrain of the debate concomitantly shifted from the physical arena of the battlefield to the more symbolic one of marriage and alliance. "Bella gerant alii; tu, felix Austria, nube" ("let others make war; you, happy Austria, marry") may have been a motto associated specifically with the Habsburgs, but it was one with which James VI and I would have been in instinctive sympathy, and these plays too find it an ethos increasingly congenial. In that shift from landholding to influence, an increased investment in the power of natural borders and in the idea of England (or occasionally and more accurately Britain) as an island plays a central part, not least because the very name Elizabeth had to a certain extent come to connote ideas of boundedness and of England as confined to its own geographical borders:

as Jeffrey Knapp points out, as a virgin “Elizabeth could seem . . . the providential consummation of England’s efforts to realize itself as an island. William Paten (1575) lists ‘Ad Insulam’ or ‘To the Isle’ . . . as one derivation of the queen’s name.”⁴ And since the marriages and alliances in question are almost by definition international, an inevitable concomitant of this emerging emphasis on cross-border collaboration is that shared nationality starts to loom less large than shared confessional allegiance.

Edward II, which opens that story, can usefully be understood in the context of Marlowe’s general interest in troubled and unstable borders. Emden, of which Doctor Faustus craves the seignieury,⁵ is poised so exactly on the border between Germany and the Netherlands that as recently as 2011 Google Maps could still inflame tensions over the ownership of its port.⁶ *Dido, Queen of Carthage* takes as its subject one of the originary examples of border-setting, for the legend of Dido spoke of how, told that she might take as much land as could be covered by the hide of an ox, she cut the hide into thin strips and used those strips to mark out a substantial area. I have argued elsewhere that Tamburlaine becomes extradiegetically identified as a patroller of borders,⁷ and *Hero and Leander* is set on the banks of the Hellespont, one of the points where Europe meets Asia, and involves repeated and increasingly dangerous negotiations of that threatening, liminal space.

In *Edward II*, Marlowe revisits both the Hero and Leander narrative and the boundary between Europe and Asia, this time in order to raise questions about the borders of England and how secure they are or are not. At the very beginning of the play, attention is drawn to England’s coastline as Gaveston exclaims,

Sweet prince, I come; these, these thy amorous lines
Might have enforced me to have swum from France
And, like Leander, gasped upon the sand.⁸

This is a play which repeatedly recurs to the idea of borders and edges: Mortimer imaginatively inhabits the marches of Wales when he storms that “Wigmore shall fly, to set my uncle free” (2.2.195), Lancaster is worried about “The northern borderers” who are “seeing their houses burnt” (2.2.178), and in Ireland the crucial border of the Pale has been comprehensively penetrated: “The wild O’Neill, with swarms of Irish kerns, / Lives uncontrolled within the English pale” (2.2.157–58). Even domestic space is understood as both bounded and also potentially breachable, as we see when Margaret says to Spencer and Baldock “meet me at the park pale presently” (2.1.73). It is in this context that Isabella vows to Sir John of Hainault,

Ah sweet sir John, even to the utmost verge
 Of Europe, or the shore of Tanaïs,
 Will we with thee to Hainault, so we will.
 (4.2.29–31)

John Michael Archer notes that “Lake Maeotis or the Tanais river (the Don) were often said to demarcate Asia from Europe”;⁹ Ukraina, the name of one of the territories through which the Don flowed, translated as “on the edge.”¹⁰

More directly relevant for the idea of an English empire in Europe, though, is the border which Sir John himself represents, which would become important in English history when Edward III, a mere child in this scene, in due course married Philippa of Hainault. Hainault was a border region, as Marlowe would certainly have been aware, not least because Abraham Ortelius, whose *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* Marlowe is known to have used, was born in Antwerp and was famous for his maps of Flanders. This was territory so uncertain that Thomas Danett’s 1600 *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the eight where Comines endeth, till the death of Henry the second* could speak of a previous king of France, Francis I, as having “inuaded the Emperours dominions in Picardie and Artoys,”¹¹ while for the king at the time when Danett was actually writing, Henri IV, the citizens of these areas owed obedience only to him; this is made clear in *The Copie of a Letter sent by the French king to the people of Artoys and Henault, requesting them to remooue the forces gathered by the king of Spaine, from the Borders of France, otherwise denouncing open warre*, printed in London in 1595, in which the king warns the inhabitants of Hainault and Artois that “it being manifest that you be a little faulty of this war, you must endure the chiefest and most fierce assaults, when it shall be open war.”¹² In that sense, coupling Tanaïs with Hainault would serve only to underline what was already obvious, that the part of France to which England here establishes a claim is a perilously embattled one whose borders are permeable and unstable, and that attempting to hold it might prove more trouble than it was worth.

Edward III, which focuses on the reign of Edward’s more successful son, also looks at the borders of France, taking as one of its central events the fourteenth-century English conquest of Calais. Ultimately, though, the play is less attracted to images of conquest than to the idea of strongly defined natural borders, as when Edward says to the Countess of Salisbury:

Arise, true English lady, whom our isle
 May better boast of than ever Roman might
 Of her, whose ransacked treasury hath tasked
 The vain endeavour of so many pens.¹³

Here the idea of the sprawling Roman Empire attaches itself to the violated Lucrece, while the Countess is both chaste and the inhabitant of an island, just as the supposed link between the name Elizabeth and *insula* proposed an absolute equation between Elizabeth I and her realm.

It was certainly a good idea to be resigned to the idea that English territory should be coterminous with England and Wales, because in *1 Henry VI*, which opens with a messenger's announcement that "Guyenne, Compiègne, Rheims, Rouen, Orléans, / Paris, Gisors, Poitiers, are all quite lost,"¹⁴ we see battles before Orléans (1.4), Rouen (3.2) and Bordeaux (4.2) before York laments that "Maine, Blois, Poitiers, and Tours are won away" (4.2.45) and the Dauphin declares triumphantly "I am possessed / With more than half the Gallian territories" (5.4.138–39); by *2 Henry VI*, Anjou and Maine have been signed away to the father of Margaret of Anjou as part of the negotiations for her marriage, and since "These counties were the keys of Normandy," when King Henry asks about France in general Somerset bluntly tells him that "all your interest in those territories / Is utterly bereft you: all is lost."¹⁵

Henry V is also interested in the borders of France, and surprising as it may seem this play too is imaginatively prepared to accept that England cannot permanently hold territory there. The Prologue invites us not, as we might expect, to imagine ourselves in either England or France but rather to contemplate the space which lies between them:

Suppose within the girdle of these walls
Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder.

(19–22)

After Canterbury and the King consider the border with Scotland (1.2.140–45), Henry, himself a liminal figure in that he was, as Fluellen reminds us, born at Monmouth (4.7.11), moves from Calais, which is clearly established as a firm base for the English (3.2.45, 3.3.55–56, 3.6.139–40, and 5.0.6–7), first to Harfleur (3.3.8) and then across the Somme (3.5.1), while the French king and the Dauphin fall back on Rouen (3.5.64). In this shifting world it is no wonder that Macmorris should ask "What ish my nation?" (3.2.124) or that the disguised Henry's account of Sir Thomas Erpingham's view of their situation should be that they are "Even as men wrecked upon a sand, that look to be washed off the next tide" (4.1.98–99). Nevertheless we end as we began, with the two fixed edges of "the contending kingdoms / Of France and England, whose very shores look pale / With envy of each other's happiness" (5.2.344–46), and the closing chorus is quick to remind us that all Henry's gains in France will disappear during the reign of his son.

The last remnant of the Angevin Empire was Calais. In 1556, however, Calais was finally regained by the French, and this heralded a significant shift in English ways of thinking about Europe and of the possibility of gaining a foothold there. Although Shakespeare's Henry V may still declare in 1599 "No king of England, if not king of France," in practice that dream was dead.¹⁶ In its place a new one was born, and that was focused on Germany—or rather on a part of Germany that it had always been difficult to tell from France. In *Henry V*, Charlemagne is clearly established as a foundational figure in French history when the Archbishop of Canterbury assures the king that the only way the usurping Hugh Capet could attempt to legitimise his claim to the throne was by asserting descent from Charlemagne (1.2.69–77). However, it is oddly difficult to pin down the actual borders of Charlemagne's France, or indeed to be sure that it really was France. As the Archbishop explains, the French base their opposition to female rule on the principle that "No woman shall succeed in Salic land" (1.2.39),

Yet their own authors faithfully affirm
That the land Salic is in Germany,
Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe,
Where Charles the Great, having subdued the Saxons,
There left behind and settled certain French.

(1.2.43–47)

This territory, Canterbury declares, did not become French "Until four hundred one-and-twenty years / After defunction of King Pharamond" (1.2.57–58), while John Coke's 1550 *The Debate betwene the Heraldes of Englande and Fraunce* muddies the waters still further by declaring that "this Charlemayne was a Dowcheman."¹⁷ Given such confusion, it is not surprising that national identity should start to recede in importance and be supplanted instead by other considerations.

In Thomas Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (1615), the heroes are French-born but English-domiciled, and though the play is set in the last years of William the Conqueror it can, paradoxically, help us understand what happened later, particularly in allowing us to trace the contours of the substitution by which France was increasingly replaced by Germany in English dreams of empire. As well as the time gap between the composition of Heywood's play and the events to which it refers, there was also a gap between composition and publication, for when it first appeared in 1615 a preface apologised that "as Playes were then some fifteene or sixteene yeares agoe it was in the fashion."¹⁸ The preface goes on to attribute the decision to publish now to a renewed public interest in martial arts:

Nor could it haue found a more seasonable and fit publication then at this Time, when, to the glory of our Nation, the security of the Kingdome, and the honour of the City, they haue begunne againe the commendable practise of long forgotten Armes. (sig. A2v)

However, the marital was at least as important as the martial, for both the moment of publication and for that matter the renewed exercises in the Artillery Garden to which Heywood is referring were fundamentally connected to the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Frederick. The agenda of those exercises, and also of the celebrations that accompanied the marriage, can be glimpsed in John Taylor's prefatory remarks in his account of them, *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy* . . . (1613), where he remarks of his description of the celebrations that

I did write these things, that those who are far remoted, not onely in his Maistties Dominions, but also in foraine territories, may have an vnderstanding of the glorious pomp, and magnificent domination of our high and mighty Monarch King Iames: and further, to demonstrate the skills and knowledges that our warlike nation hath in engines fire-works and other military discipline, that there may be knowne, that howsoeuer warre seemes to sleepe, yet (vpon any lawfull ground or occasion) the command of our dread Soueraigne can rouse hir to the terrour of al malignant opposers of his royall state and dignity.¹⁹

For all that it was apparently written fifteen years earlier, *The Four Prentices* speaks strongly to this 1615 context, not least because one of its characters is repeatedly referred to as the County Palatine. In 1615 it would also have been possible to read Robert, Duke of Normandy, eldest son of William I who did not succeed his father, as representing Prince Henry, the eldest son of King James, who had died suddenly and unexpectedly just before his sister's wedding; although the play's Robert explicitly (and inaccurately) notes that he has received news of his father's death and is returning to England to reign, the audience could have been expected to know that there had never been a king of England called Robert, and thus to understand him as doomed. The marriage of Elizabeth and the Palsgrave inherently recalled the world of *The Four Prentices* in that, as Tristan Marshall notes, "the Huguenot Duc de Bouillon . . . had as early as 1611 become the leading influence on James's policy towards France and was appointed by the Palatine court as their chief negotiator in the marriage of Frederick and Elizabeth";²⁰ the heroes of *Four Prentices* are the sons of the Duke of Bouillon. Whatever *Four Prentices* may have meant when it was first written and presumably acted, by the time of its publication a whole new set of meanings had become very firmly affixed to it.

That ideological fluidity is facilitated by the play's slipperiness about questions of identity. At the beginning of the story, the four brothers are shipwrecked on the Goodwin Sands. One is washed up in Ireland; one lands in

Italy; and two come ashore in different parts of France. Separately, their father and sister also become lost. Throughout the play, one question lurks: how are their identities to be established when none of them is sure of any other? The fact that this is ultimately resolved hastily and unconvincingly underlines the extent to which their repeated failure to recognise each other is emblematic of the disunited state of Christendom, and perhaps also of the fragmentation of the Trojan diaspora. The sense of uncertain identity extends to the play's classical references. Eustace compares himself to Hector and to Alexander (sig. D3r), but also imagines himself opposed to Hercules (sig. D2v); Godfrey on the other hand identifies with Hercules when he says of Guy,

I'le cast his corke-like trunk by wondrous skill,
As Hercules threw Lycas from an Hill.

(sig. E2v)

Guy meanwhile sees himself as Achilles (sig. F1r), an identification with the Hellenic world which is cemented when he is given the crown of Cyprus and renamed Guy of Lessingham, an anglicisation which reinvents the Frenchness of the historical Guy of Lusignan (though the French are also classically-minded: the French lady speaks of her "Metamorphosis" [sig. F1v] and compares herself to Tantalus [sig. F2r]). To add to the confusion, both sides in the fight for Jerusalem apparently believe in Jove: Eustace says "I will beare this shield with as much pride, / As sate I in a chariot by Ioues side" (sig. H2v), but the Sophy too speaks of Jove (sig. F2r) and also of Cyclops (sig. I1r) and his ally the Babylonian Soldan mentions Centaurs (sig. F2v). Most strikingly, the Sophy's envoy is named Turnus, like the prince who opposes Aeneas in the *Aeneid*. This is a world in which everyone can lay some claim to classical heritage but no one has a monopoly.

If *Troilus and Cressida* is about the disappearance of Troy, *Four Prentices* is at least in part about another disappearance (or at least displacement), that of France as the prime focus of English interest on the European mainland. In *Henry V* (1599), the English king wants to become king of France; by 1615, dreams of an English empire in Europe were centred on Germany. Heywood's play, with its original composition close in date to that of *Henry V* and its publication in the aftermath of the Palatinate marriage, offers a neat bridge between these two historical moments and the differing political imperatives that conditioned them. Early in the play, a Presenter echoes the Chorus of *Henry V* by assuring us that the four brothers have sailed across the sea before a series of dumbshows and subsequent glosses shows each being separately shipwrecked in a different part of Europe. (*Henry V* is also echoed when Guy, like Henry, marries the daughter of the king of France.²¹) The subsequent adventures, involving the repeated encoun-

ters of the brothers and their multiple failures to recognise either each other or their sister (with whom all four separately fall in love), enact a parable of accidental division and providential reunification with obvious applicability to the contemporary divisions among the sibling states of Christendom. The Clown says to two of the brothers, Eustace and Charles, who are fighting each other over the love of their own sister, “What do you meane Gentlemen to fight among your selues, that should be friends, and had more need to take one anothers part” (sig. D4r); the ludicrousness of the squabbling is underlined by the fact that, as Jane Pettegree observes, “The image of the exemplary crusader is shaped by the comic stereotypical awareness of the *miles gloriosus* in scenes such as that in which Godfrey argues with Guy of Lessingham over who should march at the head of the army.”²² Fortunately, however, there is also another repeated pattern of hostilities eventually paving the way to friendship as each of the combatants is impressed by the fighting skills and chivalry of the other. Particularly resonant in this context is another evocation of *Henry V*, this time of the Four Captains scene, when Guy declares that “Within our Troupes are English, French, Scotch, Dutch” (sig. K2r): united these can beat the combined forces of the Sultan and the Sophy, divided they must fall. *Henry V*, then, provides a powerful model for Heywood’s play, and yet by the time of the play’s 1615 publication the geopolitics of *Henry V* had been entirely reconfigured.

For authors trying to negotiate the switch in emphasis from France to Germany, a repeated strategy is to mobilise Troy, and to connect it to Germany. Although Anna of Denmark might lament that if her daughter married Frederick she would henceforth have to answer to “Goody Palsgrave,” at least two plays of the period seem to make it their business to spell out exactly who and what Frederick was and why his wife might one day be something rather grander than “Goody Palsgrave.” One of these, *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, is ascribed on the title page to George Chapman, who had translated Homer, and of whom Roy Strong observes that “out of all the poets with connections to St. James’s court, Chapman by 1612 was beginning to emerge as the most important.”²³ Fredson Bowers does not entertain Chapman as a possible author,²⁴ and also argues for a date in the 1590s,²⁵ which would of course significantly predate the Palatinate marriage; however, the play may very possibly have been revised later (the title page also says it was performed at the Blackfriars, which would need to be no earlier than 1609, and it may well have been updated for that) and, like *The Four Prentices of London*, *Alphonsus* certainly took on new urgency in the context of the Palatinate marriage and the build-up to it. (It also had an unusually long afterlife if, as Marshall thinks, “*The Tragedy of Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* was performed on 3 October 1630 at court and on 5 May 1636 at Blackfriars before the Queen and the Prince Elector,” though again Bowers argues the opposite view.²⁶)

The second play, which definitely postdates the marriage, is William Smith's *The Hector of Germany. Or The Palsgrave, prime Elector*.²⁷ Smith had lived in Nuremberg for twenty years and had a German wife, so he was well placed to write such a play. The prologue to *The Hector of Germany* explicitly disavows any connection between the Palsgrave who is its subject and the Palsgrave who had just married Princess Elizabeth:

Our Authour for himselfe, this bad me say,
Although the Palsgrave be the name of th' Play,
Tis not that Prince, which in this Kingdome late,
Marryed the Mayden-glory of our state:
What Pen dares be so bold in this strict age,
To bring him while he lives upon the Stage?²⁸

This is, however, clearly disingenuous; Jaroslav Miller suggests that the play had been censored, prompting the sardonic tone of those last two lines, and that

the author obviously counted on the ability of the audience to grasp the historical theme in the context of the current political and religious situation in England and on the Continent . . . The plot . . . works with an allegorical identification of Palsgrave with the Black Prince, Henry Stuart and Frederick of the Palatinate . . . The chief message of the play is to present Frederick as the legitimate heir to the still living political and religious legacy of Henry Stuart.²⁹

Marshall concurs, arguing that "Throughout *The Hector of Germany* the character of the Palsgrave is moulded less by the real-life Frederick, though it is in him that Protestant hopes lie, but rather by a romantic image of what glory Britain's prince might have found in Europe had he lived,"³⁰ while Hans Werner sees the play as clearly and uncompromisingly "encoding the equation . . . Frederick V = Prince Henry."³¹ Indeed if by nothing else, the game would be given away when the hero, Palsgrave Robert, is explicitly said to be at odds with "the bold Bastard, late expulst from Spayne" (sig. A3r), who aims at the empire. The reference to Spain maps the play directly onto the contemporary political landscape as seen by the Protestant party and also creates an exact parallel with *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, where almost the first thing Alphonsus does is to reveal the fundamentally Spanish identity which lurks hidden beneath his official title as he muses that "The Spanish Sun hath purifi'd my wit."³² Thereafter Alphonsus is repeatedly referred to as the King of Castile and the point is reinforced by the introduction of the other half of the polarity by which the Spain of this period was so often characterised, the Netherlands, when one of the seven Electors is addressed as "Brave Duke of Saxon, Dutchlands greatest hope" (sig. B4r); "Dutchland" seems a pointed variation from the more usual and certainly available terms "Germany" or "Almain" and acts as a pointer to the war-torn Spanish Netherlands.

Henry of Trastamara, the villain of *The Hector of Germany*, is a relatively undercharacterised figure. He is Spanish. He is a bastard. He does not need to be anything else to damn him, though he does offer echoes of Tamburlaine when he calls Saxony “the step by which I did ascend” (sig. D1v). The Palsgrave himself, though, is more fully sketched. Early in the play, even though he is sick, he reviews his troops and declares:

Brauely done fellow: that tricke once againe,
And there's gold for thy paines, hee fights like Hector.
Whilst at his feete th'amazed Grecians fall,
And though Achilles would renew the Field,
Hee dares not doo't, the enemies so strong.

(sigs B2r–v)

Other elements of classical mythology are also evoked. In the subplot, Young Fitzwaters is in love with the daughter of Lord Clinton, but his father hopes to marry her instead. When Old Fitzwaters discovers that his son is his rival, he declares,

I haue put on Dianiras poysoned shirt
In the discourse, and euery word cleaues to me
As deadly in the apprehension,
As that which kill'd the Iew-borne Hercules.

(sig. B3r)

(“Jew-borne” is in fact almost certainly a mistake for “Jove-borne,” since an EEBO-TCP search for “born* Hercul*” reveals that to be a frequent epithet.³³) Finding his son unpersuadable, Old Fitzwaters resolves, “here Ile offer vnto Hecate / A hellish sacrifice in a sonnes blood” (sig. C1r). When the son subsequently escapes with the girl, Old Fitzwaters rages that “Some Pegasus has borne her from my sight” (sig. C3v). Later the Bastard says “A couple of Protean villaines I haue ready” (sig. D3v) and the French queen asks Floramell “What Medea was't, / Of whom you learnt the Art of Sorcery, / To inchaunt a King, and draw him to your bed?” (sig. F3v). This is, then, a classicising world.

The use of classical references is an important part of a deliberate strategy. In both *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* and *The Hector of Germany*, the status of the Palatinate and its ruler is carefully and repeatedly boosted. As in William Fennor's gratulatory poem “A description of the Palsgraves Countrey, as it was delivered in a speech before the King, the Prince, the Lady Elizabeth, at White-Hall,” where the territory of the Palsgrave is said to lie between rivers “like a Paradise,” the Palatinate that both these plays present is a land worth having, even for an English princess.³⁴ In *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, in a scene which could be seen as functioning almost as a modern newspaper briefing

piece on a royal's prospective spouse might do, the electors introduce themselves one by one, each giving his full name, title, and responsibilities. The Palsgrave is third and explains that

The next place in election longs to me,
George Cassimirus Palsgrave of the Rhein,
His Highness Taster.

(sig. B4r)

The Hector of Germany goes even further: its Palsgrave Robert declares that "I am chiefe Elector of the seven, / And a meere Caesar now the Chayre is voyde" (sig. A3r). The imperial ambitions hinted at here were indeed an important subtext of the Palatinate marriage. Jaroslav Miller notes that "in September 1620 James I acknowledged in Privy Council that as early as 1612 he had discussed with his future son-in-law the hypothetical chance of Frederick's accession to the Bohemian throne,"³⁵ but *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* hints at glories greater even than that, since it shows an Englishman, Richard, Earl of Cornwall, rising to be Holy Roman Emperor. Richard of Cornwall, the second son of King John, had been not just the first but the only Englishman to hold the title of Holy Roman Emperor, but the Palatinate marriage made it possible to think that perhaps an English head might once again wear an imperial crown, for Jaroslav Miller notes that "Some texts from these years indicate the existence of public conviction or faith that within a certain time the Palatine dynasty could be elevated to the status of Roman Emperors,"³⁶ and Jane Pettegree concurs: "The panegyrics that accompanied the marriage of Elizabeth Stuart to Prince Frederick of the Palatine suggested the dynastic alliance would create a new, Protestant Holy Empire."³⁷ Henry Peacham's *Prince Henrie Revived* (1615), for example, celebrates the birth of Frederick and Elizabeth's first son and wishes that "Caesar Henrie thou maist one day raigne, as good, as great, as ever Charlemagne."³⁸ It was for this, presumably, that the anonymous pamphlet *The marriage of Prince Fredericke, and the Kings daughter, the Lady Elizabeth* notes that the bride wore "upon her head a crowne of refined golde, made Imperiall (by the Pearles and Dyamonds thereon placed)"³⁹—that is, a crown closed with a hoop, which signified imperial status, rather than an open one, which was merely regal. In *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* an unusually careful stage direction is used to introduce a key character: "Enter the Empress Isabella King John's Daughter" (sig. B4v s.d.). Since John's defiance of the Pope had made him a Protestant icon, this would already have evoked easily recognised connotations at the time of the play's composition, but the Palatinate marriage brought it an important new association to compound its original meaning, for now it was again possible to fantasise about the daughter of an English king becoming an empress.

Two aspects of the language and iconography attending on this imperial theme prove particularly challenging to negotiate in the context of English dynastic politics and national and confessional allegiances: these are the name of Caesar and the idea of Rome. In *Roman Invasions*, John Curran argues that competition with Rome was an important factor in the popularity of stories about Brutus and hence by implication about Troy.⁴⁰ Although it had been a long time since there had been anything particularly Roman about the Holy Roman Empire, in *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy* John Taylor draws on a standing Renaissance pun about the word “room” and the contemporary pronunciation of “Rome” when he declares that “Since first the framing of this worlds vast Roome, / A fitter, better match was not combinde,”⁴¹ and in *Alphonsus, Emperour of Germany* Alexander may say “Now is my Lord sole Emperour of Rome” (sig. H2v). However, the possibility of a *Protestant* Holy Roman Emperor creates an iconographical and allegorical problem. The solution proves to be Troy, equally classical and equally authorisatory, but free of the complicating connotations of Roman Catholicism. In the classic style of Renaissance empire-building as identified by J. H. Elliott,⁴² classical mythology is extensively evoked in a number of plays connected to the Palatinate marriage, with the story of Troy in general and of the *ur*-coloniser Aeneas in particular deployed in the service of presenting Germany as both the home of people fundamentally kin and also as territory amenable to imperial ambitions. In *The Hector of Germany*, the King of Bohemia reveals the logic of the play’s title by saying of the ailing Palsgrave,

The strength of Germanie is sicke in him,
And should hee die now in his prime of life,
Like Troy we loose the Hector of our Age.
(sig. A3v)

The Palsgrave is confident that he will get better very soon (he thinks a bit of bad news would give him the spur he needs), and at the very end of the play he does indeed recover sufficiently to fight (and kill) his enemy the Duke of Saxony. In Fennor’s “Description,” we are told that

Poets leave writing of the Grecian Queene,
And of Aeneas, Lady Venus sonne:
Two rarer beauties shortly shall be seene
in Almany, when Englands pride is wonne.
(sig. C3r)

Helen and Aeneas are apparently evoked only to be declared inferior to Elizabeth and Frederick respectively, but their memory lingers.

In *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, too, Greeks and Trojans matter. Alphonsus himself, viewing his adviser Lorenzo de Toledo, whom he has just drugged, says,

How now Lorenzo, half asleep already?
Aeneas Pilot by the God of dreams,
Was never lulld into a sounder trance.
(p. 6)

Later, Alphonsus drags his empress (the character who has been explicitly identified as King John's daughter) by the hair, as Menelaus is said to have done Helen, and accuses her (correctly, though he is wrong about the reason) of having concealed the Palsgrave in her chamber:

So for the best advantage of thy lust,
Hast thou in secret Clytemnestra like,
Hid thy Aegestus thy adulterous love.
(p. 40)

The Duke of Saxony (whose Christian name is the suitably classical Augustus) initially casts around for a suitable classical precedent:

Me thinks I now present Mark Antony,
Folding dead Iulius Caesar in mine arms.
No, no, I rather will present Achilles,
And on Patroclus Tomb do sacrifice.
(p. 66 / sig. K1v)

However, later Alexander settles definitively on a Trojan model when he explains how he watched the battle from the tower and

posted from the turrets top,
More furiously than ere Laocoon ran,
When Trojan hands drew in Troy's overthrow.
(p. 69 / sig. K3r)

The European characters of *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* display an implicitly classicising mindset when they refer to the English as "divided from our Continent" (p. 9), but both they and the characters of *The Hector of Germany* share with the English a fundamentally Trojan identity which helpfully brings with it the motif of the *translatio imperii*.

The idea of a shared Trojan identity is even more central in Jasper Fisher's *Fuimus Troes*, a puzzling play which we could read more easily if we could date it securely. It was first published in 1633, but could have been written several

years before. One thing though seems clear: it is interested in the Palatinate marriage. Chris Butler argues for allusions to the Elector Frederick,⁴³ and though Caesar's reference to "Mount Palatine, thou throne of Jove" (3.4.12) ostensibly refers to one of Rome's seven hills, it also has an obvious applicability to the Palatinate. In keeping with the cultural fantasy that an English princess could become a queen (for the first time since the brief marriage of Henry VIII's sister Mary to Louis XII of France) and perhaps even a Holy Roman Empress, this is a play in which national identities are radically fluid. When it opens, Caesar looking at Britain from Gaul says "I long to stride / This Hellespont, or bridge it with a navy" (1.2.33–34), to which Volusenus replies, "Embark your legions at the Iccian shore [Calais] / And teach Erinyes swim, which crawled before" (1.2.64–65): transposing the geography of Greece onto that of the Continent, Caesar thus implicitly figures France as the edge of Europe (since the Hellespont divides Europe from Asia) and whatever lies beyond it as barbaric, other, and appropriate prey for the Furies (Erinyes).

The play is however heavily invested in proving him wrong. The Britons are warned of the Roman approach by the druid Hulacus, who proclaims,

Saturn, joined
In dismal league with Mars, portends some change.
Late in a grove by night, a voice was heard
To cry aloud, "Take heed, more Trojans come."
(2.3.43–46)

The Romans are "more Trojans" because both Romans and Britons claim descent from Aeneas, but the Roman claim to Trojanness does not invalidate the British one. Britons live in new Troy, as we see when the high king Cassibelane (Cassivelaunus) says,

Meanwhile, Androgeus, hold unto your use
Our lady-city Troynovaunt and all
The toll and tribute of delicious Kent
(1.3.6–8)

Cassibelane's letter of defiance to Caesar also proudly lays claim to a Trojan identity:

As you from Troy, so we our pedigree do claim.
Why should the branches fight when as the root's the same?
(2.4.26–27)

The fact that these Trojans have moved to a location other than Troy is irrelevant; Androgeus, developing the metaphor of root and branches, declares that “trees transplanted do more goodly grow” (5.5.43).

The Britons certainly “feel” Trojan. Like both sides in the Trojan War, they sacrifice animals to the gods: Belinus says,

The king and army do expect as much,
That powers divine, perfumed with odour sweet
And feasted with the fat of bulls and rams,
Be pleased to bless their plots.

(2.3.49–52)

They also play a Trojan game: Cassibelane says,

Triumphs must thrust our obsequies, and tilt
With tourney and our ancient sport called Troy,
Such as Iulus, 'bout his grandsire's tomb,
Did represent.

(3.4.53–57)

Mentally, they certainly live in a classical world: Eulinus persistently compares his love Landora to classical goddesses such as Juno, Pallas, Venus, Aurora, Proserpina, including claiming ridiculously that she has “Medusa's hair / Before it hissed” (2.2.35–36); later, speaking of his feelings for Landora, he compares himself to Jason, Hercules, Venus, Midas, and Paris (3.6.5–9). In 4.2, he mentions Orpheus and Arion (1), Urania (3), Prometheus (10), Tityus and Sisyphus (11), and the Danaids and Tantalus (12), declaring that his grief at having killed his friend exceeds them all. Finally he addresses his dagger as “A passport to the Elysian land” (5.3.42) and apostrophises the dead Landora, “Leander-like, I swim to thee through blood” (5.3.48).

Caesar's initial response to all this conspicuous classicism is to claim that even if the Romans and British are both Trojans, the Romans are not just “more Trojans” but *more Trojan*:

What privilege hath this place? Have we or they
The Phrygian powers? Have they Palladium got?
No, no. Those gods our Capitol keep with joy;
These only have undaunted minds from Troy.

(4.4.46–49)

Soon though he finds himself having a pithy conversation with Hulacus:

Caesar. What god adore you?
Hulacus. Him whom all should serve.
Caesar. What's the moon?

Hulacus. Night's sun.
Caesar. What's night?
Hulacus. A foil to glorify the day.
Caesar. What most compendious way to happiness?
Hulacus. To die in a good cause.
Caesar. What is a man?
Hulacus. An hermaphrodite of soul and body.
Caesar. How differ they in nature?
Hulacus. The body hath in weight, the soul in length.
Caesar. One question more: what dangers shall I pass?
Hulacus. Many, by land and sea, as steps to glory.

(5.1.22–31)

There is an obvious resemblance here to a catechism, and Caesar's willingness to consult Hulacus about his own personal fate suggests that the druid's answers have convinced him that they are on the same cultural page. He would of course have done well to have listened to Hulacus's further warning to keep away from the Capitol, and also to have heeded his advice to

Be Saturn, and so thou shalt not be Tarquin.
 A Brutus strong
 Repay in fine
 Thy brutish wrong
 To Brutus' line.

(5.1.45–49)

There are two kinds of Brutus here, the one who colonised Britain in the past and the one who will stab Caesar in the future. In Hulacus's prophetic words the two bleed into each other, but Caesar is deaf to this because he is so ruthlessly focused neither on past nor future but on the present, and the power he can seize in it. Audiences or readers, though, would surely be alert to the way that time collapses in on itself in this moment, and understand that, by implication, this play which is ostensibly about the past also has an urgently topical and contemporary application.

As soon as the two armies come to blows, Caesar is forced to concede that his opponents are indeed justified in laying claim to Trojan heritage:

We may confess they come of Trojan kind;
 A hundred valiant Hectors here we find.

(3.2.8–9)

To be Trojan is however not an auspicious identity. When Cassibelane asks how many ships have come against Britain, he gets an ominous answer: "Rising from shore, conjecture might descry / A thousand ships" (4.3.2–3).

Anyone with even a passing acquaintance with Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* knows how many ships were launched against Troy (A text, 5.1.89), so the information that Caesar too has a thousand ships cannot bode well. Cassibelane also makes a rather unexpected comparison:

Uncertain 'tis where, when, he makes in-road.
 To furnish all, unlikely, to neglect
 Any were dangerous as Pelides' heel.
 Our shores are large and level. Then, t'attend
 His time and leisure would exhaust the state,
 Weary our soldiers.

(4.3.27–32)

Britain's indented coastline is like an Achilles's heel (Achilles being the son of Peleus and thus bearing the patronymic Pelides), but Achilles was not a Trojan but a Greek: at the moment when Britain is threatened with destruction just as Troy was, it cannot even hold on to its Trojan identity.

One Briton, though, is securely Trojan. The funeral elegy for Nennius declares that

Nennius had Aeneas' fame.
 Hannibal, let Afric' smother,
 Nennius was great Scipio's brother.
 Greece, forbear Achilles' story,
 Nennius had brave Hector's glory.

(3.7.15–19)

Cassibelane confirms the identity when he laments "Our British Hector, Nennius, dead" (5.4.12). Chris Butler argues that Nennius is an analogue to Prince Henry, and this would strengthen the sense that *Fuimus Troes* is offering support to the Elector Frederick, who was insistently presented as Henry's natural heir and even in some sense his replacement. There is certainly no sense of sympathy for Henry's *de jure* heir, his brother Charles: Themantius's dictum that "A body politic must on two legs stand" (5.5.37) runs clean contrary to Charles's fanatical commitment to absolutism and might also be a sly glance at the fact that Charles himself seems to have had weak legs (he was so slow in learning to walk that James I considered iron boots for him). Finally, the play ends with Mercury saying to the ghosts of Brennus and Furius Camillus, who have been on opposite sides in both life and death, "You must be friends at last. The close is sweet / When, after tumults, hearts and hands do meet" (5.7.28–29). The rhetoric is that of a marriage, reminding the reader that Fisher wrote an epithalamium for Frederick and Elizabeth, comparing their union to that of Hebe and Hercules. Brennus and Camillus cannot marry, being among other things both male and both dead, and

Frederick and Elizabeth have already done so, but there is another kind of marriage metaphorically available for consummation, and that is a marriage of ideas (and of military effort) between English and European Protestants, in the shape of the potential support which might made be available to Frederick. It is richly ironic that the most appropriate way of figuring the idea of a Protestant alliance should be one between two groups of *Romans*, given that Rome itself was now the seat not of the Capitol but of the Vatican, but the insistence on their common Trojan ancestry takes the sting out of it, and directs our focus to Rome's past rather than its future. Where is Hector now? He is itinerant, but based mostly in Germany, and rather than devoting himself to war, he is focusing his efforts on brokering a pan-European peace under the sign of a common Trojan heritage, in a way which makes even Rome seem acceptable.

Notes

1 Thomas Heywood, *The Iron Age containyng the rape of Hellen: the siege of Troy: the combate between Hector and Aiax: Hector and Troilus slayne by Achilles: Achilles slaine by Paris: Aiax and Vlisses contend for the armour of Achilles: the death of Aiax, &c.* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1632), sigs H1r and H3r.

2 I have discussed this at length in the first chapter, "'Bisson Conspectuities': Language and National Identity in Shakespeare's Roman Plays," of my *From the Romans to the Normans on the English Renaissance Stage* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017).

3 Hugh A. MacDougall, *Racial Myth in English History* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1982), p. 44.

4 Jeffrey Knapp, *An Empire Nowhere: England, America, and Literature from Utopia to The Tempest* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), p. 67.

5 Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: Everyman, 1999), A text, 2.1.23.

6 See <http://www.thelocal.de/national/20110221-33241.html>. Last accessed 12 February 2019.

7 See Lisa Hopkins, *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

8 Christopher Marlowe, *Edward II*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: Everyman, 1999), 1.1.6–8.

9 John Michael Archer, *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern English Writing* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), pp. 102, 105, and 108. John Gillies notes that "If for no other reason, Marlowe's familiarity with the ancient boundary discourse may be assumed on the basis of his translation of the first book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*" (John Gillies, "Marlowe, the *Timur* Myth, and the Motives of Geography," in *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan [Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1998], pp. 203–29, p. 210).

10 Norman Davies, *Vanished Kingdoms: The History of Half-Forgotten Europe* (London: Allen Lane, 2011), p. 260.

- 11 Thomas Danett, *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the eiight where Comines endeth, till the death of Henry the second* (London: Thomas East for Thomas Charde, 1600), p. 87.
- 12 Henri IV, *The Copie of a Letter sent by the French king to the people of Artoys and Henault, requesting them to remooue the forces gathered by the king of Spaine, from the Borders of France, otherwise denouncing open warre* (London: Peter Short for Thomas Millington, 1595), p. 4.
- 13 Anonymous, *Edward III*, in *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, 2nd edition, edited by Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2005), Scene 3, 190–92.
- 14 William Shakespeare, *King Henry VI, Part One*, edited by Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1.1.60–61.
- 15 William Shakespeare, *Henry VI, Part Two*, edited by Michael Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1.1.111 (Salisbury), and 3.1.83–85.
- 16 William Shakespeare, *King Henry V*, edited by T. W. Craik (London: Routledge, 1995), 2.2.194.
- 17 Richard Hillman, *Shakespeare, Marlowe and the Politics of France* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 20.
- 18 Thomas Heywood, *The Four Prentices of London* (London: Nicholas Okes for John Wright, 1615), sig. A2v.
- 19 John Taylor, *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy . . .* (London: E. Allde for Joseph Hunt, 1613), sigs A3r–v.
- 20 Tristan Marshall, *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 115–16.
- 21 On the similarities between the two plays see also Annaliese F. Connolly, “Guy of Warwick, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Elizabethan Repertory,” in *Early Modern England and Islamic Worlds*, edited by Bernadette Andrea and Linda McJannet (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 139–58, p. 142.
- 22 Jane Pettegree, *Foreign and Native on the English Stage, 1588–1611* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011), p. 127.
- 23 Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), p. 180.
- 24 Fredson Bowers, “The Date and Composition of *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*,” *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 15 (1933): 165–89.
- 25 Fredson Bowers argued that “the date of composition can be assigned to the years 1594–99 (and probably to 1597–99)” (“*Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, and the *Ur-Hamlet*,” *Modern Language Notes* 48.2 [February 1933]: 101–8, p. 102).
- 26 Marshall, *Theatre and Empire*, p. 188.
- 27 The play has traditionally been attributed to Wentworth Smith, but Dave Kathman has shown that this is erroneous: David Kathman, “*The Freeman’s Honour*, William Smith, and the Lord Chamberlain’s Men,” paper given at the Shakespeare Association of America annual meeting, 2017. I am very grateful both to him and to Matthew Steggle for alerting me to this.
- 28 [William] Smith, *The Hector of Germany. Or The Palsgrave, prime Elector* (London: Thomas Creede for Josias Harrison, 1615), sig. A2v.
- 29 Jaroslav Miller, “The Henrician Legend Revived: The Palatine Couple and Its Public Image in Early Stuart England,” *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire* 11.3 (2004): 305–31, p. 324.

30 Marshall, *Theatre and Empire*, p. 157.

31 Hans Werner, "The Hector of Germanie, or The Palsgrave, Prime Elector and Anglo-German Relations of Early Stuart England: The View from the Popular Stage," in *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, edited by R. Malcolm Smuts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 113–32, p. 119.

32 George Chapman, *The tragedy of Alphonsus, Emperour of Germany* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1654), sig. B1r.

33 I am grateful to Matthew Steggle for this information.

34 William Fennor, "A description of the Palsgraves Countrey, as it was delivered in a speech before the King, the Prince, the Lady Elizabeth, at White-Hall," in *Fennors descriptions, or A true relation of certaine and diuers speeches* (London: Edward Griffin for George Gibbs, 1616), sig. B3v.

35 Miller, "The Henrician Legend Revived," p. 317.

36 Miller, "The Henrician Legend Revived," p. 317.

37 Pettegree, *Foreign and Native on the English Stage*, p. 146.

38 Miller, "The Henrician legend revived," p. 317.

39 Anonymous, *The marriage of Prince Fredericke, and the Kings daughter, the Lady Elizabeth* . . . (London: Thomas Creede for William Barley, 1613), sig. B1v.

40 John Curran, *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism and the Historical Imagination in England 1530–1660* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002).

41 Taylor, *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy*, sig. D1r.

42 J. H. Elliott, *The Old World and the New 1492–1650* [1970] (Cambridge: Canto, 1992).

43 Jasper Fisher, *Fuimus Troes*, edited by Chris Butler, 2007. Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/iemls/renplays/fuimustroes.htm>.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 5

Making Troy New

In his 1593 text *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes*, Richard Harvey made the tongue-in-cheek suggestion that the reason for the lack of any physical evidence for the story of Brutus, great-grandson of Aeneas, and his band of Trojan descendants might be that “their actes were wrought in needleworke onely, and so worne out.”¹ This chapter discusses women’s engagement with the Troy story through a consideration of how they sewed it and also how they retold it in ways intended for domestic performance. Troy is in many ways a story about women. Everyone knows that the Trojan War was triggered by the abduction of Helen, but the early modern period was aware that this was just one episode in a history of abductions of women: *Troilus and Cressida* mentions this, and Laurie Maguire notes that “The ‘old aunt,’ Priam’s sister, Hesione . . . features prominently in medieval and early modern narratives.”² One of the Greek tragedies most popular in the period, Euripides’s *Hecabe*, offers a couple of vivid vignettes of women’s everyday lives. The first is when Hecabe explains how she will bury Polyxena:

I’ll ask my fellow-prisoners
If some of them have jewellery from their own homes
Which they have kept out of the sight of our new masters;
And what they have, they’ll all give for Polyxena.³

The second is when the Chorus remembers the fall of Troy:

I was arranging my hair,
Fastening it under my cap,
Gazing in the endless gleam of my golden mirror,
Sitting ready to fall into my bed;
When a roar rose along the streets.⁴

For some women in early modern England, the tale of Troy became part of their own lived experiences. One woman could even claim to live there: Ruth Elizabeth Richardson notes that in 1502 Blanche, Lady Troy, whose husband William Herbert of Troy Parva was an illegitimate son of the Earl of Pembroke, “joined her husband in welcoming Henry VII, his queen and earls at the ‘palace of Troy,’ Troy(e) House, south-east of Monmouth.”⁵ The iconography of the tale of Troy could be used against women—Mary Queen of Scots was figured as Medea and as Clytemnestra⁶—but it could also become a valued and important part of their identities.

In Book Six of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Pallas and Arachne weave rival tapestries. Arachne's shows some of Jove's seductions, including those of Europa, Leda, Antiope, Danaë, Mnemosyne, and Proserpine,⁷ and thus uses needlework to express women's experiences and emotions (as we shall see in the next chapter, Aspatia in *The Maid's Tragedy* calls for needlework to do precisely this). Weaving is consistently represented as a major activity of Greek and Trojan women. In Euripides's *Hecabe*, the Chorus says,

Perhaps I shall come to live in Athene's city,
And there on the saffron robe of Pallas,
Weaving bright threads in a flowery pattern,
Yoke the horses to her glorious chariot;
Or depict the race of raging Titans
Quelled by Zeus, son of Cronos,
With the flame of his lightning.⁸

Later, Polymestor talks about the Trojan women "admiring / the Thracian texture of my cloak," implying the women of one culture taking an intelligent interest in the handwork of the women of another.⁹ A number of early modern plays connect needlework to Greek women in particular. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, set in and outside Athens, Helena remembers how,

We, Hermia, like two artificial gods,
Have with our needles created both one flower,
Both on one sampler, sitting on one cushion,
Both warbling of one song, both in one key,
As if our hands, our sides, voices and minds,
Had been incorporate. So we grew together,
Like to a double cherry, seeming parted,
But yet an union in partition.¹⁰

Needlework is understood here as fundamentally a bonding activity, and this is a recurrent feature of early modern women's connection with classical women: Bess of Hardwick commissioning a panel embroidery of Penelope is forging an identification. There is also an element of identification implicit in the fact that Hermia and Helena are sewing a flower while themselves figuratively embodying a fruit: the feminine is firmly located in the realm of the natural, which is a source of power for Helena and Hermia as the act of creation turns them into "two artificial gods" and indeed constitutes them as almost a philosophical statement, "an union in partition."

David Goldstein, noting that "embroidery in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries enjoyed an axiomatic association with nature,"¹¹ points to the preponderance of floral patterns; in that regard, Helena and Hermia would appear to

she does echo him by not making an emotional commitment to a partner, and her skirt, like Hero's and the queen's, would thus express an aspect of her identity.

Flowers and needlework are connected again in the figure of the Jailer's Daughter. Once she goes mad, she famously sings about flowers (4.1.72–78) and the Doctor advises the Wooer to “Come to her stuck in as sweet flowers as the season is mistress of” (4.3.81–82), but before she goes mad she thinks about sewing as she looks at “The little stars and all, that look like aglets” (3.4.2), that is decorative fastenings, and vows, “For I'll cut my green coat, a foot above my knee” (3.4.19). Both flowers and needlework are also, once again, connected to women's suffering: Theseus is moved to remember how “I have heard / Two emulous Philomels beat the ear o'th'night” (5.3.123–24), and he may also think of Iphigenia if Theobald was right to conjecture that he should say “At the banks of Aulis meet with us” (1.1.212) for Q's “Anly,” as seems not unlikely given that Emilia's sacrifice to Diana involves a silver hind which is snatched away and miraculously replaced by a rose tree (a substitution which itself extradiegetically substitutes for Artemis's replacement of Iphigenia by a hind).

In *Pericles*, we are invited to imagine another pair of Greek women sewing, as the Chorus tells us that Philoten

Would ever with Marina be,
Be't when they weaved the sleided silk
With fingers long, small, white as milk,
Or when she would with sharp needle wound
The cambric which she made more sound
With hurting it.¹³

There is however a presumed difference in the standard of performance, given that Marina is in general not only more attractive but also more accomplished than Philoten. Certainly Marina is proud of her needlework: she tells Boult to “Proclaim that I can sing, weave, sew, and dance” (4.5.186). This is supported by the Chorus, who declares that

Deep clerks she dumbs and with her nee'le composes
Nature's own shape of bud, bird, branch or berry,
That even her art sisters the natural roses.
Her inkle, silk, twin with the rubied cherry,
That pupils lacks she none of noble race.

(5.0.5–10)

Like Hermia and Helena, Marina is connected with fruit and flowers: her silk is like a cherry, her subjects include buds, branches, and berries, and either she sews roses or her work itself is as beautiful as roses (perhaps both). She also sews

birds, and this brings out an idea often imaginatively connected with needlework, which is singing. Helena and Hermia sing while they sew; Philomel was a nightingale as well as a needlewoman; Marina herself can “sing, weave, sew, and dance.” Connecting needlework to singing helps us to understand what a rich power of expression stitching had in the context of the early modern household: Emilia wants a skirt embroidered with narcissi not merely for decoration, but to say something about herself; when Greek women sew or when early modern women sew Greek subjects, they sing the self.

When early modern women imitated Greek needlewomen, they could sometimes do so to challenging effect. Needlework is ostensibly a meek activity, but it could work to subversive effect: Susan Frye notes that “Women responded to the unchanging injunction to perform domestic needlework by evolving a subculture within which patterns and pictures articulated their lives. These patterns . . . formed visual expressions of narratives offering alternatives to the passivity, privacy, and silence that needlework was supposed to enforce.”¹⁴ Frye observes elsewhere that “The most popular subject for a needlework panel was that of Esther, who, silenced by the conditions of her marriage, nevertheless gained the attention of her emperor-husband and saves her people from genocide at the hands of the emperor’s adviser, Haman,”¹⁵ but classical stories were also popular and they too could encode messages about self-expression; Rozsika Parker argues that “embroidery permitted a woman to acquire a humanist education without threatening the boundaries between masculinity and femininity” by stitching figures from the classical past.¹⁶

Particularly influential was the *Odyssey*’s depiction of Penelope as using the alleged necessity of weaving a shroud for her father-in-law Laertes, which she worked on every day and secretly unpicked every night, as a ruse to stave off the unwelcome attentions of her suitors. Penelope was a particular favourite of Bess of Hardwick, whose clear self-identification with her is shown by the fact that in an embroidered hanging at Hardwick Penelope wears a countess’s coronet, just like the ones which surmount Bess’s initials above the main façade of the house; Mary S. Lovell notes that “in one famous set of tapestries representing goddesses and their virtues there is a distinct resemblance in the faces of Zenobia and Penelope to a portrait of Bess soon after she became Countess of Shrewsbury.”¹⁷

Hardwick also contains what appears to be a painting of an embroidery, perhaps one made by Bess herself. Janet Arnold says of the skirt in the Hardwick Portrait of Elizabeth I, “The delightful variety of motifs in the Hardwick portrait include pansies, roses, iris, sea monsters, a crab, snakes, butterflies, fish, a sea horse, a kingfisher, and a swan, among other birds, executed in a wide range of colors. These are scattered over the white silk in a random

arrangement. All this suggests that the design is probably embroidery rather than staining. The petticoat might have been a New Year's gift worked by the donor" (that is, Bess).¹⁸ Whoever created it, the petticoat of the Hardwick Portrait has an extraordinary iconographical range: Arnold notes that "Inspiration for monsters in the Hardwick portrait comes from a variety of sources, one of them probably Sebastian Munster's *Cosmographia*" and that "Many slips of flowers are worked on the Queen's petticoat in the Hardwick portrait."¹⁹ In this profusion of symbols it resembles a fictional skirt, that of Hero in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*:

Her wide sleeves green, and bordered with a grove,
Where Venus in her naked glory strove
To please the careless and disdainful eyes
Of proud Adonis that before her lies.²⁰

In both cases needlework is used to express and fashion female identity, and in both cases it encodes iconographical and emblematic messages.

Although Bess had a painting of *The Return of Ulysses to Penelope*, most of her Troy-related pieces were made of needlework, including an embroidered hanging of Penelope, a needlework table carpet showing *The Judgement of Paris*, and "the Ulysses set in the High Great Chamber, which was clearly important to Bess."²¹ Such an attachment to a classical figure was however not without risk. Alison Wiggins, noting that in all her letters to her fourth husband the Earl of Shrewsbury, who came to regard her with bitterness and suspicion, "Bess presented herself through the trope of the ideal Renaissance wife: patient, obedient, dutiful and unfailingly loyal to her husband," connects this to Bess's "precise and sustained identification" with Penelope. Shrewsbury seems to have thought this too, but to have taken a rather different view of it: in 1584, shortly after the couple had separated, he wrote to her that "Your letter . . . carrying so faire and vnaccustomed shewe of dutifulness & humilite of spirit cometh now so late and so out of season that makes me suspect it to be a Sirens songe set for some other purpose then it pretendeth."²² He is clearly aware of her self-identification with Penelope, and equally clearly regards it as untrue and self-serving: Bess, he angrily declares, is no chaste Penelope but a very different member of the cast of the *Odyssey*, a deceitful and destructive siren.

Another of the female figures stitched by Bess was Cleopatra, an unusual choice in that Cleopatra was often regarded as far from heroic; Stephen Alford notes that the murals at the London headquarters of the Hansa, painted by Holbein the Younger, included "a cheerless march of the doomed" in which "trudging beside Plutus, burdened by their riches, were the unhappy figures of Cleopatra, Croesus, Midas and Tantalus."²³ Cleopatra could however be

connected to fabric: in *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare specifies that Cleopatra's pavilion was "cloth-of-gold of tissue,"²⁴ and in *Cymbeline* Iachimo attempts to convince Postumus of Innogen's infidelity by describing how her bedchamber

was hang'd

With tapestry of silk and silver, the story
 Proud Cleopatra, when she met her Roman,
 And Cydnus swell'd above the banks, or for
 The press of boats, or pride. A piece of work
 So bravely done, so rich, that it did strive
 In workmanship and value; which I wonder'd
 Could be so rarely and exactly wrought.²⁵

The tapestry described by Iachimo echoes Cleopatra's own duality in possessing both artistic and monetary value, and this helps us understand something about the importance of embroidered hangings within wealthy early modern households, for they did indeed speak of both actual and cultural capital. Susan Frye suggests that "Imogen's room, like the Sala di Penelope designed for Eleonora of Toledo in the Palazzo Vecchio . . . encapsulates a way of thinking that grew out of the medieval practice of mingling allegorical self-representation with mythic and religious narratives in order to assert and validate one's identity,"²⁶ while Rebecca Olson argues that in *Cymbeline* "Shakespeare surrounds his heroine with textiles and textile references: the textiles of her bedchamber represent the elaborate needlework and weaving that could be found in the bedchambers of Elizabethan ladies, and even her attending lady, Helen, recalls an infamous weaver in Classical mythology."²⁷

Both embroideries and tapestries could speak of women's identities and positions. I have suggested elsewhere that it is possible to read *Coriolanus* in relation to a particular event which took place at Hardwick Hall, which the Queen's Men seem to have visited in 1600, probably acting Shakespeare.²⁸ In 1603, Bess's "bad son" Henry Cavendish appeared at the gates with forty armed horsemen, with the aim of rescuing his cousin Arbella, Bess's granddaughter, but was turned back by the sheer force of Bess's personality; I think it is possible to see a parallel here with the way in which the apparently inflexible Coriolanus finds his purpose turned by his mother. For a play about a military hero, *Coriolanus* is surprisingly interested in embroidery. The idea of needlework first enters the play at the beginning of act one, scene three, when a stage direction announces, "Enter Volumnia and Virgilia, mother and wife to Martius. They set them down on two low stools and sew."²⁹ Peter Holland's note in the Arden 3 edition observes, "Many productions and/or performers have difficulty imagining

Volumnia sewing,” but there are other definite or possible references to needlework and tapestries in the play: Aufidius speaks of Coriolanus “Breaking his oath and resolution like / A twist of rotten silk” (5.6.95–96), Volumnia says that honour is “no better than picture-like to hang by th’wall, if renown made it not stir” (1.3.10–11), and Martius thinks of sewing materials when he speaks of how “steel grows soft / As the parasite’s silk” (1.9.44–45). Menenius tells Coriolanus “This must be patched / With cloth of any colour” (3.1.254–55) and Coriolanus himself remembers how his mother used to call the plebeians “woollen vassals” (3.2.10). Perhaps most surprisingly, there are five separate references to cushions (1.3.5, 2.1.86, 2.2 s.d., 3.1.103, 5.3.53), more than in any other Shakespeare play. Moreover, *Coriolanus*, as Janet Adelman has shown, is full of references to feeding, especially breastfeeding, as part of its pervasive interest in hunger.³⁰ Hardwick Hall provides us with one of the most arresting of Elizabethan images of lactation, a needlework hanging of a grown woman breastfeeding her imprisoned father through the bars of his gaol in order to keep him alive; the woman in question is named Pero and her father Cimon, and the story became famed as an example of Roman charity or “caritas Romana.”

We do not know what Volumnia and Virgilia are sewing; our only clue is Valeria’s question “What are you sewing here? A fine spot in good faith” (1.3.54–55),³¹ which simply indicates that there is a design (Iago describes Desdemona’s handkerchief as “spotted with strawberries”³²). We do know that Volumnia associates needlework with passivity, since she thinks that her son’s prowess would be “no better than picture-like to hang by th’wall, if renown made it not stir” (1.3.10–11), where the word “stir” seems to suggest a flexible material such as embroidery or tapestry rather than a fixed and static one such as the canvas or wood on which a portrait would be painted. Volumnia is however not necessarily right to connect needlework with passivity, as indeed she herself hints when she says “I pray you, daughter, sing, or express yourself in a more comfortable sort” (1.3.1–2). Sewing is apparently not comfortable, and indeed Susan Frye draws attention to a cushion embroidered by Mary, Queen of Scots which bore the words “Virescit Vulnere Virtus”: “The message, that the barren stalk of Elizabeth should be cut away so that the fruitful branch of Mary might flourish, made the cushion admissible evidence at Norfolk’s trial”;³³ it was a message which cost Norfolk his head.

Mary made that cushion while she was in the household of Bess of Hardwick, where Penelope figured largely. Penelope is mentioned in *Coriolanus* too when Valeria says to Virgilia,

You would be another Penelope. Yet they say all the yarn she spun in Ulysses' absence
did but fill Ithaca full of moths. Come, I would your cambric were sensible as your finger,
that you might leave pricking it for pity. (1.3.83–87)

This is part of a general interest in the play in Greece and also in the Trojan War. Coriolanus speaks of “a graver bench / Than ever frowned in Greece” (3.1.107–8) and says,

Whoever gave that counsel to give forth
The corn o'th'storehouse gratis, as 'twas used
Sometime in Greece—

(3.1.114–16)

He also remembers Volumnia imagining herself as the wife of Hercules (4.1.17), while Menenius says Coriolanus will shake Rome “As Hercules did shake down mellow fruit” (4.6.101) and that “He sits in his state as a thing made for Alexander” (5.4.21–22). Aufidius defies him with “Wert thou the Hector / That was the whip of your bragged progeny” (1.8.12–13), and in the sewing scene of *Coriolanus*, Trojan women are specifically remembered when Volumnia says,

The breasts of Hecuba
When she did suckle Hector looked not lovelier
Than Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood
At Grecian sword contemning.

(1.3.42–45)

Both Virgilia and Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus* have names which speak of the Roman past (Virgil being the chronicler of Roman greatness at the court of Augustus and Lavinia the wife of Aeneas) and both might therefore be expected to produce needlework which told stories of both personal and national significance. We are reminded of what specifically Lavinia might have been expected to sew in *Cymbeline*, when Iachimo notes Innogen's book: “She hath been reading late, / The tale of Tereus, here the leaf's turn'd down / Where Philomel gave up” (2.2.44–46). In *Titus Andronicus*, Marcus Andronicus had also thought of Philomel when he looked at his niece Lavinia after she had been raped and mutilated:

Fair Philomela, why she but lost her tongue,
And in a tedious sampler sewed her mind;
But, lovely niece, that mean is cut from thee.
A craftier Tereus, cousin, hast thou met,
And he hath cut those pretty fingers off,
That could have better sewed than Philomel.³⁴

Lavinia's handless state means she cannot actually sew, but Marcus is right to connect this story of furious and revelatory needlework to his niece, as we see when she finally finds a means to draw attention to a copy of Ovid. The story that Lavinia might have sewn has the same status as the tapestry that might have been created at the court of Brutus: neither has ever actually existed, yet both represent an idea which is politically and emotionally resonant. In the case of Virgilia we do not even know what the subject of her needlework is, but we do know that it is something which Volumnia does not find comfortable; whatever it is, we can guess that it might have political as well as personal meaning. Virgilia may be addressed by her husband as "My gracious silence" (2.1.70), but voices in this play are not reliable: the people give theirs and then retract them, while Brutus says of Coriolanus "He's a lamb indeed that baas like a bear" (2.1.11). Needlework by contrast is dumb, but it does allow women to stitch men into heroic roles which are perhaps more easily sustained in embroidered hangings than in real life. We may not be sure exactly what Virgilia is stitching, but we should recognise that she is performing an act which has both political and classicising overtones.

Bess of Hardwick's granddaughter Arbella Stuart, who may just possibly have been tutored by Christopher Marlowe,³⁵ also used the iconography of Troy, but in her case she wrote it rather than sewed it. Arbella's choice of writing is a deliberate rather than a default one: Santana Levey notes that despite the preponderance of textiles at Hardwick New Hall "There is no evidence that Bess herself was a compulsive embroiderer . . . but her granddaughter Arbella Stuart was a skilled needlewoman," sewing a veil for Elizabeth to which the queen was said to have taken "an especiall likeing";³⁶ she could thus certainly have embroidered an image of Penelope had she wished to do so, but what she wanted to say about Troy was more complicated than her grandmother's uses of it.

In her case it was inflected by the fact that the story of Troy is inherently dynastic. It is about the transmission of cultural and imperial authority from father to son: specifically from Aeneas to Ascanius to Silvius to Brutus, generically and by implication from Brutus to King Arthur and hence to all future kings of England. Arbella, who had a claim to the thrones of both England and Scotland through her father Charles Stuart, grandson of Henry VIII's sister Margaret, turned to Troy when she made her first attempt to marry into the Seymour family (also potential claimants through their descent from Lady Catherine Grey, granddaughter of Henry's other sister, Mary). For much of the 1590s and early 1600s she was trapped in her grandmother's custody, most often at Hardwick, where she was exposed to Bess's love of visual representations of classical heroines. Two generations of Cavendish women later, Lady Jane Cavendish and Lady Elizabeth Brackley, daughters of Arbella's first cousin

William Cavendish, chose to figure themselves in terms of Cleopatra, when Cicilley in their jointly authored play *The Concealed Fancies* says to Sh (a character only ever identified by these two letters; perhaps Susannah), “You mean how did you look in the posture of a delinquent? Faith, as though you thought the scene would change again, and you would be happy though you suffered misery for a time,” and Sh replies that she was able to do this because “I practised Cleopatra when she was in her captivity, and could they have thought me worthy to have adorned their triumphs[,] I would have performed his gallant tragedy and so have made myself glorious for time to come”;³⁷ perhaps they were influenced by the fact that in the embroidered hanging at Hardwick Cleopatra was shown with Fortitude and Justice.³⁸ Lady Anne Clifford, a friend of Arbella’s cousins the countesses of Arundel and Kent, seems also to have turned to Cleopatra, apparently being represented in costume as Cleopatra with some lines from Samuel Daniel’s play, “And Egipt now where Cleopatra I / Have acted this,” painted in the corner of the portrait.³⁹

For Arbella, though, it was the tale of Troy that appealed. The letter in which she first alludes to Troy is, like much of her writing, not very coherent. However, there is one stable element, which is that she repeatedly has recourse to classical imagery:

For whearas if the Noble gentleman you would needes suspect had binne transported by somm Archimedes to Newstead as miraculously especially to him selfe as certaine Romanes (those Romanes weare full of unsuspecting magnanimity) weare hoised over the walles of the besieged Siracus and drawne by one poore Scholler (who lightly are not the wisest nor strongest faction) through the towne, which feate I thinck unlesse you will beleeve for the Author my disgraced frend Plutarkes sake, you are like never to see executed by any Architect, Mathematicien, or Ingenier living, I will not sweare but tell you as I thinck. Now suppose he should land at Bludworth haven . . .⁴⁰

Her thoughts turn first to the siege of Syracuse in Sicily—“Magna Graecia”; she finds herself thinking of Archimedes, who helped defend Syracuse and ultimately died there. With bewildering suddenness, though, the focus switches to a “he” who cannot be Archimedes, and the idea that this mystery man might “land at Bludworth haven.” Sara Jayne Steen, the editor of Arbella’s correspondence, glosses this as an “unidentified haven in the Blidworth area southeast of Mansfield, in Sherwood Forest; perhaps Stuart refers to the area’s reputation as the haven for Robin Hood and his band.”⁴¹ Both Steen and the queen’s emissary Sir Henry Brounker seem surprisingly unsurprised by the idea of *sailing* into Sherwood Forest, but it is not the obvious way to arrive. However, the idea of landing at a haven might have been suggested to Arbella by Henry VII’s landing at Milford Haven; Bishop Goodman, writing shortly after James’s death, wrote that one of Arbella’s crimes had been to “match with one of the

blood royal who was descended from Henry the Seventh,”⁴² and a letter which controversially refers to Arbella’s husband William Seymour as “a prince of England” also mentions Henry VII’s landing at Milford Haven.⁴³ In addition, Leanda de Lisle points out that one of Arbella’s chosen go-betweens in the marriage negotiations was the resonantly-named Owen Tudor, and the fact that when the plans for Arbella’s marriage went wrong Owen Tudor fled to Anglesey suggests that he was, or thought he was, connected to the actual Tudors, who came originally from Anglesey.⁴⁴ (The fact that Henry Tudor was of Welsh descent gave a considerable boost to the currency and prestige of the matter of Troy, even though it was ironically Henry’s own pet historian Polydore Vergil who first cast serious doubt on the existence of Brutus.)

Whether or not Arbella’s thoughts turned towards the origins of the Tudor dynasty, they are soon back with the story of Troy and its aftermath: “I finding my selfe scarce able to stand <on my feete> what for my side and what for my head, yet with a commaunding voice called a troupe of such viragoes as Virgilles Camilla that stood at the receipt in the next chamber.”⁴⁵ Camilla, as Arbella indicates, is a character from Virgil’s *Aeneid*; the reference to “my side” is to the recurrent pain that Arbella experienced there, probably a symptom of the hereditary disease porphyria, which gave rise to bouts of insanity. It seems likely that Arbella was in the midst of one such bout when she wrote this letter, which would account for its incoherence. Camilla, being a virgin, is not an inappropriate analogue for her ladies-in-waiting, whom she summoned at this point, but neither is she a particularly or specifically appropriate one. More strikingly, if her ladies-in-waiting are like Camilla, there is no one for Arbella herself to be. Perhaps, though, Arbella thinks of Virgil because she is thinking, as she often does, of the Earl of Essex, whose sister was named Penelope and who was himself, as Andrew Hiscock notes, often figured in classical terms, particularly as Achilles.⁴⁶ Indeed Arbella herself connects Essex with the Trojan War when, writing on the anniversary of the earl’s execution, she demands, “how overviolently hasty . . . to recover [the queen’s favour] he was this fatall day Ashwensday and <the> newdropping teares of somm might make you remember if it were possible you could forgett. Quis talia fando Temperet a lachrimis? Myrmidonum Dolopumque aut duri miles Ulissei?”⁴⁷ She also connects Essex to Greece (and perhaps, via *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, by association to the Troy story) when she writes,

it pleased his Majesty to give me leave to gaze on hir and by triall pronounce me an Eglett of hir owne kinde <as> worthy [to] even yet (but for my []) to carry hir . . . Thunderbolt and prostrat my selfe at hir feete (the Earle of Essex fatall ill sought [*desire*] unobtained desire as <any> Hebe whose disgraces may be blushingly concealed but not unseene. or Ganimed though he may minister Nectar in more acceptable manner. But whether do my

thoughts transport now? Let me live like an Owle in the wildernesse since my Pallas will not protect me with hir shield.⁴⁸

Maybe the thought of Essex is what prompts Arbella's image when she says "my little circuite is capable of resolve rather to indure a .10. yeares siege and even loose my Hector then you shall get my love into your danger."⁴⁹ In these lines, she herself becomes Troy, with Essex, perhaps, as the Hector whom she has indeed already lost—a valiant and defiant image, but also one in which the certainty of defeat is always already inscribed.

However, the reference to the queen calling her "an Eglett of hir owne kinde" takes us in another direction. This refers to Elizabeth's having apparently declared, when Arbella was still only a teenager, that she would "one day be even as I am."⁵⁰ In fact—and greatly to her own disadvantage—Arbella consistently failed to be like Elizabeth in any of the ways that mattered. Instead the person with whom Arbella most strongly identified herself appears to have been Lady Jane Grey, an ill-starred choice. When she wrote to the Earl of Hertford suggesting a possible marriage to his grandson, she asked him to send, as a proof that any answer came from him, "somm picture or handwriting of the Lady Jane Gray whose hand I know. and she sent hir sister a booke at hir death which weare the very best they could bring, or of the Lady Catherin, or Queene Jane Seimer, or any of that family which we know they and none but they have";⁵¹ Elizabeth Mazzola, noting that "Arbella sees Lady Jane's writing as a useful object," situates this as part of a pattern in which "Elizabeth and Bess, Mary and Arbella respond to each other over and over again in the raw language of material things."⁵²

It is also suggestive that Arbella says "we": Mary Lovell points out that after Jane's execution, "for the rest of her life Bess kept a portrait of Jane Grey on a table beside her bed,"⁵³ so this could be a sign of Arbella aligning herself with her grandmother as well as with Lady Jane. However, Leanda de Lisle offers an alternative explanation: she suggests that the salient point about the book Arbella mentions was that it was directly connected to Lady Jane's execution, so it could be an emblem of a claim to the throne.⁵⁴ There has always been disagreement about the extent of Arbella's ambition, but her biographer Sarah Gristwood points out that Arbella's attempt to marry into the Seymour family coincided with the 1608 unearthing of the clergyman who had married Hertford and Lady Catherine Grey,⁵⁵ boosting the claim of Hertford's grandsons to the throne. At the same time, though, for Arbella to identify herself with either Grey sister was to align herself with two women who failed to contribute to the line of succession, and to position herself as part of the Tudor dynasty, which represented the past, rather than the Stuart dynasty which was the present.

It was also, for one final time, to align herself with the story of Troy, for when Lady Jane Lumley, daughter of the Earl of Arundel, chose to memorialise the fate of her cousin Lady Jane Grey, she did it by translating Euripides's *Iphigenia at Aulis*, with the doomed Iphigenia a transparent stand-in for the doomed nine days' queen.⁵⁶ Patricia Demers suggests that in order to understand Lumley's translation we need to "braid domestic and political contexts."⁵⁷ Lumley's is a version of the play which is even more interested in women than the original; Tanya Pollard notes that she significantly expands the role of Clytemnestra, who provides much of the emotional focus,⁵⁸ and Stephanie Hodgson-Wright observes that Iphigenia (like Jane Grey) remembers her sisters before she dies.⁵⁹ Diane Purkiss argues that "In giving his daughter a strong classical education, the Earl of Arundel was not giving her a voice so that she might embark on a career as a writer or express herself fluently. He was buying a commodity ... To have a daughter able to read Greek was figuratively to stand near the throne."⁶⁰ Is it true that Lumley's translation advertises her knowledge of Greek and implicitly identifies that as a rare and valuable accomplishment; one of the things which causes Agamemnon grief is that he has taken so much care over Iphigenia's upbringing. It may, however, additionally draw attention to the fact that the ability to translate Greek was also an accomplishment of Lady Jane Grey's (along with skill in needlework),⁶¹ and was thus one of the things lost with her death. Four generations later, it was an accomplishment of Arbella's too, and for her as well it was similarly a function of her rank. But whatever the intentions of the men who taught them the language, Greek did offer women a vehicle for emotional expression. Whether or not she was tutored by Marlowe, on which I suggest the jury is still out, referring to the tale of Troy was for Arbella a way of exploring what it meant to be a woman, and to lose.

Notes

1 Richard Harvey, *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes* (London: John Wolfe, 1593), sig. D2v.

2 Laurie Maguire, *Helen of Troy: From Homer to Hollywood* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 87.

3 Euripides, *Hecabe*, in *Medea and Other Plays*, translated by Philip Vellacott (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963), p. 81.

4 Euripides, *Hecabe*, p. 91.

5 Ruth Elizabeth Richardson, *Mistress Blanche: Queen Elizabeth I's Confidante* (Wootton Almeley, Herefordshire: Logaston Press, 2007), p. 26.

6 John D. Staines, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560–1690* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 45 and 64ff.

7 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, translated by Mary M. Innes (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), Book 6, pp. 136–37.

8 Euripides, *Hecabe*, pp. 76–77.

- 9 Euripides, *Hecabe*, p. 98.
- 10 William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, edited by Harold F. Brooks (London: Methuen, 1979), 3.2.203–10.
- 11 David Goldstein, "Woolley's Mouse: Early Modern Recipe Books and the Uses of Nature," in *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity*, edited by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 105–27, p. 110.
- 12 William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, edited by Lois Potter (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 1.1.1.
- 13 William Shakespeare [and George Wilkins], *Pericles*, edited by Suzanne Gossett (London: Bloomsbury, 2004), 4.0.20–25.
- 14 Susan Frye, "Sewing Connections: Mary Stuart, Elizabeth Talbot, and Seventeenth-Century Anonymous Needleworkers," in *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, edited by Susan Frye and Karen Robertson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 165–82, p. 165.
- 15 Susan Frye, "Staging Women's Relations to Textiles in Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Cymbeline*," in *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, and Empire in Renaissance England*, edited by Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 215–50, p. 218.
- 16 Rozsika Parker, *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine* [1984] (London: I. B. Tauris & Co, 2010), p. 75.
- 17 Mary S. Lovell, *Bess of Hardwick: First Lady of Chatsworth* [2005] (London: Abacus, 2006), p. 221.
- 18 Janet Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd* (London: Maney, 1988), p. 78.
- 19 Arnold, *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd*, p. 79.
- 20 Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, in *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Patrick Cheney and Brian J. Striar (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), First Sestiad, 11–14.
- 21 Santina M. Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles* (London: The National Trust, 1998), pp. 55 and 23.
- 22 Alison Wiggins, *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: Language, Materiality and Early Modern Epistolary Culture* (London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 74 and 77.
- 23 Stephen Alford, *London's Triumph: Merchant Adventurers and the Tudor City* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2018), p. 2.
- 24 William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, edited by Emrys Jones (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), 2.2.209.
- 25 William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, edited by J. M. Nosworthy (London: Methuen, 1955), 2.4.68–75.
- 26 Frye, "Staging Women's Relations to Textiles," p. 233.
- 27 Rebecca Olson, *Arras Hanging: The Textile that Determined Early Modern Literature and Drama* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013), p. 135.
- 28 Lisa Hopkins, *Renaissance Drama on the Edge* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), chapter one; David N. Durant, *Bess of Hardwick: Portrait of an Elizabethan Dynast* [1977] (London: The Cromwell Press, 1988), p. 185.
- 29 William Shakespeare, *Coriolanus*, edited by Peter Holland (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 1.3 s.d.
- 30 Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 143. See also Stanley Cavell, "'Who Does the Wolf Love?': *Coriolanus* and the Interpretation of Politics," in

Shakespeare and the Question of Theory, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (London: Methuen, 1985), pp. 245–72, p. 248.

31 Peter Holland in the Arden 3 edition has her address this specifically to Volumnia, implying in a note that she would be more likely to praise Volumnia than Virgilia.

32 William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by E. A. J. Honigsmann (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1997), 3.3.438.

33 Frye, “Sewing Connections,” p. 170; see also Parker, *The Subversive Stitch*, p. 77.

34 William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, edited by Jonathan Bate [1995] (London: Thomson Learning, 2003), 2.3.38–43.

35 As long ago as 1937 it was suggested that Christopher Marlowe was the person meant in Bess of Hardwick’s letter to Lord Burghley on 21 September 1592 describing how “On Morley who hath attended on Arbell & red to hyr for the space of thre yere & a half shoed to be much discontented since my retorn into ye cuntry, in saying he had lyued in hope, to haue som annuities graunted him by Arbell out of hyr land during hys lyfe, or some lease of grounds to ye value of forty pound a yere, alledging yat he was so much damnified by leuing of ye vniuersitie; & now saw yat if she were wyllinge yet not of abylyte to make him any such assurance. I vnderstanding by dyuers yat Morley was so much discontented, & withall of late hauing some cause to be dobtfull of his forwardnes in religion (though I can not charge him with papistry) toke occasion to parte with him after he was gone from my howse and all hys stuff caried from hence, the next day he returned ageyn, very importunate to serue, without standinge vpon any recompence, which made me more suspicious & ye wyllinger to parte with hym.” (Bess of Hardwick to Lord Burghley, 21 September 1592. Online: <http://www.bessofhardwick.org/letter.jsp?letter=163>) Various objections have been made to the proposed identification on the grounds that Marlowe is known to have been elsewhere for some of the relevant period, but Sarah Gristwood has pointed out that so too were some known members of Bess’s household: she observes that “There are, in fact, no certain records of Marlowe being in the south when Bess and her family weren’t in town,” though she concludes that “The identification is a possibility; no more than that” (Sarah Gristwood, *Arbella: England’s Lost Queen* [London: Bantam Books, 2003], pp. 459 and 461).

36 Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance*, pp. 41 and 47.

37 Jane Cavendish and Elizabeth Brackley, *The Concealed Fancies*, in *Renaissance Drama by Women: Texts and Documents*, edited by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (London: Routledge, 1996), 3.4.6–10 and 3.4.13–16.

38 Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance*, p. 69.

39 Yasmin Arshad, Helen Hackett, and Emma Whipday, “Daniel’s *Cleopatra* and Lady Anne Clifford: From a Jacobean Portrait to Modern Performance,” *Early Theatre* 17.2 (2014): 167–86, p. 171. (Though for a counter-argument see Jessica L. Malay, “Viewing the Jacobean *Cleopatra* Portrait: Literary and Visual Intersections in Female Devisership,” *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 18.1 [Winter 2018]: 29–65.)

40 Sara Jayne Steen, ed., *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 149–50.

41 Steen, *Letters*, p. 150.

42 Gristwood, *Arbella*, pp. 389–90.

43 Gristwood, *Arbella*, p. 426.

44 Leanda de Lisle, *After Elizabeth: The Death of Elizabeth and the Coming of King James* [2004] (London: HarperPerennial, 2006), p. 101.

45 Steen, *Letters*, p. 152.

- 46 Andrew Hiscock, “‘Achilles Alter’: The Heroic Lives and Afterlives of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex,” in *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*, edited by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 101–32.
- 47 Steen, *Letters*, p. 167.
- 48 Steen, *Letters*, p. 162.
- 49 Steen, *Letters*, p. 154.
- 50 Steen, *Letters*, p. 20.
- 51 Steen, *Letters*, p. 121.
- 52 Elizabeth Mazzola, *Women’s Wealth and Women’s Writing in Early Modern England: “Little Legacies” and the Materials of Motherhood* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 1 and 5. Mazzola also notes that in 1610 Arbella sold some of Bess’s needlework panels to her aunt Mary Talbot (p. 91).
- 53 Lovell, *Bess of Hardwick*, p. 89.
- 54 De Lisle, *After Elizabeth*, p. 98.
- 55 Gristwood, *Arbella*, p. 333.
- 56 See Tanya Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 49, and Alison Findlay, “Reproducing *Iphigenia at Aulis*,” *Early Theatre* 17.2 (2014): 133–48. Lumley’s text survives in only one manuscript, but that is not to say that Arbella could not have read it; there might originally have been other copies, and Arbella might have had sight of one through her family connections with the Arundels (her cousin Alatheia Talbot married the Earl of Arundel, grandson of Lumley’s sister, in 1605) or her grandmother’s friendship with Leicester, whose brother Guilford had been Jane Grey’s husband. Since Lumley had no surviving children, it is likely to have descended collaterally. Arundel, who owned the palace of Nonsuch where the Lumleys lived (see Marion Wynne-Davies, *Women Writers and Familial Discourse in the English Renaissance: Relative Values* [Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007], p. 74), might well have had a copy. Wynne-Davies thinks there was “no clear textual succession” (p. 87) for Lumley family discourse, but Arbella Stuart might conceivably represent a continuation of a sort.
- 57 Patricia Demers, “On First Looking into Lumley’s Euripides,” *Renaissance and Reformation* 23.1 (Winter 1999): 25–42, p. 2.
- 58 Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*, pp. 49–50.
- 59 Stephanie Hodgson-Wright, “Jane Lumley’s *Iphigenia at Aulis*: *Multum in parvo*, or, Less is More,” in *Readings in Renaissance Women’s Drama: Criticism, History, and Performance 1594–1998*, edited by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 129–41, p. 135.
- 60 Diane Purkiss, “Blood, Sacrifice, Marriage: Why Iphigeneia and Mariam Have to Die,” *Women’s Writing* 6.1 (1999): 27–45, p. 29.
- 61 On the Grey sisters doing needlework most evenings, see Hester Chapman, *Lady Jane Grey* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962), p. 29; on Jane’s proficiency in Greek, Alison Plowden, *Lady Jane Grey* (Stroud: Sutton, 2003), pp. 46–47.

This page intentionally left blank

Part III: **Striking Too Short at Greeks**

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 6

The Greek Actor: Art, Aesthetics, and Drama

A number of early modern plays set in or referring to Greece or Troy offer self-conscious experiments in dramatic form in ways which insistently remind audiences and readers that Athens was the first home of drama, and that Greek myths offered some very powerful reflections on the expression of emotion. There was persistent speculation on wherein exactly had lain the emotional effect of Greek tragedy (and whether music, for instance, had played a part), and plays which connect their own theatrical practice to that of Greece often accompany their action with openly metatheatrical speculation on what the aesthetic effect (and affect) of that action is likely to be. John Ford's *The Broken Heart*, set in ancient Sparta, insistently pairs "heart" and "art," and *Timon of Athens* introduces a poet and a painter apparently for the sole purpose of reflecting on the relationship of art and nature. Other plays set in Greece also reflect on the emotional and expressive power of art. Kent Cartwright notes that "Gosson's *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579) links Circe to poetry's transformational power,"¹ to which Efterpi Mitsi adds that "In *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare's transformation of classical heroism through drama and playacting challenges Gosson's reference to Homer in *The Schoole of Abuse* used to attack the theatre."² In Lyly's *Campaspe*, Psyllus alludes to a very famous anecdote about the power of art when he says,

I serve Apelles, who feedeth me as Diogenes doth Manes, for at dinner the one preacheth abstinence, the other commendeth counterfeiting. When I would eat meat he paints a spit, and when I thirst, "O," saith he, "is not this a fair pot?" and points to a table which contains the banquet of the gods, where there are many dishes to feed the eye but not to fill the gut.³

Art can reproduce appearance but not substance, and Psyllus's metaphor of feeding the eye but not filling the gut is a particularly apposite one for early modern drama, where the motif of the insubstantial, interrupted, or ultimately fatal banquet is a commonplace of tragedy and is also sometimes to be found in other genres, as when the Pope fails to get any dinner in one of the comic scenes of *Doctor Faustus* or harpies snatch away the food in *The Tempest*. Lurking behind the stage picture of the blighted banquet are two delicate questions, which are never fully surfaced but can always be glimpsed: the theological difference between transubstantiation and consubstantiation, and the question of whether drama itself provides appropriate and satisfying emotional nourishment to its audiences. In early modern theatres, whose design owed so much to church architecture, these two can be understood as always potentially

converging, and collectively inviting the audience to consider whether the act of communal, quasi-congregational contemplation which is playgoing is producing a satisfactory emotional and aesthetic yield for them.

Campaspe itself is all about the power of art and its relationship to emotion. Hephestion, the friend of Alexander the Great, declares,

commonly we see it incident in artificers to be enamoured of their own works, as Archidamus of his wooden dove, Pygmalion of his ivory image, Arachne of his wooden swan—especially painters, who, playing with their own conceits, now coveting to draw a glancing eye, then a rolling, now a winking, still mending it, never ending it till they be caught with it. And then, poor souls, they kiss the colours with their lips, with which before they were loath to taint their fingers. (5.4.15–24)

Certainly this is the case with Apelles, who deliberately delays finishing the portrait of Campaspe as Venus because he is in love with her. For Alexander, who lacks any talent for painting and has a naïve theory of artistic representation, there is a simple equivalence between sitter and subject: “How now, Apelles? Is Venus’ face yet finished?” (2.2.75). Apelles himself, though, doubts the ability of art to equal nature, telling Campaspe, “Lady, I doubt whether there be any colour so fresh that may shadow a countenance so fair” (3.1.1–2) and declaring that he will never finish the picture “for always in absolute beauty there is somewhat above art” (3.4.93–94). For Apelles, legendary exponent of an art highly prized in classical Greece, art must always be exceeded by nature, and it is of a piece with this that the mutual attraction between himself and Campaspe is best expressed by being *not* expressed, being at its most potent and of most interest to the audience when it is still latent sexual tension. Once it is out in the open, their love story dwindles into comedy, and becomes merely the cue for Alexander’s display of magnanimity, as he renounces his own feeling for Campaspe and departs to resume his career of conquest. Emotion dispels when it is surfaced; plays, like paintings, must always fall slightly short of what is really there, and yet even as they do so they offer a sense that there *is* something that is really there, just as Shakespeare conveys a sense of the pathos of Troy despite the unappealing Trojans of *Troilus and Cressida*.

A number of other early modern plays build on and develop this link between Greece, art of various forms, and emotional expression, and many of them take up *Campaspe*’s interest in the limits of what can be achieved by artistic representation. In this chapter, I discuss what may initially seem to be an eclectic mix of plays, but I shall argue that they are bonded by a common interest in this set of topics. I begin with Massinger’s *The Roman Actor*, which despite its title is interested particularly in Greek dramatic modes, and then move on briefly to *Hamlet*, which takes me to Chettle’s *Hoffman*, and finally to Beaumont and

Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy*. In each case I aim to show that a cluster of references to Greece or Greeks goes hand in hand with a metatheatrical sensibility which insistently invites the audience to notice not only what is happening but how they are being made to feel about it.

Despite the loud announcement in the title of Massinger's *The Roman Actor* that the eponymous hero will be Roman, he is in fact insistently connected to both Greece and Troy, not least in being named Paris, and the resonances of that name are built on. Lamia hopes

That this my ravished wife may prove as fatal
To proud Domitian, and her embraces
Afford him in the end as little joy,
As wanton Helen brought to him of Troy.⁴

Later Caesar when Domitia kisses him says,

If I now wanted heat of youth, these fires
In Priam's veins would thaw his frozen blood,
Enabling him to get a second Hector
For the defence of Troy.

(2.1.282–85)

In another of the inset plays Paris remembers “Queen Hecuba, Troy fired, / Ulysses’ bondwoman” (3.2.258–59). Finally Paris reveals in an aside his intention to resist the empress (4.2.88–97), but is nevertheless caught in an apparently compromising position when Domitia says to him “Kiss closer. Thou art now my Trojan Paris, / And I thy Helen,” upon which Caesar, spying on them, declares “And I am Menelaus” (4.2.102–5). In this world in which all the characters display an easy familiarity with Greek myth and legend, Paris has no choice but to live up to the destiny of adultery and vengeance already inscribed in his name. When the actors perform, personages from Greek mythology crowd in: one of Paris’s lines is “*He stares as he had seen Medusa’s head*” (2.1.343) and Latinus speaks of

A mass of treasure which, had Solon seen,
The Lydian Croesus had appeared to him
Poor as the beggar Irus.

(2.1.356–57)

Paris speaks of the riddle “*that the monster Sphinx from the steep rock / Offered to Oedipus*” (3.2.163–64) and, apostrophising love, refers to “*thy Paphian mother*” (3.2.168); he also mentions Niobe (3.2.252), and the Revels editor’s introduction compares the inset play *The False Servant* with the stories of Phaedra and Sthenoboea.⁵ Domitia also demands “let us see tomorrow / *Iphis*

and *Anaxarete*” (2.1.416–17); the story of Iphis and Anaxarete is an inset narrative in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, where it is described as “the best-known [story] in all Cyprus.”⁶

Most notably, from the opening lines of the play, drama itself is badged as Greek:

Aesopus. What do we act today?
Latinus. Agave’s frenzy,
 With Pentheus’ bloody end.
 (1.1.1–2)

This is the story told in Euripides’s *Bacchae*, and it is also a foreshadowing of the story told by *The Roman Actor* itself, where Caesar will be killed by his female relatives. More than that, though, it surfaces the issue of emotion, and implicitly posits a distinction between something which is natural—Agave’s maternal feeling for Pentheus—and something which is artificially stimulated and created, which is the induced, wildly heightened communal passions of the Maenads. Tacitly, it thus invites the audience to be consciously mindful of a possible distinction between the natural and the artificial which will indeed prove crucial to both the plot and the sensibility of the play.

The connection between Greece and theatre is immediately developed when Paris complains that

The Greeks (to whom we owe the first invention
 Both of the buskined scene and humble sock)
 That reign in every noble family
 Declaim against us.
 (1.1.5–8)

The Greeks impinge on Paris’s consciousness in two separate respects: they are a powerful political force in Rome, and they were the originators of drama. The two are implicitly connected by the fact that the ground of the Greeks’ collective objection to the actors is presumably aesthetic; this is not stated (and the question is not referred to again during the course of the play), but it is hard to imagine what else might prompt their hostility. Again therefore the audience is being subtly called to attention: if they watch the play carefully enough, they will be able to decide for themselves whether the Greeks’ objections are justified, or whether they consider the quality of the representation to be on a par with Greek tragedy.

The invitation to the audience to compare what they see to classical subjects and performance practices continues. Paris says,

Let a good actor in a lofty scene
 Show great Alcides honoured in the sweat
 Of his twelve labours.

(1.3.84–86)

The early modern stage had something of a penchant for showing Hercules (the reputed son of Alceus, and hence sometimes referred to by the Greek patronymic Alcides) in scenes which were conspicuously *not* lofty, partly because of the fun to be had from seeing a normal-sized man (or boy) portraying a mighty demigod, as in *Love's Labour's Lost*; here though Paris proposes something much more theatrically challenging, which is to show a credible Hercules, even if it is one whose twelve labours are already complete and thus do not have to be staged. We do not in fact see this, but we are implicitly invited to consider whether what we do see is “lofty” and credible.

Other performance challenges are also imagined. When Domitia sings (2.1.217 s.d.), Caesar exclaims,

Who can hear this
 And falls not down and worships? In my fancy,
 Apollo being judge on Latmos hill,
 Fair-haired Calliope on her ivory lute
 (But something short of this) sung Ceres' praises,
 And grisly Pluto's rape on Proserpine.

(2.1.221–26)

We can see from the amount and variety of music offered by early modern plays that there must have been some talented performers either among acting companies or available to them, but presumably there were none comparable to Apollo, and in any case the point of this passage may well be that Domitia's performance is not particularly distinguished and that only Caesar's partiality makes him think it so.

All this leads up to the metatheatrical climax in which Domitia compares herself and Paris to Jupiter and Alcmena when Hercules was conceived and Caesar interrupts with “While Amphitrio / Stands by and draws the curtains” (4.2.109–12). Later Caesar adds that the guilty pair are “taken in a net of Vulcan's filing” (4.2.114), completing the sense that not only is the action of the play insistently metatheatrical, it is also insistently Greek; indeed Douglas Howard notes that “Paris's defence of the stage . . . ultimately derives from *Poetics* 4 . . . where Aristotle observes that men are better pleased when they learn by seeing.”⁷

At the heart of the play lies a sustained process of reflection on the nature of acting. Aretinus tells the actors,

You are they
 That search into the secrets of the time,
 And under feigned names on the stage present
 Actions not to be touched at, and traduce
 Persons of rank and quality of both sexes,
 And with satirical and bitter jests
 Make even the senators ridiculous
 To the plebeians.

(1.3.36–43)

Ostensibly this is a Roman character talking to Roman actors, but there is of course an obvious topical application available which would enable audiences to read this as reflecting on the cultural work which *The Roman Actor* itself is performing. That in turn might well prompt a question about whether the play really is “satirical and bitter,” or whether it is simply true—a question which would also be about the relationship between reality and artistic representation.

Caesar, like Alexander in Lyly’s *Campaspe*, has a naïve theory of mimesis. He says first,

Can it be
 This sordid thing, Parthenius, is thy father?
 No actor can express him. I had held
 The fiction for impossible in the scene,
 Had I not seen the substance.

(2.1.268–72)

Like Alexander, who drew no distinction between Campaspe as Venus and Campaspe herself, Caesar subscribes to an idea of art as representing purely and simply what *is*, though it can never quite match the original. In the first place, he would not have believed a dramatic representation of Philargus unless he had seen Philargus himself; in the second place, he does not believe that any form of representation could do justice to the full sordidness of Philargus—“No actor can express him.” He displays a similarly unsophisticated understanding of the way theatre works when he asks Philargus himself,

Canst thou make good use of what was now presented,
 And imitate in thy sudden change of life
 The miserable rich man that expressed
 What thou art to the life?

(2.1.431–34)

Caesar clearly feels that plays should have a nice simple moral message, and that the audience should be able to go away and apply it to their own lives. His naïveté would be funny, except that when Philargus refuses to comply with this

model, Caesar hangs him. Finally, cementing his image as an aesthetic imbecile, Caesar asks,

Why are you
Transported thus, Domitia? 'Tis a play;
Or grant it serious, it at no part merits
This passion in you.

(3.2.282–85)

Theatre would be nothing if it could not arouse emotion, and Caesar's proposed opposition between "play" and "serious" is likely to find few if any adherents in any audience with its fair share of people less stupid than he is. With beautiful economy, the play skewers antitheatricity and absolutism on the same metaphorical spit.

At the same time, ideas about performativity and expression are connected to one of the preferred instruments of absolutism, torture. Martin Butler argues that "Far from being the noble defence of theatre it was long taken to be, *The Roman Actor* surely achieves the exact opposite,"⁸ but I suggest that it is only certain kinds of performance that are indicted. The idea of playing at torture is introduced when Paris remembers how

I once observed
In a tragedy of ours, in which a murder
Was acted to the life, a guilty hearer
Forced by the terror of a wounded conscience
To make discovery of that which torture
Could not wring from him.

(2.1.90–95)

The idea of the hearer moved by a play to confess a crime is a commonplace; Hamlet had already tried it on Claudius, with satisfying results. Hamlet, though, had *only* theatre at his disposal; here there is a suggestion that an alternative would be to torture the criminal (indeed the syntax flirts with the possibility that torture has already taken place). The collocation of the two possible methods of extracting the truth sets up a disturbing potential equivalence between theatre and torture chamber, and soon the idea of torture leaches out of the theatre and into the real world of the play itself. Parthenius says to Caesar,

Alas, I know, sir,
These bookmen, Rusticius and Palphurius Sura,
Deserve all tortures. Yet in my opinion,
They being popular senators, and cried up
With loud applauses of the multitude
For foolish honesty and beggarly virtue,

'Twould relish more of policy to have them
 Made away in private, with what exquisite torments
 You please—it skills not—than to have them drawn
 To the degrees in public; for 'tis doubted
 That the sad object may beget compassion
 In the giddy rout, and cause some sudden uproar
 That may disturb you.

(3.2.12–24)

Onstage, the torture fails in its object: “*The Hangmen torment 'em, they still smiling*” (3.2.71 s.d.). Offstage, the effect of this passage is likely to be rather different. What Parthenius suggests is essentially that public displays of cruelty are unedifying and ultimately counterproductive, since they are likely to engender public sympathy for those who have been branded enemies of the state. This is an idea which would have currency and traction not only in imperial Rome but also in Jacobean England, where the torture would be real and not simulated, and which also calls into question the motives and morals of those who watch spectacles of suffering, since Domitilla complains that “Nero and Caligula / Commanded only mischiefs, but our Caesar / Delights to see 'em” (3.1.107–9), and who would wish to be like Caesar? For the final time the play thus calls us to attention: we should watch, but with the right motives and the right degree of alertness, and we cannot expect any simple correspondence between what we see and how we subsequently behave and feel.

Arguably the greatest and most influential example of coupling engagement with Greece and Troy with engagement with ideas about performance is *Hamlet*. *Hamlet* is about fathers and sons, and in that it is typical of stories about Troy. In *Campaspe*, the Prologue at the Court declares that “Appion, raising Homer from Hell, demanded only who was his father” (10–11). At the heart of the tale of Troy lies Priam, a father of fifty sons; at the heart of the *Odyssey* lies the relationship between Odysseus and Telemachus; and at the heart of what Troy meant to England was the idea of the *translatio imperii*, the cultural and genealogical transmission of authority and bloodline from Aeneas to Ascanius to Silvius to Brutus and supposedly ultimately to the Tudors. That *Hamlet* is thinking about Troy is clear when the prince calls for the Pyrrhus speech and also in the way that “unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd” can be seen as evoking Chapman's translation of Achilles's lament over Patroclus, “Dead, undeplor'd, / Unsepulchred.”⁹ Patroclus is at this stage literally unburied, but the metaphorical, spiritual unburial suffered by the ghost of Hamlet's father is in some ways an even worse fate, and less easy to redress, while Hamlet's uncertainty about the Ghost's nature may be partly prompted by a memory that in the *Odyssey*, ghosts do not recognise the living until they are

given blood to drink. Tanya Pollard is right that “The moving power of Hecuba’s laments directly highlights Hamlet’s sense of his own failings,”¹⁰ but it is not only Trojan women but also Greek men who do that.

Hamlet’s version of the tale of Troy is explicitly introduced as an aesthetic failure: “the play, as I remember, pleased not the million, ’twas caviare to the general. But it was, as I received it—and others, whose judgements in such matters cried in the top of mine—an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning” (1.2.431–37). This deliberate drawing of attention to an already existing play introduces another “father” of a different sort, Marlowe, whose *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is generally taken to be the play alluded to here.¹¹ The heady mixture of a great individual predecessor and of the classical past as a whole makes for a strong sense of present inadequacy, leaving Hamlet feeling dwarfed both in comparison to his father, the cause of his grief, and also in comparison to Hecuba and even to the player, both of whom express grief better than he can. And yet for all his sense that he *cannot* express his emotions, Hamlet has become for readers and audiences the ultimate example of dramatised emotions; his claim that “I have that within which passes show” (1.2.85) has proved utterly convincing, much more so than if he had in fact attempted to show it. Cicero recorded that the Greek painter Timanthes had expressed the grief of Agamemnon at the death of Iphigenia by showing him with a cloak covering his face, leaving a blank onto which the spectator could project emotion; Hamlet, brooding on the deaths of both Priam and his own father, conceals himself behind a metaphorical cloak, finding in an aesthetic of reticence a powerful means of self-expression.

Ideas about Greece and about performance are picked up again in Henry Chettle’s *The Tragedy of Hoffman*, a play which both insistently echoes *Hamlet* and equally insistently evokes ancient Greece. *Hoffman*, like *Hamlet*, is set in and around the Baltic, partly on the island of “Burtholme” (almost certainly Bornholm) and partly in the Duke of Prussia’s court at Danzig. It is therefore somewhat unexpected that Hoffman should tell the eloping lovers Lodowick and Lucibella that the disguises he has prepared for them include “Grecian habits for your heads,”¹² something which one might suppose would make them more conspicuous rather than less so. This is, however, a society conditioned by its engagement with Hellenic culture, which in the Renaissance imagination often made a surprising pairing with the north. Thomas Nashe observed of the Icelandic volcano Mount Hecla that “a number conclude [it] to be hell mouth; for near unto it are heard such yellings and groans as Ixion, Titius, Sisyphus and Tantalus blowing all in one trumpet of distress could never conjoined bellow forth,”¹³ and in Christopher Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine the Great* Orcanes declares that Greenland is inhabited by “Giants as big as hugy Polypheme.”¹⁴

Hoffman's pairing of *Hamlet* and Greece reaches its height when the hero/villain Hoffman asks, "What is Lorrique to you, or what to me?" (5.3.63), obviously recalling Hamlet's "What's Hecuba to him, or he to her" (2.2.553), and Katherine Heavey notes that the burning crown used to murder Hoffman's father echoes "the burning or poisoned crown that Medea traditionally uses to murder Creusa or Glauce,"¹⁵ an idea picked up when Hoffman says of Otho,

He was the prologue to a tragedy,
That, if my destinies deny me not,
Shall pass those of Thyestes, Tereus,
Jocasta, or duke Jason's jealous wife.
(1.3.18–21)

Hoffman may be only the son of an executed Baltic pirate, but he aspires to inhabit the world of Greek tragedy.

It is not only Jason and Medea who are recalled, but the characters of the *Iliad*. Austria says,

Saxon's proud wanton sons
Were entertained like Priam's firebrand
At Sparta: all our state gladly appeared
Like cheerful Lacademons, to receive
Those demons that with magic of their tongues
Bewitched my Lucibel, my Helen's ears.
(2.2.13–18)

Here is the tale of Troy, as Lodowick and Mathias become a kind of composite Paris, Lucibella is figured as Helena, the Duke of Saxony is implicitly Priam, and Austria himself is understood as echoing both Agamemnon and Menelaus. Later, Greek tragedy is invoked to almost comic effect when Hoffman says Martha "will be missed" and Lorrique ripostes,

By whom? By fools: gross, dull, thick-sighted fools,
Whom every mist can blind. I'll sway them all
With exclamation that the grieved duchess,
When she beheld the sea that drowned her son,
Stood for a while like weeping Niobe,
As if she had been stone; and when we strived
With mild persuasions to make less her woe
She, madder than the wife of Athamas
Leapt suddenly into the troubled sea,
Whose surges greedy of so rich a prey,
Swallowed her up, while we in vain exclaimed
'Gainst heaven and hell, 'gainst fortune and her fate.
(5.2.129–41)

Invoking a classical framework, in Lorrique's opinion, is enough to make people believe any old rubbish: the story that the Duchess jumped into the sea while two grown men stood by and did nothing will be believed if she is cast in the mould of a mythological figure. Here Greece is connected not to a form of acting that imitates nature but to a form of false acting which occludes what actually happened, and this is typical of the way *Hoffman* invests in an aesthetic of excess rather than one of credible representation. This is not a play which is interested in the exploration of character or in the evocation of emotion, it is one which is interested in out-Hamleting *Hamlet*, with *The Spanish Tragedy* thrown in for good measure. Performance has become less a means to act on an audience than an end in itself.

It is still, though, an art form fundamentally connected to Greece, not least in the number of characters from Greek myth who are recalled. Hoffman says to Otho,

You, virtuous gentleman,
Sat like a just judge of the under-shades,
And with an unchanged Rhadamantine look,
Beheld the flesh, mangled with many scars,
Pared from the bones of my offended father.

(1.1.161–66)

Hoffman's contemporary Jerome has, like Hamlet and Faustus, been to Wittenberg, and Hoffman himself has presumably been brought up as a Christian, but he thinks of the afterlife in strictly classical terms (and also terms which directly echo the Greek-minded *The Spanish Tragedy*, whose situation is inverted when a son uses a father's body for a prop instead of a father using a son's). In similar vein Jerome says of Lucibella "Heart, you would not unhorse Hercules for her, father?" (1.2.68) and Hoffman after he has anatomised Otho declares,

If there live e'er a surgeon that dare say
He could do better, I'll play Mercury,
And like fond Marsyas flay the quacksalver.

(1.3.1–3)

Hoffman also prays "Rhamnusia, help thy priest: / My wrong thou know'st, my willingness thou seest" (1.3.37–38); Lucibella says "I have robbed Prometheus of his moving fire" (4.1.40) and Mathias declares,

The mead is ringed with tents of stranger knights,
Whose rich devices and caparisons
Exceed the Persian monarch's, when he met

Destruction and pale death sent from the sword
Of Philip's son, and his stout Macedons.

(2.3.118–22)

We may be literally in Germany, but imaginatively we are at the court of Alexander the Great.

Imagery drawn from Greece and Troy continues to proliferate. Ferdinand says to his followers of the multitude, “Strike their Typhoean body down to fire” (3.2.55), referring to the monster Typhoeus, and Hoffman declares “Had I Briareus' hands, I'd strive with heaven” (4.1.249), Briareus being a storm giant. Hoffman rhapsodises over the sleeping Martha:

Endymion's love, muffle in clouds thy face,
And all ye yellow tapers of the heaven
Veil your clear brightness in Cimmerian mists.

(4.2.59–61)

Martha is here troped as the moon-goddess, who loved Endymion, as staged in Lyly's play of that name. She is also figured as another character from ancient Greece when Lorrique tells Hoffman “Then strangle her: here is a towel fit” (4.2.69), evoking the means by which Clytemnestra killed Agamemon, and Lorrique evokes other characters from Greek mythology when he declares that he has led them “in a labyrinth” (5.1.304) and advises Hoffman that if Martha resists he should “Make her a Philomel, prove Tereus” (5.2.127). Hoffman lists amongst impossible tasks to “with thy shoulders, Atlas-like attempt / To bear the ruins of a falling tower” (4.2.98–99), and Lucibella wishes “would I were with my Lodowick asleep / In the Elysian fields, where no fears dwell, / For earth appears to me as vile as hell” (5.1.249–51). Geographically, these characters are in north-eastern Europe, but culturally they are in Greece.

In light of the way that classical literature has seized the imagination of this Baltic society, it is, I think, worth paying some detailed attention to an episode at the beginning of act three which has received little previous discussion, even though it is structurally at the heart of the play. Lodowick and Lucibella, convinced that there is a plot against their lives, have fled the court and now find themselves in a wooded landscape:

Lodowick. Are you not faint, divinest Lucibell?
Lucibella. No, the clear moon strews silver in our path,
And with her moist eyes weeps a gentle dew
Upon the spotted pavement of the earth,
Which softens every flower whereon I tread.

(3.1.1–6)

Lodowick's opening question to Lucibella echoes Lysander's remark to Hermia in a similar setting: "Fair love, you faint with wand'ring in the wood,"¹⁶ and Bill Angus compares Lorrique's "I am as nimble as your thought, devise, I'll execute what you command" (2.3.97) to Puck.¹⁷ *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, whose incompetent and literal-minded mechanicals implicitly lampoon the idea of Athens as the home of drama, is influential in general; it seems for instance also to be echoed in Chapman's translation of the *Odyssey* (1616), where we find the word "rere-mouse" (Book 12, line 610) and Nausicaa warns Odysseus that

the men that sway
In work of those tools that so fit our state,
Are rude mechanicals, that rare and late
Work in the marketplace.

(Book 6, lines 420–23)

Here, however, it is echoed insistently, for there are a number of other words and phrases in the scene between Lodowick and Lucibella which recall it. In *Dream* the moon is "like to a silver bow" (1.2.9) and is associated with dew (4.1.52), while Demetrius is "spotted" (1.1.110), as too are snakes (2.2.9); "silver," "dew," and "spotted" occur in three successive lines of Lucibella's speech. There is a further set of echoes when Lodowick adjures Lucibella "behold a bank / Covered with sleeping flowers that miss the sun" (3.1.9–10). This is the landscape of *Dream* too:

I know a bank where the wild thyme blows,
Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows.
(2.1.249–50)

Later Lucibella specifically mentions violets:

My heart is troubled with some heavy thing.
Rest on these violets, whilst I prepare,
In thy soft slumber to receive a share.
Blush not chaste moon to see a virgin lie
So near a prince, 'tis no immodesty.
For when the thoughts are pure, no time, no place,
Hath power to work fair chastity's disgrace.
(3.1.50–57)

She also promises "No, I'll be sentinel; I'll watch for fear / Of venomous worms" (3.1.39–40), echoing both *Dream*'s interest in snakes and its use of the word "sentinel" (2.2.25). Hoffman's remark to the dying Lodowick that "I judged you for a Greek as you appeared" (3.1.104) further recalls *Dream*, where Oberon

tells Puck “Thou shalt know the man / By the Athenian garments he hath on” (2.1.263–64).

The scene ends, however, in a very undreamlike way, as Lodowick and Lucibella are both stabbed and left for dead, leading the apparently dying Lucibella to lament,

How now! what have ye done? my Lodowick bleeds.
Some savage beast hath fixed his ruthless fang
In my soft body: Lodowick, I faint,
Dear, wake: my Lodowick—alas what means
Your breast to be thus wet? Is't blood or sweat?

(3.1.66–70)

In fact, this recalls something that is feared in *Dream*, though there it does not actually happen. Hermia awakes from a nightmare exclaiming,

Help me, Lysander, help me! Do thy best
To pluck this crawling serpent from my breast!
Ay me, for pity! What a dream was here!
Lysander, look how I do quake with fear.
Methought a serpent ate my heart away,
And you sat smiling at his cruel prey.
Lysander! What, remov'd? Lysander! lord!

(2.2.144–50)

Lucibella, however, is not actually dead but only wounded, and as if to underscore the parallel with *Dream*, she proceeds to morph into a succession of other Shakespearean heroines. First comes Juliet, as Lodowick says “your daughter is become a bride for death, the dismal even before her wedding day. Hermit, God pardon thee: thy double tongue hath caused this error” (3.1.164–66), though “double tongue” is also found in *Dream* (2.2.9). The parallels with Juliet continue as Saxony tells Austria “Lodowick shall be my burden: brother, yours / The lovely but the luckless Lucibel” (3.1.224–25), echoing Montague and Capulet reconciling over the bodies of their dead children, and Hoffman calls Lucibella “new-deflowered by death” (3.1.276). Soon, though, Juliet is displaced by Ophelia as Lucibella herself, now mad, declares,

For I am going to the river's side
To fetch white lilies and blue daffodils
To stick in Lodowick's bosom, where it bled;
And in mine own. My true love is not dead,
No: y're deceived in him.

(4.1.19–23)¹⁸

Lucibell is thus in effect a composite Shakespearean heroine, passing from comic to tragic as the mood of the play darkens. First and foremost, though, she is Hermia, as the fantasy of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* turns here into reality.

I think it is no coincidence that *Dream* should be remembered in *Hoffman*, because despite appearances to the contrary a central concern of Chettle's play is the search for an appropriate aesthetic for the expression of emotion—only it is, I suggest, collective rather than individual emotion that is at stake. Ostensibly, of course, the play is about grief. When *Hoffman* caps *Hamlet* by bringing not just a skull but a complete skeleton onto the stage, it raises obvious questions about death, but also brings forward considerations of literary influence and of how best to mourn. However, Chettle provides Hoffman with an obsession with his dead father that far exceeds that of Hamlet, extending to the fate of the body as well as that of the soul, and which is also fundamentally theatrical and performative in nature to an extent which ultimately undermines the credibility of what is represented. Hoffman's theft of his father's corpse suggests a bizarre physicalisation of death very different from the ghostly form taken by Hamlet's father, and this is an emphasis developed later in the play when Ferdinand, told that Hoffman is dead, immediately demands "Where is the villain's body?" (1.2.113), while Martha asks "Where have you laid the body of my son?" (4.2.194). Even more striking is the fact that Lucibella says "Nay, look you here, do you see these poor starved ghosts? Can you tell whose they be?" (5.1.150–51) when she is actually looking at skeletons, and that Hoffman at the mouth of the cave asks

S' death, who stands here?
What's that? Lorrique's pale ghost?
(5.3.117–18)

For both Hoffman and Lucibella, "ghost" is apparently synonymous with "bone," as if the soul had physical rather than spiritual form.

If this reduction to the physical means that we are unlikely to care about the characters, though, it does not mean that there is nothing we do care about. Like *Hamlet*, *Hoffman* touches on a question likely to have been at the forefront of the minds of many of the audience: their personal salvation. On an island in the recently converted Baltic, *Hoffman* evokes both Greek myth and three other recent tragedies about parents and children to invite its audience to ask some probing and focused questions about what individuals and societies feel and believe, and how these feelings and beliefs are most appropriately expressed.

Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy* is another play which connects ideas about the expression of emotion to Greece. It is set in

Rhodes, as is announced as early as the thirteenth line, Lysippus's "The land by me welcomes thy virtues home to Rhodes";¹⁹ the fact that "to Rhodes" is extrametrical suggests that the playwrights are anxious to name the location as early as possible. Although Melantius speaks of ladies' "Milan skins" (4.1.11), which might suggest a more early modern feel, there are also several touches of local, classical colour. Melantius says of Amintor,

When he was a boy,
As oft as I returned (as, without boast,
I brought home conquest) he would gaze upon me
And view me round, to find in what one limb
The virtue lay to do those things he heard.
(1.1.49–53)

This recalls Achilles and Hector viewing each other in *Troilus and Cressida* so that each can assess and comment on the probable strength of the other. Amintor hopes he and Evadne will both die on the same day (3.1.143) as Philemon and Baucis did; the King tells Evadne, "I'll be thy Mars; to bed, my Queen of Love" (5.1.50); and Evadne herself says,

I will redeem one minute of my age,
Or like another Niobe I'll weep
Till I am water.
(4.1.257–59)

Collectively these leave us in no doubt that we are in a society deeply influenced by classical Hellenic culture. Lindsay Ann Reid, suggesting that "what is most evocative about the play's stated location is the diverse range of historical and cultural meanings attached to it," notes that the Rhodes of *The Maid's Tragedy* is

physically located within a terrain also traversed by the likes of Aeneas and Theseus, and it is hard not to hear echoes of the Trojan archetype in Beaumont and Fletcher's representation of their own walled city. As in the Trojan saga, which begins with the discord between Menelaus, Paris, and Helen, the strife in this fictive Rhodes is similarly put in motion with a disagreement between two men ... who have competing claims on the same woman.²⁰

It is particularly suggestive that a number of characters in *The Maid's Tragedy* take their names from Greek practitioners of various art forms. As the notes on the *Dramatis Personae* in T. W. Craik's Revels edition observe, Lysippus is the name of a sculptor (as recalled in *Campaspe* where Apelles asks "What Pygmalion or what Pyrgoteles or what Lysippus is he that ever made thy face so fair or spread thy fame so far as I?" [3.5.26–28]), Melantius was a painter, and

available to act as its climax, and it is thus by definition disabled from offering any sense of resolution.

The playwrights' interest in art is at its peak when it comes to the appropriate representation of grief. The play's prime figure of grief is of course Aspatia, of whom Lysippus says that she

Walks discontented, with her wat'ry eyes
Bent on the earth. The unfrequented woods
Are her delight, and when she sees a bank
Stuck full of flowers she with a sigh will tell
Her servants what a pretty place it were
To bury lovers in, and make her maids
Pluck 'em and strow her over like a corse.

(1.1.90–96)

Again there are echoes here of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with lovers, flowery banks, and tears evoked in both, and there is an even closer parallel when Cynthia addresses Night as “Great queen of shadows” (1.2.142), echoing Puck's description of Oberon as “king of shadows” (3.2.347). Memories of *Dream* may also inform Evadne's association between lovers and snakes—“I sooner will find out the beds of snakes, / And with my youthful blood warm their cold flesh” (2.1.209–10)—and Aspatia's reference to Amintor's “double tongue” (2.2.7), and there is too an implicit correspondence between the friendship of Melantius and Amintor, put under stress by a woman, and that of Helena and Hermia, put under stress by a man.

Such echoes of *Dream* are in themselves part of the masque's meditation on modes of expression, as too are Cynthia's injunction to Night to “Heave up thy drowsy head,” which the Revels note points out is a quotation from *Hero and Leander* (1.2.278), and Aspatia's revisiting of Ophelia:

Perhaps he found me worthless,
But, till he did so, in these ears of mine,
These credulous ears, he poured the sweetest words
That art or love could frame.

(2.1.50–53)

In case this were not clear enough, she also says to the other women, “Remember me” (2.1.61). It is of a piece with this literary self-consciousness that Aspatia declares that she will “teach you an artificial way to grieve” (2.1.95) and “must try / Some yet unpractised way to grieve and die” (2.1.122–23). She is also interested in ways to express the grief of others:

That downcast of thine eye, Olympias,
Shows a fine sorrow; mark, Antiphila;
Just such another was the nymph Oenone's
When Paris brought home Helen. Now a tear,
And then thou art a piece expressing fully
The Carthage queen when from a cold sea rock,
Full with her sorrow, she tied fast her eyes
To the fair Troyan ships, and having lost them,
Just as thine does, down stole a tear.

(2.2.28–36)

For Aspatia, figures from classical mythology, in the shape of Oenone and Dido, offer the ultimate instances of female emotion. Soon after, ordering Antiphila to “Show me the piece of needlework you wrought” (2.2.40), she offers a detailed critique:

Aspatia. You have a full wind and a false heart, Theseus.—
Does not the story say his keel was split,
Or his masts spent, or some kind rock or other
Met with his vessel?
Antiphila. Not as I remember.
Aspatia. It should ha' been so.

(2.2.45–49)

Since the story did not end as she thinks it should have, she proposes to change it:

Antiphila, in this place work a quicksand,
And over it a shallow smiling water
And his ship ploughing it, and then a Fear:
Do that Fear to the life, wench.
Antiphila. 'Twill wrong the story.
Aspatia. 'Twill make the story, wronged by wanton poets,
Live long and be believed.

(2.2.54–59)

Even then though she cannot be satisfied:

These colours are not dull and pale enough
To show a soul so full of misery
As this sad lady's was.

(2.2.63–65)

For Aspatia, emotion is something that must always exceed expression, and yet even as she voices that idea she surely also succeeds in evoking pity and interest in the audience. The same is true when she herself ultimately becomes the subject of a discussion of the aesthetics of grief, when her father Calianax says,

“My daughter dead here too! And you have all fine new tricks to grieve, but I ne’er knew any but direct crying” (5.3.273–75). The simple pathos of Calianax’s almost entirely monosyllabic lament, together with the disclaiming of artifice implicitly contained in the switch from verse to prose, has a dignity and conviction which transcend anything the other characters have achieved, and claims our sympathy in a way that Melantius, Amintor and Evadne may well fail to do. Here too, then, as in *Campaspe*, *The Roman Actor*, *Hamlet*, and *Hoffman*, Greece affords a fertile setting for an exploration of the aesthetics of drama in general, and of tragedy in particular.

Notes

- 1 Kent Cartwright, “*The Comedy of Errors* and ‘Farthest Greece,’” in *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 45–67, p. 59.
- 2 Efterpi Mitsi, “Greece ‘Digested in a Play’: Consuming Greek Heroism in *The School of Abuse* and *Troilus and Cressida*,” in *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), pp. 93–114, p. 95.
- 3 John Lyly, *Campaspe*, edited by G. K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 1.2.57–63.
- 4 Philip Massinger, *The Roman Actor*, edited by Martin White (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 1.2.106–9.
- 5 Massinger, *The Roman Actor*, edited by Martin White, introduction, p. 12.
- 6 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, translated by Mary M. Innes (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), p. 330.
- 7 Douglas Howard, “Massinger’s Political Tragedies,” in *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 117–37, p. 123.
- 8 Martin Butler, “Romans in Britain: *The Roman Actor* and the Early Stuart Classical Play,” in *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 139–70, p. 159.
- 9 William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, edited by Harold Jenkins (London: Methuen, 1982), 1.5.77; George Chapman, *Chapman’s Homer: The Iliad and the Odyssey* (London: Wordsworth, 2000), *Iliad*, Book 22, lines 330–31.
- 10 Tanya Pollard, *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 119.
- 11 See for instance M. C. Bradbrook, “The Inheritance of Christopher Marlowe,” *Theology* 47 (1964): 298–305; Michael Hattaway, “Christopher Marlowe: Ideology and Subversion,” in *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, edited by Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), pp. 198–223; and Maurice Charney, “The Voice of Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* in Early Shakespeare,” *Comparative Drama* 31.2 (1997): 213–23, though Charney hears *Tamburlaine* rather than *Dido* here.
- 12 Henry Chettle, *The Tragedy of Hoffman*, in *Five Revenge Tragedies*, edited by Emma Smith (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2012), 2.3.52.
- 13 Thomas Nashe, “The Terrors of the Night,” in *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, edited by J. B. Steane (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 222.

- 14 Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great*, edited by J. S. Cunningham (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), Part Two, 1.1.25–32.
- 15 Katherine Heavey, *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558–1688* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 112.
- 16 William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, edited by Harold F. Brooks (London: Methuen, 1979), 2.2.34.
- 17 Bill Angus, *Intelligence and Metadrama in the Early Modern Theatre* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), p. 165.
- 18 The echo of Ophelia is also noticed by Tom Rutter (“Marlowe, *Hoffman*, and the Admiral’s Men,” *Marlowe Studies* 3 [2013]: 49–62, p. 56).
- 19 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Maid’s Tragedy*, edited by T. W. Craik (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 1.1.13.
- 20 Lindsay Ann Reid, “Beaumont and Fletcher’s Rhodes: Early Modern Geopolitics and Mythological Topography in *The Maid’s Tragedy*,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 16.2 (2012). Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/16-2/16-2toc.htm>.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 7

Metatheatre and Metamorphosis in Thomas Tomkis's *Albumazar*

Thomas Tomkis's comedy *Albumazar*, acted in 1614 and printed in 1615, is an English version of Giambattista Della Porta's *L'Astrologo*. Trinity College Cambridge, where *Albumazar* was first staged, already had a tradition of performing his work which included Walter Hawkesworth's *Labyrinthus*, "the earliest known case of English plagiarism of Della Porta," Samuel Brooke's *Adelphe*, and George Ruggle's *Ignoramus*; *Albumazar* was performed the night after *Ignoramus*.¹ *Albumazar* is so much the best of these that in the nineteenth century Henry Ingalls attributed it to Shakespeare, and although Louise George Clubb argues that "Tomkis softened the satire" of the original,² it is in fact an important and even a dangerous play, which asks some probing questions about learning in general and Greek learning in particular, and, I shall suggest, uses Marlowe to do so.

Although *Albumazar* is certainly an adaptation of *L'Astrologo*, it is central to its effect that it also pillages cheerfully and widely from elsewhere. At a particularly tense moment, Pandolfo says,

How slow the day slides on! When we desire
Times hast, it seemes to loose a match with Lobsters.³

Obviously lobsters are not horses, but there may be an affectionately parodic reference here to Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, where Faustus's final speech includes the apostrophe "*O lente, lente currite noctis equi!*"⁴ If so, this would be only one of many literary allusions in Tomkis's play: indeed *Albumazar*'s servant Harpax declares that "This Poet is that Poets Plagiary, / And he a third's, till they end all in Homer" (sig. B1r). Harpax's chosen point of origin is an apt one, because the play is indeed in thrall to Greek learning, but the first of its own borrowings comes from closer to home. When the supposed magician *Albumazar* proceeds to develop Harpax's idea of plagiarism, he himself commits the first of the play's literary thefts while actually talking about theft:

The world's a Theater of theft. Great rivers
Rob smaller brookes; and them the Ocean.
And in this world of ours, this Microcosme:
Guts from the stomack steale, and what they spare,
The meseraicks filch, and lay't i'th liver:
Where (least it should be found) turn'd to red Nectar,

Tis by a thousand theevish veines convey'd
 And hid in flesh, nerues, bones, muscles and sinewes,
 In tendons, skin and haire, so that the property
 Thus altered, the theft can never be discovered.

(sig. B1v)

This is of course a parodic inversion of Menenius's famous speech about the belly in *Coriolanus*, and that knowledge informs Harpax's faux-naïve response "I thought these parts had lent and borrowed mutuall" (sig. B1v), which is what Menenius says they do.

Shakespearean echoes can also be detected elsewhere in Tomkis's play. Later, Trincalo when he thinks he has been transformed into Antonio declares,

For fiue dayes I was vnder water; and at length
 Got vp and spred my selfe vpon a chest,
 Rowing with armes, and steering with my feet;
 And thus in fiue dayes more got land.

(3.5.sig. F4r)

This clearly pokes fun at the shipwreck survival narratives characteristic of Shakespeare's late plays in particular; the shipwreck motif is not confined to the late plays, though, and an early play in which it appears, *The Comedy of Errors*, is also recalled in *Albumazar* when a chain is promised in payment. There is also a scene in which the real Antonio is denied entry to his own house on the grounds that he is an impostor, again echoing *The Comedy of Errors*, and a moment when Antonio asks Trincalo "Which Antonio?" (4.7.sig. H4r), which could perhaps be a sly nod at the fact that Shakespeare's default choice of name for male characters is Antonio. (In *L'Astrologo* the Antonio character is called Guglielmo, but ironically Antonio might seem a more Williamesque name than Guglielmo.) Indeed the very name of Trincalo might be borrowed from Trinculo in *The Tempest*, not least since similar ideas accrue to both: Stephano asks of Caliban "Can he vent Trinculos?"⁵ and Armellina declares,

Then must I waite, till old Antonio
 Bee brought to bed of a faire Trincalo;
 Or flea you, and strip you to yourselfe againe.

(4.11.sig. I3v)

In both these speeches, we find the idea of one character, named either Trinculo or Trincalo, emerging from inside another. *The Comedy of Errors* and *The Tempest*, plays from the beginning and end of Shakespeare's career, thus both seem to be remembered, suggesting that as well as translating Della Porta Tomkis is casting an appraising glance at the dramatic aesthetic of his greatest contemporary.

The suggestion that Antonio might somehow give birth to Trincalo also touches on the central concern of the play, which is transformation and how it is effected. In this context I think it is suggestive that two of what I take to be direct glances at Shakespeare should focus on the stomach, which becomes doubly emblematic of transformation as it is identified as the site of both gestation and digestion. At the same time as it registers these two biological functions, moreover, *Albumazar* performs some digesting and gestating of its own as it takes in Marlovian and Shakespearean material and reproduces it in changed form.

This is typical of how *Albumazar* works: the mirror that will supposedly dissolve the enchantment, returning Trincalo to himself as soon as he looks into it, emblematises the way that the play as a whole holds the glass up to earlier drama and transforms it. Trincalo says of Armellina “will I confound her with complements drawne from the Plaies I see at the Fortune, and Red Bull, where I learne all the words I speake and vnderstand not” (2.1.sigs C4v–D1r); later, after Armellina has left him alone on stage, he comes out with the parodic “O lippes, no lippes, but leaues besmear’d with mel-dew! ô dew no dew, but drops of Hony combs! ô combs no combs, but fountaines full of teares! ô teares no teares, but—” (2.1.sigs D1r–v), an obvious allusion to *The Spanish Tragedy*’s “O eyes, no eyes, but fountains fraught with tears!”.⁶ Later Furbo burlesques Dowland’s “Flow my tears” as “Flow streames of liquid salt from my sad eyes” (3.8.sig. G3r), and Armellina too responds to and transforms a literary model when she says of Trincalo,

Well: hee’s something foolish;
The better can I dominere, and rule him
At pleasure. That’s the marke, and vtmost height
Wee women aime at. I am resolu’d; I’le haue him.
(4.11.sig. I4v)

The idea that what women most desire is power glances at the tale of the Wife of Bath, in itself also a story of transformation, in that the Loathly Lady is under an enchantment which alters her physical appearance.

Most obviously, the play resembles *The Alchemist*, to the extent that Dryden thought that Jonson had copied from it. One of the many sources of comedy in Jonson’s play is the Spanish Don costume which Surly wears to woo Dame Pliant. In *Albumazar* too the link between costume and identity is explored. *Albumazar* declares,

Forget not clothes for th’new transform’d, and roabes
For me to sacrifice: you know the fashion.

I'le rather change fiue, then apparrell one.
 For men haue liuing soules, cloathes are vnanimate.
 (2.5.sig. E3r)

Everything about the transformation chamber has to be white, which may gesture at the importance of the colour in alchemy, as in *The Alchemist* where Subtle asks “He has his white shirt on?”⁷ Trincalo may glance at *The Alchemist* as well as at *The Spanish Tragedy* itself when he declares,

When this transformed substance of my carcasce
 Did liue imprison'd in a wanton hogshead,
 My name was Don Antonio, and that title
 Preseru'd my life, and chang'd my sute of cloathes.
 (4.6.sig. H3v)

Most importantly, there is also a sympathy of sensibility between Tomkis's play and Jonson's. In *The Alchemist*, part of the point of the Spanish Don joke is that it is so absurdly simple to pull off: Face says “Hieronimo's old cloak, ruff and hat will serve” (4.7.71). We are invited to contemplate a transformation which is simultaneously total and trivial, and the discrepancy is part of the comedy. In *Albumazar*, too, there is a splendid simplicity to the supposed magic; the deception convinces even sensible characters by dint of its sheer effrontery.

On the surface, *Albumazar* is a play for a changing world. Louise George Clubb identifies its source text *L'Astrologo* as virtually sharing a plot with *La Turca*, which features the corsair Dragut Rais,⁸ and a similar exoticism obtains in *Albumazar*. Albumazar himself orders,

My Almanacke made for th'meridian
 And height of Iapan, giu't th'East Indy company:
 There may they smel the price of Cloues and Pepper,
 Munkies and China-dishes fiue yeares ensuing.
 (1.5.sig. C1v)

Japan, the East India Company, and China amongst them have reconfigured geography and brought new ideas and new ways of thinking as well as new commodities. There are many other mentions of travel and different cultures: Antonio has gone to Barbary, and Ronca asks about “The perpetual motion / With a true larum in't to run twelue houres / 'Fore Mahomets returne,” to which Albumazar replies,

Deliu'er it safe
 T'a Turkie Factor, bid him with care present it
 From mee to th'house of Ottoman.
 (1.5.sig. C2r)

In *The Alchemist*, foreign countries are invoked in a way which is purely metaphorical: Sir Epicure Mammon says “here’s the rich Peru” (2.1.2) and later declares “I’ll purchase Devon and Cornwall, / And make them perfect Indies!” (2.1.35–36). In *Albumazar*, foreign countries are real and are visited, and encounters with their cultures change the characters and challenge their assumptions, effecting in a way a transformation of their own.

It is also, though, a play rooted in the classical past. In particular, it evokes Greece at a number of other points, echoing Tomkis’s earlier play *Lingua* where *Lingua* herself speaks of “The learned Greeke rich in fit Epithites” (sig. A3v), and where *Mendacio* mentions Aristotle, says he himself was “borne in Greece, nurst in Creete and euer since honoured euery where: Ile bee sworne I held old Homers pen when hee write his Iliads, and his Odisses,” and later adds “I helped Herodotus to pen some part of his muses” (sig. D1r).⁹ In *Albumazar*, what Ronca calls “the learned Phrontisterion / Of most diuine Albumazar” (sig. B3v) derives from Aristophanes, and Ronca also mentions “Apollonius the Magitian” (sig. B3v) and “Iust Aesop’s Crow, prink’t vp in borrowed feathers” (sig. F3v). The otacousticon recalls the parabolic phenomenon of theatre acoustics, as in the amphitheatre at Epidaurus whose design supposedly echoed the shape of the human ear, and *Albumazar*’s opening speech invokes the Spartans:

For in the dayes of old, Good morrow Theife,
As welcome was receiu’d, as now Your Worship.
The Spartans held it lawfull, and th’Arabians,
So grew Arabia, Foelix; Sparta valiant.

(sig. B1r)

One of the things the “perspicill” is promised to show is “that small Iliade / That in a wall-nut shell was desk’t” (sigs B3v–B4r); Pandolfo refers to “These strange Gorgonian instruments” (sig. C1r); and Trincalo acts out a psychomachia when he says “And thou in his shape maist possesse her. Turne” (sig. D2r). *Albumazar* evokes a character from the Trojan War when he says he can make Ronca “walke as vnwounded as Achilles, / Dip’t by his mother Thetis” (sig. C4r), and he also evokes another sort of Greek myth when he warns that if the transformation is interrupted, Trincalo may be left “Like to a Centaure, halfe Clowne, halfe Gentleman” (sig. F2r). Finally he makes fun of Greek terminology when he says,

Now then declining from Theourgia,
Artenosoria, Pharmacia, reflecting
Necro-puro-geo-hydro-cheiro-coscinomancy,
With other vaine and superstitious sciences,

Wee'l ancor at the Art Prestigiatore,
 That represents one figure for another,
 With smooth deceit abusing th'eyes of mortals.
 (sig. D3v)

Antonio too evokes Greece when he says "Conformitie of yeares, likenesse of manners, / Are Gordian knots that bind vp matrimony" (sig. K4v), since the Gordian knot was famously cut by Alexander the Great. Moreover, Tomkis's play echoes *The Alchemist* not only in plot but in drawing on the story of *Medea*. Katherine Heavey notes of Jonson's play that "What Mammon presents as classical and alchemical learning is in fact nothing more than an avaricious obsession with gold, and while he swaggers as if his possession gives him control over the legend, in fact he has entirely misunderstood it, claiming that the obstacles to Jason's winning of the fleece (bulls, the dragon, the men who spring from the dragon's teeth) are actually the means to obtain it."¹⁰ *Albumazar* too makes use of the *Medea* story when Pandolfo calls Flavia's love "More powerfull then *Medea's* drugges" (1.2.sig. B3r); both plays take this most tragic of Greek myths and rework it for comic effect. Greek vocabulary, science, and mythology thus underpin the play at every level, and provide crucial material for the concept in which *Albumazar* invests most of its dramatic and intellectual energy, which is the idea of transformation.

The idea of transformation is important in a number of plays in the period, and can usefully be thought of in terms of a taxonomy structured by four questions: by whose power the transformation is effected, for how long, to what end, and what exactly is transformed. When actual transformation occurs in drama, it typically takes the form of human-animal transformation of one sort or another and is for obvious reasons only partial, whether as in the ass's head which Puck bestows on Bottom or the horns which Doctor Faustus inflicts on Benvolio, both of which are brought about by supernatural agency. Such transformations are very often sexualised, unsurprisingly given that Renaissance literature's ultimate topos for the motif of transformation is Ovid, where it is typically the desire of a god or the coyness of a goddess which kickstarts the narrative. The addition of the ass's head makes Bottom a suitably grotesque sexual partner for Titania, and the reason that the horns strike Doctor Faustus as a harsh enough punishment for Benvolio is that they connote cuckoldry. *Albumazar* does gesture at this connection between transformation and sex when Cricca says "'Tis an ill time to marry. / The Moone growes fork't, and walks with Capricorne" (1.5.sig. C2v). What is at stake in the play, though, is not human to animal transformation but human to human, and it is also apparently to be effected by a human. At the centre of the change motif is Thomas Trincalo, a farmer from Tottenham, who declares "wee'l get a boy / And call

him Transformation Trincalo" (2.2.sig. D2v) and says "I am mutable / And therefore apt to change" (2.2.sig. D2v). The idea is that Trincalo is going to be turned into a local man called Antonio who is temporarily away from home, and although the reasons for this proposed identity swap are loosely connected with sex, or at any rate with marriage, what really grips the characters' imaginations is not so much what they are going to gain from the transformation as the idea of transformation in itself.

This too is something already touched on in *Lingua*, where Tactus says that when he held his hands in front of his face to shield himself from the sun,

I sawe my fingers neere transform'd to glasse,
Opening my breast, my Breast was like a windowe,
Through which I plainly did perceiue my heart

...

But when I had ariu'd and set me downe,
Viewing my selfe, my selfe ay me was changed
As thou now seest to a perfect vrinall.

(sig. B4r)

Olfactus reassures the victim of this supposed transformation that it is entirely imaginary—"Tactus diswade thy selfe, thou doest but thinke so" (sig. B4r)—but to no effect. In *Albumazar*, the specific ways in which the process of transformation might occur represent a subject of compelling interest to the play. Pandolfo says,

I must confesse in yeares about three score,
But in tuffe strength of body, foure and twenty,
Or two monthes lesse. Loue of yong Flauia,
More powerfull then Medea's drugges, renew's
All decay'd parts of man: my Arteryes
Blowne full with youthfull spirits, moue the bloud
To a new businesse: my withred Neru's grow plumpe
And strong, longing for action.

(1.2.sig. B3r)

This passage is notable for a number of reasons. Pandolfo begins by claiming that he is in a sense already transformed, in that he is different from what he biologically ought to be: his real age is around sixty, but he claims to have the body of a twenty-four-year-old. This miracle is apparently due to love, which has rejuvenated him, but he also glances at another possible cause when he refers to Medea, who used a combination of herbs and magic to achieve a similar effect. We are thus left uncertain whether transformation is internally or externally produced, and whether it is something natural and wholesome, or

something unholy and ominous. At the same time, we also recognise the transformation of the stuff of Greek tragedy, here repurposed for comic effect.

The idea of transformation continues to be developed, and continues to be complicated. Learning that the person whose likeness he is to take was a gentleman, Trincalo says indignantly,

O ho!
 Now do I smell th'Astrologer's tricke: hee'l steepe mee
 In souldiers bloud; or boyle me in a Chaldron
 Of Barbarous Law French: Or annoint me ouer
 With supple oyle of great men's seruices.
 For these three meanes raise Yeomen to the Gentry.
 (2.2.sig. D2r)

The cauldron is another nod at Medea, and the suggestion of blood sacrifice also underlies the idea that soldiers' blood might be involved, but we are taken in a very different direction by the idea that what the cauldron contains will be law French, or that the oil which will be used will derive not from animal fats but from sycophancy. These much more metaphorical ideas of transformation introduce concerns such as class and behaviour, which would be directly relevant to the young men of Trinity College Cambridge who would presumably form a large part of the audience, many of whom would be expecting to undergo a transformation of their own when they graduated and entered society.

As the moment of Trincalo's supposed transformation approaches, speculation mounts about what it might actually prove to entail. Trincalo himself wonders whether it might be like cooking:

twould grieue me to be bray'd
 In a huge Mortar, wrought to paste, and moulded
 To this Antonio's mould.
 (2.2.sig. D2r)

He imagines himself being prepared as the ingredients of a pie might be; it might perhaps be worth noting that a standard early modern term for a pie crust was a coffin, and Trincalo attaches a similar sense of ominousness to the idea of being pounded in a mortar, which would not unnaturally "grieve" him (and would also represent a comic reworking of *Titus Andronicus*). Cricca too implicitly assumes that some of the techniques of cooking will be involved when he demands,

No danger? cut thy finger and that paines thee;
 Then what wil't do to shred and mince thy carkasse,

Bury't in horse-dung, mould it new, and turne it
T'Antonio?

(2.4.sig. E1v)

Shredding and mincing are two more things that one might do to ingredients, and the original audience might remember that at Blackfriars the year before, Bosola had assured the Duchess of Malfi that the apricots she had just eaten had been ripened in horse-dung.

Trincalo is also worried about how complete the transformation will be. He says,

Doctor Albumazar, I haue a veine of drinking,
And artery of lechery runs through my body:
Pray when you turne me gentleman, preserue
Those two, if 't may be done with reputation.

(2.5.sig. E2v)

Understanding his behaviours to be corporeally based, Trincalo is worried that a transformed appearance may result in a transformed character. He is concerned particularly about his emotions and his intellect:

And when you come to th'hart, spoyle not the loue of Armellina.
And in my braine leaue as much discretion
As may spye falshood in a Tauerne reckoning;
And let me alone for bounty to winke and pay't.

(2.5.sig. E2v)

There are profound questions of identity at stake here, and there is also, I think, the first hint that *Albumazar* may be something more than a very funny comedy. In Chettle's *Hoffman*, seven years before, a radically physicalised understanding of death had left the words "bone" and "soul" apparently interchangeable; here a radically physicalised understanding of life seems similarly to crowd out any possibility of the metaphysical, making affection and intellect functions of bodily organs rather than signs of a potentially immortal soul. In *Lingua*, Mendacio refers to himself as "I that haue fained so many hundred Gods" (sig. B2r), and though the fact that some gods are feigned obviously does not mean that all gods are feigned, the confession is a striking one. In *Albumazar*, lurking in the background is a provocatively materialist idea that humans can be created by other humans, which leaves no room for God; if this play showcases Greek wisdom, it is the wisdom of Socrates rather than the wisdom of Teiresias.

When the transformation appears to actually begin, still further ways of thinking about it are employed. Pandolfo says,

While the Astrologer hew's out Trincolo,
 Squaring and framing him t'Antonio.
 (3.1.sig.E4v)

"Hew's" suggests not so much cooking as sculpting, or perhaps wood carving. Albumazar though appears to imply something different again when he assures his client,

Signior Pandolfo, three quarters of an houre
 Render's your seruant perfectly transform'd.
Cricca.
 Is he not wholly chang'd? what parts are wanting?
Albumazar.
 Antonio's shape hath cloath'd his bulk and visage,
 Onely his hands and feete, so large and callous,
 Require more time to supple.

(3.2.sig. F1v)

The process here appears to be something more like melting or being moulded out of wax, and it is perhaps worth noting that as well as *L'Astrologo* Della Porta's works included the treatise *Chirofisionomia*, a study of palmreading which also paid attention to feet.¹¹ Della Porta wrote this in 1581 but could not get it published, because he had a dangerous history: according to Louise George Clubb, *Albumazar's* source play, Della Porta's *L'Astrologo*, was written as a penance after he was accused of heresy. Pointing out that he was taken before the Neapolitan Inquisition in 1579 on suspicion of magic, warned off any further dabbling in the occult, and ordered to write a comedy instead, she argues that "*L'Astrologo* . . . is clearly a result of Della Porta's encounter with the Inquisition; it was probably his response to the Inquisitors' ominously jesting suggestion that he write a comedy as penance for his forbidden practices"; she also relates the play to his visits to prisons and hospitals and the anatomical experiments he was undertaking for *Chirofisionomia*, and adds that "The scholastically trained minds of the censors had quickly perceived the ultimate danger of Della Porta's investigation of forbidden knowledge, especially judiciary astrology. After his censure by the Inquisition, he had found it difficult to obtain licenses for his books."¹² The combination of anatomical experiments and the whiff of the occult attached to the practice of palmistry made *Chirofisionomia* particularly dangerous territory; if Tomkis had heard anything about the treatise (and the sustained interest in Della Porta at Trinity makes this not impossible), the specific mention of hands and feet being transformed might begin to look pointed.

Finally, when the transformation is supposedly complete Albumazar gestures at yet another way in which it might have been achieved when he orders,

Stand forth transform'd Antonio fully mued
 From browne soare feathers of dull yeomanry
 To th'glorious bloome of gentry; prune your selfe slick,
 Sweare boldly y'are the man you represent
 To all that dare deny't.

(3.4.sig. F3r)

Antonio is “fully mued,” as if he were a bird which had transformed in a wholly natural way by developing its adult plumage. The image of a man being like a bird is one which could work in two very different ways. It could recall the trope of the soul taking flight, but it could also evoke more specifically materialist experiments with the possibility of actual flight. It was at Trinity that John Dee, when a student there, had made a beetle fly in Aristophanes's play *Pax*, which had led him to being accused of sorcery, and there is an interest in the mechanics of transformation in another Greek-set play, Lyly's *Campaspe*, where the crowd genuinely believes that Diogenes might fly, and a number of characters are specifically interested in how he might actually do it:

Granichus. How is he furnished to fly? Hath he feathers?
Manes. Thou art an ass; capons, geese and owls have feathers. He hath found
 Daedalus' old waxen wings and hath been piecing them this month, he is so
 broad in the shoulders. O, you shall see him cut the air even like a tortoise.
Solinus. Methinks so wise a man should not be so mad; his body must needs be too
 heavy.
Manes. Why, he hath eaten nothing this sevensnight but cork and feathers.¹³

Moreover, though the image of mewing makes transformation seem both possible and normal, it is also self-evidently an image: whatever else Trincalo has done, he has not grown feathers, and the injunction to “prune your selfe slick” carries with it the implication that transformation is essentially a matter of inner belief, in effect a form of self-fashioning.

Trincalo does indeed believe in himself, declaring,

My veines are fild with newnesse: ô for a Chyrurgian
 To ope this Arme, and view my gentle blood,
 To try if't run two thousand pounds a yeare.
 I feele my vnderstanding is enlarg'd
 With the rare knowledge of this latter age.

(3.5.sig. F3r)

After all the build-up to the supposed transformation and all the speculation about what it might entail, what the audience actually sees is nothing more than new clothes and a bracing shot of self-confidence; and yet it works, to the extent that not only the family of the real Antonio but the real Antonio himself come to believe

in the impostor. The reason it works is, as so often in transformation plays, connected to the nature of theatre itself. In William Rowley's *The Birth of Merlin*, for instance, transformation and the supernatural are insistently connected to theatricality. After a stage direction "*Enter the Devil in mans habit, richly attir'd, his feet and his head horrid*" (D2v) the Clown demands "'Slid who's that talks so? I can see no body'" (D3r);¹⁴ like Oberon's cheerfully crude declaration that "I am invisible" (2.1.186),¹⁵ this scene clearly depends on confident acting rather than any form of prop or trick. More fundamentally, the idea of simply insisting that you are who you say you are is of course the principle which already underlies the actor's presentation of Trincalo in the first place; the ultimate transformation proves to be theatre itself.

Things are not quite as simple as that, though, because even after the transformation has supposedly occurred, there are still questions about what it might actually be and mean. The play's strategy of insistently connecting material transformation to literary transformation could be seen not only as part of its intense self-reflexiveness but also as a means of avoiding the overt discussion of dangerous topics. When he first tries to persuade Trincalo to act as guinea-pig, Pandolfo says,

Here's an Astrologer has a wondrous secret
To transforme men to other shapes, and persons.
Trincalo.
How? transforme things to men?

(2.2.sig. D1v)

The idea of making humans out of things was dangerous, because it implicitly raised the question of whether or not there was a soul involved, and, if there was, where that soul came from. Almost exactly two hundred years later, this was the question that Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* would take up, and even in 1818 it was still controversial. (For Shelley the idea is also implicitly Greek: the subtitle of *Frankenstein* is *The Modern Prometheus*.) In 1614, the idea that things could be changed to men was quite extraordinarily provocative, and it is no wonder that the play drops it almost as soon as it raises it, for in fact Trincalo is not quite as human as all that; he says,

Not a one shakes his taile, but I sigh out a passion: thus do I to my Mistresse; but alas I kisse the dogge, and shee kicks mee. I neuer see a yong wanton Filly, but, say I, there goe's Armellina; nor a lusty strong Asse, but I remember my selfe, and sit downe to consider what a goodly race of Mules would inherit, if she were willing: onely I want vtterance, and that's a maine marke of loue too.

(2.1.sig. C4v)

Insofar as Trincalo compares himself with dogs and asses, there is almost an element of animal-human transformation.

However, though clearly comic, that too is a potentially disturbing idea, and in this context I think it is significant that one of the plays echoed in *Albumazar* is *Doctor Faustus*, itself a play of human-to-animal transformation when Faustus plants horns on the head of Benvolio. The debt might not be surprising given that Marlowe was a Cambridge alumnus, but *Doctor Faustus* is rarely an innocent or uncontroversial choice of source. There may just possibly have been an association of ideas between Marlowe, his friend Hariot, and Della Porta, who himself dabbled in many of the same arts as *Albumazar*: Louise George Clubb notes that he worked on “a parabolic mirror and an ‘oc-chiale,’” “an instrument for long-distance hearing,”¹⁶ and also claimed to have invented the telescope, which may be glanced at when *Albumazar* orders,

Ronca, the bunch of planets new found out
Hanging at th'end of my best Perspicill,
Send them to Galilaeo at Padua;
Let him bestow them where hee please. But th'starres
Lately discover'd 'twixt the hornes of Aries,
Are as a present for Pandolfo's marriage,
And henceforth stil'd Sidera Pandolfaea.

(1.5.sig. C1v)

Della Porta complained that “he had suffered much from plagiarists and had not only been robbed of credit for the invention of the telescope, but had also seen his work on the magnet filched by a certain barbarous Englishman, who was, moreover, mad enough to believe that the earth moves.”¹⁷ Clubb offers no guess as to who this could have been, but one candidate might be Hariot, who read and disagreed with Della Porta's conclusions on refraction.¹⁸ Clubb also argues that Della Porta must have known Giordano Bruno (he was certainly summoned before the Venetian Inquisition in 1592 shortly before Bruno),¹⁹ and Bruno's name too is sometimes connected to Marlowe's, albeit with less certainty. Della Porta died on 4 February 1615 so was still alive when *Albumazar* was written, and it is not impossible that thinking of him might have prompted thoughts of Marlowe.

Through whatever cause or reason, there are certainly echoes of Marlowe in Tomkis's play. Ronca assures Pandolfo that by means of *Albumazar*'s magic glass, he can see as far as Rome:

I see the Pope, his Card'nals and his mule,
The English Colledge and the Iesuits,
And what they write and doe.

(1.3.sig. B4r)

This is the first of several glances at *Doctor Faustus*, for Faustus too was anxious to see Rome. Faustus, though, was interested primarily in classical sights: among the delights which Mephistopheles promises him are “the gates and high pyramides / Which Julius Caesar brought from Africa” (3.1.42–43). The direct focus on the English College and the Jesuits is rather more controversial. Later, Albumazar tells Pandolfo that he can guess what he wants:

Antonio dead that promis'd you his daughter,
Your businesse is t'entreate mee raise his ghost,
And force it stay at home til't haue perform'd
The promise past, and so returne to rest.

(1.7.sig. C3v)

To speak with the dead is also a goal in *Doctor Faustus*, though it is the Emperor rather than the doctor himself who desires it. Officially there is no question of raising the dead in *Albumazar*, but it may be slyly suggestive that Antonio's surname Anastasio is derived from the Greek word for resurrection. Finally, Pandolfo warns “The resemblance last's but one whole day” (2.2.sig. D1v), parodically reducing the twenty-four years of *Doctor Faustus* to twenty-four hours. This time period is also mentioned in an exchange between Cricca and Albumazar, and here it is explicitly mocked:

Cricca.

Pray you sir
How long shall he retaine this metamorphosis?

Albumazar.

The compleate circle of a naturall day.

Cricca.

A naturall day? Are any daies vnnaturall?

(3.2.sig. F1v)

The phrase “natural day” comes from Faustus's conversation with Mephistopheles about planetary phenomena (2.3.52), and Cricca's seizing on it could mean various things: a rather clever comment on the banality of what Faustus actually achieves and on the speciousness of many of his arguments; a glance at the fact that actually a day on which you sign your soul away might well be called an unnatural one; or a metatheatrical joke about the unity of time, by which the two hours' traffic of the stage is cheerfully agreed to represent the twenty-four hours of a day. Any or all of these readings would be witty and amusing, and yet Cricca has also lit on something else, which is that there is something inherently troubling about the idea of temporary transformation, since it implies a potentially permanent and infinite state of malleability and flux in which there is no room for any stable concept of identity.

Most suggestively, *Doctor Faustus* is recalled when Antonio himself begins to believe that Trincalo has been turned into him, and wonders how it could possibly have happened:

Could the fearefull apprehension
Of th'vgly feare of drowning so transforme me?
Or did I dye, and by Pythagoras rule,
My soule's prouided of another lodging?
(4.7.sig. H4v)

Here we are obviously invited to remember Faustus's final speech, "Ah, Pythagoras' *metempsychosis*, were that true" (5.2.106). In Marlowe's case this is a characteristic sign of interest in non-Christian theologies. In *Albumazar*, it seems more of a pointer to the fact that Christianity itself was no longer monolithic; it had been fissured into two confessions, in ways which *Albumazar* seems to remember when Trincalo says,

Come, come sir, quickly,
Let's to th'Astrologer, and there transforme,
Reforme, conforme, deforme me at your pleasure.
I loath this Country countnance; dispatch: my skin
Itch'es like Snakes in Aprill, to be strip't off.
(2.2.sig. D2v)

Trincalo runs "Reform," "conform," and "deform" together as if they were merely slight variants of one another, but they are far from it, and Reformation theology would certainly have an opinion on whether there was conformity involved in believing in the possibility of this kind of deformity.

Albumazar, like so many post-Reformation texts, is riven by a deep-seated spiritual uncertainty. *Albumazar* himself says,

O what a busnesse what a maister peece
'Tis to raise vp his Ghost, whose bodie's eaten
By fish.
(1.7.sig. C3v)

When Tomkis's father John died in 1592 he asked to be buried beside his wife, though he declared that this was "not for any 'superstitious' reason."²⁰ It was however the kind of thing that was liable to *look* "superstitious": the Scottish preacher William Birnie, writing in 1606, declared that "There is nothing wherein the Antichristian crew is found more condemnable" than "their many fold sepulchromany,"²¹ and explicitly castigated what he considered an unchristian insistence on being buried in the churchyard on the grounds that it could not possibly matter where one was buried and that allowing church

burial encouraged the belief that churchyards were haunted. In *Albumazar*, though, we are apparently invited to believe that the fate of the spirit is indeed conditioned by that of the body, if the fish-eaten state of a man's corpse can affect the appearance of his ghost. Matters become even more complicated when Lelio says

Doubtlesse, th'Astrologer hath rais'd a ghost
That walkes in th'reverend ghost of my dead father.
(4.5.sig. H3r)

This apparently means that one ghost can inhabit another, an idea that makes the theological complexities of *Hamlet*, at which the passage surely gestures, look simple and easy.

Ultimately, the play disposes of such worries and complexities. In its final transformation, it magics up happy endings across the board: Cricca says "Offend not your good luck, y'are now more fortunate / Then when you rose this morning" (5.10.sig. L2v), and Pandolfo renounces his pretensions to the hand of the much younger Flavia. The same idea of cheer and universal goodwill is implicit in the Epilogue, spoken by Trincalo:

But if you come to Totnam
Some foure dayes hence, and aske for Trincalo
At th'signe o'th Hogshead; I'le morgage all my liues
To bid you welcome. You that loue Trincalo,
And meane to meete, clappe hands and mak't a bargain.
(sig. L4r)

If the audience did indeed trot off to Tottenham, and reconvene at the Hogshead, they might well have fallen into discussion of the play. And if they had, they might well have found that in some of the areas on which it had touched it had the potential to challenge and perhaps to transform existing ideas, because all the answers offered by *Albumazar* to the four questions central to transformation plays are unconventional and potentially troubling.

To return to my proposed taxonomy, I suggested that there are four questions that matter: by whose power the transformation is effected, for how long, to what end, and what exactly is transformed. In terms of by whose power, the play provocatively flirts with the idea that Albumazar, a human, can change Trincalo into Antonio merely through his own skill. Admittedly the process is not envisaged as permanent, but the twenty-four hours for which it will supposedly last are disturbingly reminiscent of *Doctor Faustus*, a play whose implications clearly had the potential to destabilise conventional ideas about Christianity, and which survived in a state whose fissured and fragmented nature mirrored and called

attention to the divide between the two confessions. In terms of to what end, officially the sole purpose of the transformation is to enable Pandolfo to marry, but unofficially it raises much larger questions about the extent to which anyone could potentially mould and alter their identity, and by implication their class status and social position. Finally, the question of what exactly is transformed also raises questions about identity. Trincalo hopes that his whole body might be changed but his inner propensities and proclivities remain the same; Lelio seems to think that his father's spirit might somehow be able to share its essence with another spirit. Obviously none of this happens because there is no actual transformation, but nevertheless the ways in which the play thinks about transformation are richly suggestive and provocative, and raise some very striking questions about the relationship between the material and the spiritual which are fundamentally underpinned by Greek thought. On one level, all these potentially serious ideas are dissipated and defused by the fact that marriage, as so often in comedy, is a *telos*, a way of signalling a happy ending and imposing a securely comic tone; Tomkis's play may be a translation of Della Porta, but it has something of the same sensibility as Aristophanes, and elements too in common with the comedies of Lyly and Jonson. As so often, though, comedy proves a serious business; *Albumazar* shows that both of the genres which the early modern stage inherited from Greece have the potential to be explosive.

Notes

- 1 Louise George Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta, Dramatist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 276, 278–79, 281, and 284.
- 2 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, pp. 285 and 288.
- 3 Thomas Tomkis, *Albumazar: A Comedy presented before the Kings Maiestie at Cambridge, the ninth of March, 1614. By the Gentlemen of Trinitie Colledge* (London: Nicholas Okes for Walter Burre, 1615), 2.6.sig. E2r.
- 4 Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, in *The Complete Plays*, edited by Mark Thornton Burnett (London: Everyman, 1999), A text, 5.2.75.
- 5 William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, edited by Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (London: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 2.2.105.
- 6 Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, edited by David Bevington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 3.2.1.
- 7 Ben Jonson, *The Alchemist*, edited by Peter Bement (London: Routledge, 1990), 2.3.83.
- 8 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, p. 172.
- 9 Thomas Tomkis, *Lingua* (London: G. Eld for Simon Waterson, 1607). Other classical moments in *Lingua* include Memory speaking of how he can remember “the warres of Thebes, and the siege of Troy” (sig. D4r) and how “I was at a Comedie of Aristophanes making (I shall neuer forget it). The Arch-gouernor of Athens tooke me by the hand” (sig. D4v). He also remembers Amphitryo and Alcmena (sig. F4v) and Phaeton (sig. G1r). Anamnestes complains

of Memory that “he’le tell me a long story of his acquaintance with King Priamus and his familiarity with Nester” (sig. E4r). Towards the end of the play Visus believes himself to be Polyphemus and Tactus thinks that he is Hercules Furens, and they act out their respective parts. Gustus asks “is a Marrow Pye the Helena of meates? giue mee[']t, if I playe not Paris hang mee” (sig. M2v). *Lingua* also remembers Shakespeare: in their Arden 3 edition of *Macbeth* Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason have noticed an echo of the sleepwalking scene in Tomkis (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), introduction, p. 14.

10 Katherine Heavey, *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558–1688* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 123.

11 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, p. 39.

12 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, pp. 15–16, 64, and 28.

13 John Lyly, *Campaspe*, edited by G. K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 4.1.10–19.

14 William Rowley, *The Birth of Merlin* (London: printed by Thomas Johnson for Francis Kirkman and Henry Marsh, 1662).

15 William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, edited by Harold F. Brooks (London: Methuen, 1979).

16 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, pp. 21 and 56.

17 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, pp. 43–45. Tomkis was independently interested in such matters: in *Lingua Phantastes* says Coelum is “of Copernicus opnion” (sig. G1r).

18 Robert Goulding, “Thomas Hariot’s Optics, between Experiment and Imagination: The Case of Mr Bulkeley’s Glass,” *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 68 (2014): 137–78, p. 150. In *Lingua*, Tobacco is one of the characters (he has swine’s teeth in his nose, his neck is hung with Indian leaves, he is led by two Indian boys, and he speaks gibberish, which is “translated” for our benefit), and Hariot was famous for his consumption of tobacco.

19 Clubb, *Giambattista Della Porta*, p. 33.

20 Patrick Collinson, “Tomkys, John,” *NDNB*.

21 William Birnie, *The blame of kirk-buriall, tending to persuade cemiteriall ciuilitie* (Edinburgh: Robert Charteris, 1606), n. p., n. sig.; doc. image 2.

Part IV: Greece on the Edge

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 8

The Edge of the Hellenic World

According to legend, the goddess Venus emerged from the Mediterranean at Petra tou Romiou (the Rock of the Roman) off the coast of Cyprus. Even if the identification of a precise location for her appearance may have more to do with the Cypriot tourist industry than with actual events, Venus/Aphrodite is always understood in mythology as having been born in and from water, and Cyprus was by any reckoning a crucial strategic location, an object of desire for Christian crusaders, Egyptian sultans, and Turkish rulers bent on turning the Mediterranean into an Ottoman lake. If Greece was the edge of Christendom, Cyprus, Lusignan-ruled but culturally Hellenic and perilously close to both Syria and Turkey, was the edge of that edge; Efterpi Mitsi notes that Sir Anthony Sherley “visited Cyprus on his way to Persia in 1599” and “observed that nothing survived of its ancient splendour,”¹ suggesting both the power of its reputation and the sense that it, like Greece itself, was lost and gone. In this chapter and the next, I look at the dangerous and disruptive presence of Venus in a number of plays, some set explicitly in Cyprus and others merely alluding to the struggle between Europeans and Turks—in a sense an updated war between Greeks and Trojans—in which it was so vital a frontier. I begin with *Antony and Cleopatra*, which I relate to the story of the last queen of Cyprus, Caterina Cornaro, and her rival Charlotte of Lusignan.

In 40 BC Antony gave Cleopatra a gift: Cyprus. This is remembered in *Antony and Cleopatra* when Caesar says he “made her / Of lower Syria, Cyprus, Lydia, / Absolute queen.”² Critics have often commented on the relationship between Cyprus and Venice in *Othello*; the relationship between Cyprus and Egypt in *Antony and Cleopatra* is less developed and also less critically explored, but it repays consideration. In the first place, *Othello* and *Antony and Cleopatra* are in dialogue with each other. *Othello* contains a number of glances at Egypt: Othello himself says “Swell, bosom, with thy fraught, / For ’tis of aspicks’ tongues!,” tells Desdemona that the handkerchief “was dyed in mummy, which the skilful / Conserved of maidens’ hearts,” and declares that

If that the earth could teem with woman’s tears
Each drop she falls would prove a crocodile.³

Asps, mummies, and crocodiles all map out common ground with *Antony and Cleopatra*.

Equally, *Antony and Cleopatra* recalls *Othello* in the relationship between Antony and Enobarbus, which partially echoes that between Othello and Iago,

and in the drinking scene, and both plays share a sense of the exoticism of the traveller's tale, which is Othello's stock in trade and which is evoked in *Antony and Cleopatra* when Enobarbus calls Cleopatra "a wonderful piece of work, which not to have been blest withal would have discredited your travel" (1.2.161–62). There is also an extradiegetic connection between the two plays in the name of the last Venetian governor of Cyprus, Marcantonio Bragadin, who was flayed alive by the Turks after the island fell.

The contrast between Cleopatra and Octavia also recalls Cyprus itself, because its last period of independence had been characterised by strife between two potential queens, Caterina Cornaro and Charlotte de Lusignan (the name Cornaro is also sometimes rendered as Corner). Charlotte was the legitimate claimant, but Caterina was much the more successful: married as a teenager to effectively the last of the Lusignan kings, James II (their son James III nominally succeeded his father but died before his first birthday) after having been declared a Daughter of Venice for the occasion, she achieved the surprising feat of translating her initial position of queen consort into that of queen regnant. Although for much of her reign she was in fact little more than a puppet of the Venetian Republic in whose favour she was eventually induced to abdicate, she and her story exercised an extraordinary fascination over both contemporaries and posterity, including in England and Scotland: William Lithgow knew how "the last King of Cyprus, James the Bastard (marrying with the Daughter of a noble Venetian, Caterina Cornaro) died without children,"⁴ and in the late 1590s Fynes Moryson, landing in Crete, met Vincenzo Cornaro, a member of the family whose brother Andrea fought in the Battle of Lepanto; Moryson refers to him as "a Gentleman of that office, Il Sigr. Vincenzo Cornaro (who used us nobly and curteously)," and his conversation might well have included the story of his royal relation.⁵ Caterina is also mentioned in Nestore Martinengo's account of Cyprus, first translated into English in 1572 with a dedication to the Earl of Leicester and later reprinted by Hakluyt.⁶ Perhaps there is a memory of Caterina in *Othello*, where the general's arrival on the island is troped in mythmaking terms:

Great Jove, Othello guard,
And swell his sail with thine own powerful breath,
That he may bless this bay with his tall ship,
Make love's quick pants in Desdemona's arms,
Give renewed fire to our extincted spirits
And bring all Cyprus comfort!

(2.1.77–83)

Othello is here directly connected to Jove, and the imagery of swelling and the reference to his “tall” ship underline the eroticism implicit in the occasion and make the arrival of Desdemona sexually, socially, and politically significant to the whole of Cyprus in the same way as the arrival of Caterina had been.

The principal reason for Caterina’s triumph over Charlotte was that Caterina, like Cleopatra, knew how to manipulate her public image, while Charlotte, like Octavia, did not. There were some striking similarities between the two rival candidates for the Lusignan throne: Charlotte, like Caterina, had an only son who died as a baby, and ultimately ceded her rights to her nephew, whom she adopted, as Caterina ceded hers to her “father” St. Mark and wished to adopt her nephew Giacomo, son of her sister Bianca. However, Caterina seized the public imagination and Charlotte never did. As in the case of Cleopatra, one element of her glamour was her title of queen. The status of Cyprus as a kingdom was something of which Venice was very proud, even after it had persuaded Caterina to renounce her crown; Hurlburt, observing that “Corner’s surrender earned her a place in the pantheon of masculine heroism in history, memory, and on the Maggior Consiglio ceiling,”⁷ notes particularly “The frequent depiction of Corner with a doge” and the careful distinction between what *he* wore and what *she* wore: however much it might resemble one, the headpiece worn by the doge was not a crown, which is what is worn by both Caterina and the allegorical Venetia as Queen of the Adriatic.”⁸ James Howell in *Epistolæ Ho-Eliañæ* says of that personified Venetia that “This beauteous Maid hath been often attempted to be vitiated: some have courted her, some bribed her, some would have forc’d her, yet she hath preserved her chastity entire . . . [However,] The Grand Turk hath been often at her, and tho’ he could not have his will of her, yet he took away the richest jewel he wore in her Coronet, and put it in his Turban; I mean the Kingdom of Cyprus, the only Royal Gem she had,”⁹ and Richard Knolles’s *Generall Historie of the Turkes*, published the year before *Othello* was written, declares, “This was the fatal ruin of CYPRUS, one of the most fruitful and beautiful islands of the Mediterranean: the loss whereof not without cause grieved many Christian princes, as sometime a kingdom of itself, and now a province of the Turkish empire.”¹⁰ For both these writers, to think of Cyprus at all was to remember its status as kingdom.

The Lusignan family had ruled in Cyprus since 1192, when Richard the Lionheart rewarded his ally Guy of Lusignan, already titular king of Jerusalem, with the gift of the island. (This is the “Guy of Lessingham” whom we see acquiring the crown of Cyprus at the end of Heywood’s *The Four Prentices of London*, though there the ruler of England is anachronistically said to be William the Conqueror.) Caterina Cornaro was not of the same status as her husband, but as Liana De Girolami Cheney observes, “The Cornaro family . . . had close commercial ties with Cyprus, administering copper and sugar-mills and exporting other

Cypriot goods to Venice,”¹¹ and they also maintained that they were descended from “the Roman general Scipio Africanus, his daughter Cornelia, and her children, including Gaius and Tiberius Gracchi [sic]”;¹² Caterina normally included “Cornelii” among her names to signify this supposed link to the *gens Cornelia*. An extra resonance was added by the fact that Caterina had Hellenic as well as supposedly Roman ancestry: her mother Fiorenza was the granddaughter of the Emperor of Trebizond and the daughter of the Duke of Naxos, and the Cornaro family’s long history of trade had habituated them to the Hellenic world. From James’s perspective the logic of the marriage was simple: he had no fleet, and Venice could give him one.¹³ He was marrying ships, and Caterina was marrying the grain, sugar, salt, and textiles which were vital to the trade interests of her family and city (Cyprus lawn in particular being a commodity that was highly valued, and one with which Caterina was to become associated).

The proxy marriage between Caterina and James took place in the Doge’s palace and for the occasion, Caterina was officially adopted as a Daughter of the Republic. Venice presented the adoption as something instigated by James to boost the status of his bride;¹⁴ however, it may also have been important that adoption had a Roman precedent, with a number of emperors having adopted their heirs, given that Caterina’s family set considerable store by their supposedly classical antecedents and given too that Cyprus had also been part of the Roman Empire. Her official title was “Daughter of St. Mark—an unprecedented honour which caused the Bishop of Turin acidly to observe that he never knew that St. Mark had been married and that, even if he had, his wife must surely be a little old to have a child of fourteen.”¹⁵ The “adoption” and the grandiose title it brought proved characteristic of the way Caterina’s later image was to be constructed in terms of allegory and mythology. Of course St. Mark did not have a wife or a daughter; but then no one seriously supposed it to mean that. St. Mark needed to be evoked in connection with the marriage of Caterina because he connoted not only Venice itself but also Alexandria, where his body had lain until the ninth century, when it was said to have been removed by Venetian traders on the grounds that it would otherwise have been desecrated by hostile Muslims. Alexandria was a hugely important trade centre,¹⁶ and the vulnerable geographical position of Cyprus also meant that Egypt had become an increasingly important player in its affairs. The suggestion that the Venetians had bested Alexandria by removing an important relic from it offered the chance for valuable political and iconographical capital. For Venice, possession of the body of the saint boosted its own status and presented the city as a bastion of Christendom, implicitly contesting the rival powers of both Ottoman Turkey and Mameluke Egypt.

In 1473, five years after his wedding to Caterina, James II died, possibly poisoned, and a few months afterwards the only son whom Caterina had borne him also died. Although James had put his bastards into the line of succession, the legitimate successor was undoubtedly his half-sister Charlotte, who some thought should in fact have come ahead of him; but James had told the Egyptian Sultan (who presumably agreed) that “nature meant royal power for men, not women,”¹⁷ and Charlotte was pushed back to Kyrenia, though the fortress there was so strong that she was able to hold it for the better part of three years. According to one English writer, Cyprus did have a precedent of sorts for female rule in the shape of Charlotte’s mother, Helena Paleologa:

Helena the wife of John, king of Cyprus, who perceiving that hir husbands weakenesse was a blot whereon the greatest part of his nobility continually plained, and that the Kingdome was the stake at which they aimed, & which unles hir better skil prevented, they by their false play were like to winne; shee tooke the gouvernement into hir owne hands, to the release of the Land, and the reliefe of all his subiects.¹⁸

Pope Pius II agreed that Helena Paleologa “acted more as king than queen,” and Holly Hurlburt notes that the island had also had female regents in the past.¹⁹ As William Monter notes, several of the Cypriot barons were prepared to see Charlotte crowned,²⁰ and she also received support from the Knights of St. John, who had forty-one estates on Cyprus,²¹ and who after the fall of Acre had spent nearly twenty years in Limassol before moving to Rhodes.²² Charlotte was not, however, acceptable to the Venetians, and Caterina was installed instead, reigning at least nominally in her own right for fifteen years until 1489, when she was effectively forced to abdicate in favour of the Venetian Republic and retire into private life.

Why were first James and then Caterina able to see off the challenge of Charlotte, when Charlotte had on her side the advantages of being legitimate, a Lusignan, and someone who had been known since birth to the Cypriot aristocracy? On one level, the answer is both obvious and simple: Caterina, the Daughter of St. Mark, had the power of Venice behind her and prepared to back her to the hilt, whereas Charlotte’s allies the Knights Hospitaller were prepared to put themselves out for her only in direct proportion to her ability to deliver the sugar concession. The Knights might publicly align themselves with Charlotte’s cause, but privately they were prepared to do business with whoever won: Nicholas Coureas notes that although they pleaded with the Sultan on Charlotte’s behalf and supplied reinforcements for her garrison in Kyrenia, “the Hospitaller desire for an accommodation with James is illustrated by a letter Jacques de Milly sent on 11 October 1460 to Niccolò de Corogna, the commander of Treviso, and to Jean de Chailly, commander of Auxerre, instructing them to go to Cyprus and and have

Louis of Savoy [Charlotte's husband] escorted away from Cyprus should he wish, but also to secure his assent for a temporary accommodation with Jacques so that their goods and incomes from Kolossi, under the care of Brother William de Combort, would be secure."²³ The Knights' support was conditional on the protection of their sugar trade, administered from their base at Kolossi Castle, and Charlotte ultimately failed to meet the condition.

There is more to it than that, however. Although her own city of Venice grew to distrust her, Caterina seems to have had a hold over the imaginations of the Cypriot citizens, who supported her when some of her late husband's disaffected followers mounted a *coup* in the autumn of 1473. Her appeal may owe something to practical measures such as the shipments of wheat which she sent from Famagusta to Nicosia, or to the fact that she was careful not to outrage Cypriot sensibilities: Gilles Grivaud notes that "Boustronios présente surtout Catherine Cornaro comme une souveraine consciente de l'héritage institutionnel propre à la monarchie des Lusignan" ("Above all [the Cypriot chronicler] Boustronios presents Catherine Cornaro as a sovereign aware of the institutional heritage of the Lusignan monarchy").²⁴ However, there was also surely an element of simple glamour, as Caterina herself registered when she complained to the Venetian envoy Mocenigo about the fact that the restrictions he had placed on her personal freedom made her unable to show herself to her subjects. Almost the first thing we hear about Caterina is that she was beautiful, and though the one undoubtedly authentic portrait (the Bellini, which was painted ca. 1500) shows her when she was older and does little or nothing to capture that legendary beauty, we shall see later that even in it Caterina is deploying her clothes and jewels to very deliberate effect. In a sense, it does not even matter that this is the only portrait of her whose status and authenticity is uncontested: the other paintings which may represent her may not be so securely identified, but the fact that they have gravitated into her orbit is in itself testimony to her cultural appeal.

That cultural appeal was to a considerable extent a function of Caterina's gender. James II may have seemed to have a point, in fifteenth-century terms, when he told the Sultan that "nature meant royal power for men, not women," but Art found women a much more fertile ground for mythological inscription. Caterina's body may have limited her potential for wielding political power, but it vastly increased her potential for mythopoeic power. This was something which Elizabeth I would also discover in the century which followed, but in a rather different way. In Elizabeth's case, some of her most successful uses of iconography worked by inverting the widespread cultural trope which figured women as land to be colonised; she countered this in images such as the Ditchley Portrait, in which she dominated the land rather than vice versa. However, although Elizabeth used marine imagery, she never went to sea; the

closest she came was the legendary speech at Tilbury Docks. Caterina, by contrast, inhabited a watery world. Her youth was spent in Venice, a city configured by its lagoon and canals, and for the duration of her reign she lived in Cyprus, important above all for its island status and its crucial place on sea routes. In travelling between the two, moreover, she made two long sea journeys. This was of course a practical inevitability, but it also had symbolic and iconographical consequences. On both her arrival in Cyprus and her eventual return to Venice she came from the sea, as Venus did, and on both occasions she emitted an almost tangible aura of sexual potential.

Caterina came to Cyprus as a bride, the intended wife of a young king who had conspicuously advertised his virility by already fathering at least four bastards. What one might loosely term the propaganda associated with the marriage repeatedly stressed her beauty and desirability: Bartolomeo Pagello wrote a poem for Caterina's proxy wedding which evokes Venus, goddess of love and beauty, and the obvious intention of the alliance was that she should also prove fertile. The fact that she only ever produced one child and that that child died in infancy perhaps blinds us to the importance of her role as prospective breeder, and although once she was widowed Venice ultimately recalled her, it does not follow that it was always the plan to unseat the Lusignan dynasty and simply annex the island. It is perhaps not beyond the bounds of possibility that James II's death was hastened once Caterina was pregnant, though that would have been a risk, since her child might have been a girl or stillborn; however, it is equally possible (and arguably more probable) that he simply died of natural causes, as Caterina herself always believed. It is even less likely that the death of the small James III was attributable to anything other than natural causes: small children died at a distressingly high rate, and he seems to have contracted malaria. There is no reason to suppose that a Venetian agent poisoned him, and nothing obvious for Venice to gain by doing so. The Republic's intention was surely that Caterina would produce at least one child (she came from a large family, which might have been thought to bode well for her own fertility) and that that child would be allowed to live. This was the promise inherent in her arrival in Cyprus, and it made her a walking emblem of sexuality and fertility. Moreover, one of her favourite political tactics was matchmaking; she proposed marrying James's bastards Janus and Charla to her brother and sister respectively,²⁵ strengthening her association with fertility and matrimony.

Venice however was well aware of the danger of a potential remarriage, and treated Caterina from the start as a threat as much as an opportunity. John Julius Norwich notes that after the death of James II, Pietro Mocenigo, Venice's *capitano da mar*, was dispatched to Cyprus; he was "instructed to act through the Queen as far as possible, but was specifically empowered to use force if

necessary.”²⁶ Mocenigo did initially try to preserve the fiction that Caterina was ruling independently, but it came to an abrupt end on 13 November 1473 when a group of Cypriots led by the Archbishop of Nicosia invaded the palace at Famagusta, killed Caterina’s uncle Andrea Cornaro and her cousin Marco Bembo, and forced her to agree to betrothing James’s bastard daughter Charla to the bastard son of Alfonso of Naples (who was himself shortly to be mooted as a suitor for Caterina). Venice sent first Mocenigo, the *capitano da mar*, and next two Councillors to restore order, making Caterina a puppet; Norwich observes that “At one period she and her father had to complain that her protectors had become more like jailers; she was forbidden to leave the palace, her servants were withdrawn and she was even compelled to take her meals alone, at a little wooden table.”²⁷ By 1475 Caterina was appealing to Mocenigo, now Doge, that her situation had become intolerable and that she herself was invisible,²⁸ while her father acidly observed that of his five daughters, the one who was nominally a queen was treated much the worst.

Eventually, Caterina gave up the struggle. Her brother Zorzi was sent to Cyprus nominally in order to persuade her to resign the rights to the republic, but in practice to compel her to do so, since it was abundantly clear that she had no choice. Hurlburt attributes Venice’s decision to depose her to two things: the threat of the Turks and the fear that she might remarry.²⁹ They might also have been alarmed at the possibility that the Cornaro family in general, even if not Caterina herself, could try to exercise independent power in Cyprus. Her father Marco at one point proposed sending a hundred elite Venetian families to settle on Cyprus;³⁰ those families might have stayed loyal to the Serenissima, or they might have drifted away from it. In any case, Venice preferred to found its colonies on its own terms. Benjamin Arbel notes that there were from the outset signs that Venice clearly considered Cyprus “as a subject territory while Queen Caterina Cornaro was still occupying the royal throne,” but that those signs strengthened significantly in later years: “towards the end of the protectorate, official Venetian deliberations were less cautious in using colonial terms when referring to Cyprus.”³¹

Caterina sailed from Famagusta on 1 March 1489. Surrender of her crown to Venice brought her political safety and iconographical rehabilitation: as Terence Mullaly has it, “When Caterina again set foot in her native Venice she stepped out of history and into immortality.”³² Her nephew Marco, still only eighteen, became a cardinal; her brother Zorzi, who took to quartering the Lusignan arms with his own, found his fortune made. Hurlburt observes that “Corner’s surrender earned her a place in the pantheon of masculine heroism in history, memory, and on the Maggior Consiglio ceiling.”³³ In place of Cyprus, the Venetian government supplied Caterina with the small fiefdom of Asolo,

where she built a palace named the *Barco*. Insofar as this was a cage, it was an exceptionally gilded one: John Julius Norwich observes that when the Emperor Maximilian invaded Italy he made Asolo his headquarters,³⁴ and accommodation that was fit for an emperor was presumably good enough for a queen. Her visitors there included Dürer, who seems to have sketched her, and other artists,³⁵ a reminder that even after her deposition her image continued to be important (and was to remain so for a considerable time to come).

Caterina's previous association with fertility might seem no longer to obtain on her return to Venice. However, Caterina was still a young woman, and she could still have remarried. Again, that she did not ultimately do so may blind us to the fact that she could have, at almost any time after the death of James II. Venice consistently feared this, and it was presumably one reason why the Councillors sent by the Republic to impose order after the failed *coup d'état* by Cypriot nobles kept her from the public view: having initially (and so recently) marketed her as a paragon of beauty, they now became anxious that that beauty should not be seen, since Venice now valued her not for her potential in the marriage market but as their bridge to the island of Cyprus, of which she had in effect become a personification. Throughout the period of her nominal rule any suggestion of a possible remarriage for her was greeted with alarm and indignation by the Republic, as had happened in the case of other female heiresses to Mediterranean islands such as Caterina's ancestress Fiorenza Sanudo. Certainly one of their motivations in ultimately recalling her was to close down that possibility, and it is not surprising that the iconography associated with the queen underwent a dramatic shift after her return to Venice and in particular after her move to the quiet town of Asolo, where she was allowed luxury in exchange for a retreat into ethereality and into the rarefied and hence unthreatening values of platonic love and courtly admiration.

In her retreat at Asolo the chapel of her palace, the *Barco*, was dedicated to Catherine of Alexandria,³⁶ but in other respects it was time for a change of iconographical emphasis. Hurlburt notes that

according to some interpretations, her chosen lifestyle and sacrifice allowed her to recapture virginal status. In his 1489 oration, Taddeo Bovolini proclaimed,

you, most illustrious queen, such an inexperienced young woman, in the midst of the realm of Venus, surrounded by so many royal delights, fragile from your feminine sex . . . should be praised all the more for your continence, that you remained as if a virgin . . . fleeing the marriage knot in order to make an offering of your chastity to God.³⁷

When she made a ceremonial entrance into Brescia with her brother the iconography focused on Diana, goddess of chastity, rather than Venus, goddess of love, and her chariot was drawn by white horses equipped with horns to make

them look like unicorns, creatures which according to legend could be tamed only by virgins;³⁸ later the poet Giambattista Liliani, writing towards the end of Caterina's life, compared her to Dido.³⁹ The idea of an African queen was not inappropriate given Caterina's supposed descent from Scipio Africanus, but it also chimed with the idea of widowhood. Dido was not a wholly safe example—she had after all fallen in love with Aeneas—but at least she had committed suicide rather than actually marrying him and founding an alternative dynasty. In some ways, indeed, Dido is the ideal analogue for Caterina: a queen who might have been a threat, but ultimately was neutralised. Dido was, moreover, a queen whose kingdom no longer existed, and by recalling Caterina from Cyprus Venice had effectively ensured that the island, once famously the seat of nine kingdoms, would no longer be one at all.

Charlotte by contrast wielded none of this soft power. Charlotte was not a self-publicist, and seems not to have understood how and why she might become so; there are no known portraits of her mother Helena Paleologa,⁴⁰ suggesting that the family lacked an iconographical tradition (at least in respect of its female members), and Charlotte never learned the power of the image. She too was said to be beautiful, but the only known portraits of her are both *freschi* and hence accessible only to a limited audience. There is a particularly sharp difference between the two women when it comes to coinage.⁴¹ Gilles Grivaud notes that Alice of Jerusalem-Champagne, who in the thirteenth century was regent for her son Henry I, had her image on Cypriot coins; Caterina followed this precedent, and had her own image on her coinage. Charlotte by contrast issued coins but does not appear on them; instead they show the Lusignan arms. After her marriage to Louis of Savoy, her coinage bore his image.⁴² As a result of decisions like these, Charlotte never attained the cultural cachet or mythopoeic power of Caterina. Caterina became a figure of myth and legend; Charlotte never captured the imagination in the same way. Charlotte focused on two things in her pursuit of the crown: right, both in terms of her own legitimate descent and also in the sense that she tried to present the Christian status of Cyprus as contingent on her accession; and trade, in particular the strong investment of the Knights Hospitaller in sugar. These were insufficient either separately or together. Nobody was interested in right (Venice certainly was not), and Charlotte lacked the resources to be able to exploit the potential of the sugar trade with any real degree of effectiveness. At a basic level, it was simply much harder for Charlotte to exert real control over the material resources of Cyprus than it was for Caterina to treat it as an empire of the imagination and to finesse the material into the symbolic. It is also worth thinking for a moment about what Caterina did *not* do: she did not take a lover, unlike that other claimant to the title of Queen of Jerusalem, Juana II of Naples, who had been notorious earlier in the century. Nor did she remarry.

When Charlotte was left heir to the throne, the Cypriot barons' first move had been to find her a new husband, since her first, John of Portugal, had died after only a year of marriage; the choice fell on Louis, a younger son of the Duke of Savoy, whose mother, Anne of Lusignan, was Charlotte's aunt. Caterina by contrast fought it out on her own terms as a woman with some iconographical assistance from a goddess and a female saint, and did even attempt to exercise power independently for a while.

Caterina, in marked contrast with Charlotte, was the subject of a number of important portraits, even though it is not always now possible to be confident about which ones are intended to represent her. (The Uffizi's *Portrait of Caterina Cornaro*, for instance, may not only be either by Titian or by Giorgione, but it may not be of Caterina.) She used her portraits to boost her status. Liana De Girolami Cheney comments on the importance of copper colour in her iconography, specifically in the putative Titian painting which may show Caterina as St. Catherine, signifying the mineral wealth of Cyprus as well as the etymology of its name.⁴³ Copper mining was so central to the economy and history of Cyprus that it had even given the island its name, which derives from the Greek word for copper; when Venus was referred to in classical literature as Cypris both Cyprus and copper lurked behind the title. To connect Caterina to copper not only identified her with the island but also created powerful allegorical overtones, presenting her as doubly an incarnation of the goddess Venus's title of Cupris, as she becomes both personification of Cyprus and icon of beauty. She also wears lawn. Cyprus lawn was famous for its quality, so it is not surprising that Caterina (if this is indeed a portrait of her) should be wearing it, but it would also further cement the identification with the island and by implication with Venus. Holly Hurlburt notes too that "Pearls were a commodity characteristic of Caterina's Cyprus," and that she is shown wearing a large quantity.⁴⁴

This splendour of royal, divine, and hagiological iconography sat uneasily, though, alongside the brutal realities of how circumscribed Caterina's position actually was and how few her options. A later but equally important (and undoubted) painting of Caterina by Bellini worked in a rather different way from the Uffizi image: De Girolami Cheney notes that "When the Metropolitan Museum restored the painting in 2011, it found an inscription on the back of Bellini's *Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus*, stating, 'The senate of Venice calles me daughter. Cyprus, seat of nine kingdoms, is subject to me. You see how important I am, yet greater still is the hand of Gentile Bellini, which has captured my image on such a small panel.'"⁴⁵ Caterina matters, but she matters less than either Venice, which sponsors her, or Bellini, whose art is valorised above her image. Moreover Caterina's image was also a potential liability to her. Hurlburt observes that "Venice's ethos of individual humility cautioned against lavish

personal expenditure, and . . . the city fathers were especially sensitive to female expenditures, blaming them for the republic's economic woes and misfortunes"; "because Caterina Corner's alleged lavish lifestyle reflected no glory onto a husband, and only simply onto her civic adopted parent, in the eyes of Venice it fulfilled no public function, and was categorized as female vanity."⁴⁶ Caterina repeatedly pleaded poverty and was just as repeatedly accused by Venice of extravagance,⁴⁷ and it is certainly true that she did indeed earn some money from the tax on salt. The real point, however, was that as *feme sole*, Caterina was valuable as a potential asset, but also dangerous, particularly if she remarried. It was the same dilemma that Elizabeth I would face in the next century, and like Elizabeth, Caterina was also vulnerable to sexual slander: in the seventeenth century she was referred to by an Italian writer as "extremely inclined to the burning appetites of the flesh,"⁴⁸ and it perhaps did not help that the Lusignan family into which she had married was popularly supposed to descend from the mermaid Melusine, mermaids being notorious as symbols of sexual looseness.

In effect, Caterina and Charlotte represented not only competing dynastic claims but also competing ideological positions and contrasting understandings of trade and colonisation. Charlotte encapsulated a practical, pragmatic attitude which sought to do business with the Knights of St. John over the material resources Cyprus had to offer. Caterina by contrast projected an evocative, romanticised image which disdained the coarse realities of trade and could be used to mystify Venice's acquisition of Cyprus in terms of myth, allegory, and manifest destiny. In the short term, neither won, but in the longer term, while Charlotte has been virtually forgotten, Caterina has remained a legend in both Venice and Cyprus.

Caterina can also be seen as providing a template for Cleopatra, who makes similar use of images and instinctively understands the power and mystique of queenship. By giving Cyprus to Cleopatra, Antony not only added to her territorial holdings but also extended the range of her iconographical repertoire. The play openly associates Cleopatra with two goddesses. First, Antony calls her "my Thetis" (3.7.60), which nods to the fact that though famous for being a queen of Egypt, Cleopatra was ethnically and originally Greek, being descended from one of Alexander the Great's generals. This was well understood in the early modern period: William Alexander's *The Alexandraean Tragedie* contains several references to Philip's mistress Cleopatra and their daughter Cleopatra, and in Chapman's *Homer* we hear of Meleager's wife Cleopatra. The name continued to be used in the Cypriot royal family: Charlotte, the last legitimate member of the Lusignan dynasty, had a sister who died young called Cleopatra. Secondly, Cleopatra is connected to the Egyptian goddess Isis when Caesar says,

She
 In th'habiliments of the goddess Isis
 That day appeared, and oft before gave audience,
 As 'tis reported, so.

(3.6.16–19)

Cleopatra is also linked to Isis by two further connections. The first is to the moon. Plutarch observed, in Philemon Holland's translation, that "there be some who openly maintaine that Osiris is the Sunne . . . as also that Isis is nothing else but the Moone,"⁴⁹ and Cleopatra invokes the moon, albeit only to disclaim it, when she declares, "Now from head to foot / I am marble-constant; now the fleeting moon / No planet is of mine" (5.2.239–41). The second is to swallows, since Plutarch tells of how Isis turns into a swallow,⁵⁰ and Scarus notes as a bad omen that "Swallows have built / In Cleopatra's sails their nests" (4.12.4–5).⁵¹ Cyprus adds a further layer of association by implicitly connecting Cleopatra to the goddess Venus, who is also mentioned elsewhere in the play when Alexas alludes to "What Venus did with Mars" (1.5.18).

Despite these allusions to goddesses, however, the Egypt of *Antony and Cleopatra* is unexpectedly and improbably Christianised. So colossal are the title figures in *Antony and Cleopatra*, and so chillingly realised the characterisation and career trajectory of Caesar, who destroys them, that it may be difficult for audiences and readers to notice that there are other people in the play too. It is, however, a play almost as full of bit parts as it is of bit scenes, and perhaps one of the most surprising of them is a character ordinarily encountered in a very different context, Herod of Jewry. Early in the play, Charmian beseeches the soothsayer, "Good now, some excellent fortune! Let me be married to three kings in a forenoon and widow them all. Let me have a child at fifty, to whom Herod of Jewry may do homage" (1.2.27–30). While it has often been suggested that Shakespeare's later play *Cymbeline* is configured by a sense of the imminent arrival of Christ, it is less remarked that *Antony and Cleopatra* shows equal signs of such an awareness.⁵² There is, however, a host of suggestive allusions. There are constant references to trinities and triples. There are the potentially eschatological overtones of Antony's caution that Cleopatra will have to "find out new heaven, new earth" (1.1.17). Pompey's comment that "Caesar gets money where / He loses hearts" (2.1.13–14) chimes eerily with Jesus's recommendation to pay one's taxes because one should give unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's (in fact the whole play can in one sense be seen as being about giving Caesar what is Caesar's). Antony says that "Three kings I had newly feasted" (2.2.80), potentially glancing at the Magi, and Cleopatra pretends the fish she catches are Antony as if she were one of the fishers of men (2.5.10–15). There is also the suggestion that Cleopatra might be stricken by

leprosy (3.10.9–11), the fate which befell the Pharaoh of the Bible. There is an obvious parallel between Enobarbus and Judas—both master-leavers who subsequently regret it and commit suicide—and a less strongly marked but equally suggestive one between the last feast on the night of Cleopatra's birthday and the Last Supper. Antony apparently recollects the Psalms when he speaks of the hill of Basan (3.13.126–28), and Caesar's assurance that "The time of universal peace is near" (4.6.5–7) also gestures in the same direction.⁵³ Moreover, Arthur Little considers Caesar to be represented as Christ-like and Cleopatra to be both like and unlike Mary—"nurturing her asp, she scripts herself as the *Madonna lactans*."⁵⁴

At the same time, though, we cannot help but be struck by the similarity of the image of Isis and Horus to that of the Madonna and Child, as if religions were linked and syncretic rather than fundamentally different, and as if this unexpected Christian identity were merely a seamless part of a bigger and more complex truth about Egypt. This is perhaps not surprising, for the author in whom Shakespeare is most likely to have encountered details of Egyptian religion is Plutarch, and for Plutarch, Egyptian religion always already stands in for something else. Although he rejects euhemeristic interpretations and considers Isis and Osiris to be genuine daimons,⁵⁵ he understands their worship as in essence a form of metaphor, and consistently reads them in terms of broader and more general categories: he says that the Egyptians "[mean] by Osiris the river Nilus and all other power of moisture whatsoever," refers to "the image of Minerva which they take to be Isis," and declares that "it should seeme, that Anubis among the Aegyptians hath the like power as Proserpina among the Greeks, being both terrestriall and coelestiall."⁵⁶ Philemon Holland as translator goes one step further when he also implicitly associates the Egyptian deities with Christianity: his dedication to King James, who is termed "Defender of the Faith," declares that "This Philosophie of PLUTARCH: which being first naturally bred in Greece; then, transplanted in Italie, France and other regions of the continent; after sundry Nativities, if I may so speake, reserved (not without some divine providence) unto these daies, is now in this our Iland newly come to light." It is as if the same essential story had merely taken on different protective colorations at various periods of history, and our sense of this underlying continuity is increased by the way that the play mirrors both Elizabeth I and James I. Elizabeth, who had been described by a Jesuit writer as "the English Cleopatra" (with Raleigh, on this occasion, envisioned as her Antony),⁵⁷ cross-questioned the Scottish ambassador Melville over the appearance of Mary, Queen of Scots much as Cleopatra interrogates the messenger about Octavia (2.5.111–18),⁵⁸ and both Cleopatra and Elizabeth express a self-identification with a milkmaid: "No more but e'en a woman, and commanded / By such poor passion as the maid that milks" (4.15.72–73);⁵⁹ James meanwhile repeatedly figured himself as Augustus.

This sense that the ostensible content of *Antony and Cleopatra* could refer to more than one belief system or time period is further increased by the play's insistence that Egypt is the land of the Nile. Charmian refers to "the o'erflowing Nilus" (1.2.49) and Antony swears "By the fire / That quickens Nilus' slime" (1.3.68–69) and later tells Lepidus,

Thus do they, sir: they take the flow o'th' Nile
By certain scales i'th' pyramid. They know
By th' height, the lowness, or the mean if dearth
Or foison follow. The higher Nilus swells,
The more it promises; as it ebbs, the seedsman
Upon the slime and ooze scatters his grain,
And shortly comes to harvest.

(2.7.17–23)

The Nile speaks loudly of fluidity and change. In his book *Mapping Paradise: A History of Heaven on Earth*, Alessandro Scafi notes that the Nile was traditionally seen as dividing Asia from Africa as the Don divided it from Europe.⁶⁰ In one sense, *Antony and Cleopatra* appears to subscribe to this idea of a binary divide in the obvious opposition between Rome and Egypt. Predictably, though, it also complicates it. Caesar speaks of "the three-nooked world" (4.6.6) and Antony makes it a fourfold one when he refers to himself as "I, that with my sword / Quartered the world, and o'er green Neptune's back / With ships made cities" (4.14.57–59). In fact the world of *Antony and Cleopatra* is one whose geography is radically in flux, being several times rewritten during the course of the play with startling casualness. Cleopatra imagines Caesar saying to Antony "Do this, or this; / Take in that kingdom, and enfranchise that" (1.1.22–23); a Messenger reports that

Labienus—

This is stiff news—hath with his Parthian force
Extended Asia; from Euphrates
His conquering banner shook, from Syria
To Lydia and to Ionia.

(1.2.100–104)

Labienus has not just had a victory in Asia; he has apparently *extended* it, as if he had transformed not just the political situation but the very geography of the region, so that it now encompasses Lydia (part of modern Turkey) and Ionia (part of Anatolia). Later Pompey notes to the triumvirate that "You have made me offer / Of Sicily, Sardinia" (2.6.34–35) and Caesar says of Antony

His sons he there proclaimed the kings of kings;
 Great Media, Parthia, and Armenia
 He gave to Alexander; to Ptolemy he assigned
 Syria, Cilicia, and Phoenicia.

(3.6.13–16)

It is no wonder that Cleopatra's final view of Antony is that "realms and islands were / As plates dropped from his pocket" (5.2.91–92); the known world has in effect become a giant battlefield in which anyone might conquer anywhere and in which lands and titles might be moved at the stroke of a pen.

One of the reasons that geographical boundaries are so unstable in this play is that they are repeatedly imagined as inferior to personal ones. Antony declares,

Let Rome in Tiber melt, and the wide arch
 Of the ranged empire fall! Here is my space.
 Kingdoms are clay.

(1.1.33–36)

Rome and its river may represent imperial power, but they exist only in the material world; the space which Antony claims is somewhere else, transcending physical space and time, bringing him before the audience in Shakespeare's London in undimmed glory and splendour when Rome's arches have indeed long since fallen. In similar vein, Menas says to Pompey,

Thou art, if thou dar'st be, the earthly Jove;
 Whate'er the ocean pales, or sky inclips,
 Is thine, if thou wilt ha't.

(2.7.67–69)

Pompey here is figured as bigger than the earth itself, able to stretch out his hand and take whatever he wants. Indeed in some sense there is a continuity between people and places. A Messenger reports,

Caesar, I bring thee word
 Menecrates and Menas, famous pirates,
 Makes the sea serve them, which they ear and wound
 With keels of every kind. Many hot inroads
 They make in Italy. The borders maritime
 Lack blood to think on't, and flush youth revolt.

(1.4.47–52)

This passage starts conventionally enough, with the account of the activities of two pirates, but it develops in a rather unusual direction as the "borders maritime"

are figured as bloodless, as if the land itself were human. Most striking is the early exchange between the lovers:

Cleopatra. I'll set a bourn how far to be beloved.

Antony. Then must thou needs find out new heaven, new earth.

(1.1.16–17)

Cleopatra's "bourn" evokes the idea of a boundary, but it is one which applies not only to Antony himself (measuring how far he is allowed to love her) but also to the cosmos as a whole, implying the creation of whole new worlds. Similarly Enobarbus says of Cleopatra "We cannot call her winds and waters sighs and tears; they are greater storms and tempests than almanacs can report" (1.2.148–50) and Cleopatra herself says "From my cold heart like heaven engender hail" (3.13.159), as if she were able to control the weather.

Egypt, then, is a place of temporal and geographical ambiguity, of potential overlap between temporal and spiritual, and of great human potential, and one aspect of that richness and plurality is the extent to which it is presented as inherently able to trouble the boundary between humans and animals. Antony exclaims, "O that I were / Upon the hill of Basan to outroar / The hornèd herd" (3.13.126–28), and Cleopatra says of him, "the boar of Thessaly / Was never so embossed" (4.13.2–3); first he is a bull and then he is a boar, and finally he himself says,

That which is now a horse, even with a thought

The rack dislimns, and makes it indistinct

As water is in water.

(4.14.9–11)

The boundary between humans and deities is also rendered unstable. Cleopatra says of Caesar "He is a god, and knows / What is most right" (3.13.60–61) and Antony says of Scarus

He hath fought today

As if a god in hate of mankind had

Destroyed in such a shape.

(4.8.24–26)

Most suggestively, both sorts of distinctions are riddled in the discussion of the crocodile. On the face of it, this is simply absurd:

Lepidus. What manner o'thing is your crocodile?

Antony. It is shaped, sir, like itself, and it is as broad as it has breadth. It is just so high as it is, and moves with its own organs. It lives by that which nourisheth it, and the elements once out of it, it transmigrates.

Lepidus. What colour is it of?

Antony. Of its own colour too.

Lepidus. 'Tis a strange serpent.

Antony. 'Tis so; and the tears of it are wet.

Caesar. Will this description satisfy him?

(2.7.41–50)

It is however instructive to compare this with Plutarch's account of the crocodile, not least since that is prefaced by mention of the asp, the other distinctively Egyptian creature mentioned by Shakespeare in *Antony and Cleopatra*:

The Aspis also they compare to the planet of the Sunne, because he doth never age and wax old, but mooveth in all facility, readinesse and celerity without the meanes of any instruments of motion. Neither is the crocodile set so much by among them, without some probable cause: For they say that in some respect he is the very image representing god: as being the onely creature in the world which hath no tongue: for as much as divine speech needeth neither voice nor tongue.⁶¹

For Plutarch, the asp and the crocodile are both to be understood in fundamentally philosophical terms, the asp as a sign or symbol of the sun and the crocodile as the image of God. In that sense, Caesar's question "Will this description satisfy him?" entirely misses the point, for God is not susceptible of description.

It is however the essence of Caesar that he always does miss the point, for his is an essentially mundane and goal-oriented mind which understands a battle as merely a thing to be lost or won and Egypt merely as the doomed and anachronistic survival of a past which it is his job to consign to history so that the whole world may come under his universal shroud. Antony and Cleopatra, though, are different. To everything they do and say iconographical and symbolic resonances accrue, as they reach out of mere history to take on the status of legends, and if the crocodile is like God then so too is Cleopatra, for the two great setpiece descriptions of the play parallel each other: the crocodile can be described only on its own terms, and though the barge that Cleopatra sat in can be minutely described, she herself beggars all description. Antony and Cleopatra are thus not only historical but exemplary and mythical, presaging and pointing the way to many different possible identities for Egypt, and in so doing, they suggest that Egypt is a place with the potential to be many different things, in which identities are always fluid and blurred. It is a place where Asia melts into the Roman empire and where Europe is connected to Africa, but it also has historic links with Cyprus and is ruled by a descendant of Alexander the Great; it is

pagan, yet it also has strong associations with Christianity. Ultimately it is so profoundly liminal that it can, like the crocodile, be understood only as somewhere that finally defines categorisation. In presenting Egypt as unanchored and undefined, Shakespeare presents it as both outside Christendom and also as being on the edge of Christendom, a place where Christianity itself bleeds and blurs into its own opposite, and by connecting it to Cyprus he stresses both the precarity and the cultural pull of the edge of the Hellenic world.

Notes

- 1 Efterpi Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing, 1596–1682* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 127.
- 2 William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, edited by Emrys Jones (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), 3.6.9–11.
- 3 William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by E. A. J. Honigmann (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997), 3.3.452–53, 3.4.75–76, and 4.1.224–25.
- 4 William Lithgow, *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632), p. 186.
- 5 Mitsi, *Greece in Early English Travel Writing*, p. 54.
- 6 Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and sons, 1904), vol. 5, p. 126. I am grateful to Colm MacCrossan for pointing out the earlier edition. For English awareness of Caterina see also R. M. Christofides, *Othello's Secret: The Cyprus Problem* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 88–9.
- 7 Holly Hurlburt, “Body of Empire: Caterina Corner in Venetian History and Iconography,” *Early Modern Women* 4 (2009): 61–99, p. 73.
- 8 Hurlburt, “Body of Empire,” pp. 83 and 87.
- 9 James Howell, *Epistolæ Ho-Eliañæ: The Familiar Letters of James Howell* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin 1907), p. 69 (Available online via archive.org).
- 10 Richard Knolles, *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603), pp. 867–68.
- 11 Liana De Girolami Cheney, “Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus,” in *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship*, edited by Debra Barrett-Graves (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 11–34, p. 10.
- 12 Hurlburt, “Body of Empire,” p. 77.
- 13 William Monter, *The Rise of Female Kings in Europe, 1300–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), p. 81.
- 14 Holly Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice: Caterina Corner, Queen of Cyprus and Woman of the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 37.
- 15 John Julius Norwich, *The Middle Sea: A History of the Mediterranean* (London: Vintage, 2007), p. 251.
- 16 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 112.
- 17 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 22.
- 18 D. T., *Asylum veneris, or A sanctuary for ladies* (London: Edward Griffin for Laurence L’isle, 1616), pp. 108–9.

- 19 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, pp. 19–20.
- 20 Monter, *The Rise of Female Kings in Europe*, pp. 79–80.
- 21 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 77.
- 22 Victor Mallia-Milanes, “Introduction to Hospitaller Malta,” in *Hospitaller Malta 1530–1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem*, edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes (Msida: Moreva, 1993), pp. 1–42, p. 2.
- 23 Nicholas Coureas, “Participants or Mediators? The Hospitallers and Wars Involving 15th Century Lusignan Cyprus,” *Ordines Militaires: Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders* 28 (2013): 193–203, p. 201.
- 24 Gilles Grivaud, “Un règne sans fastes—Catherine Cornaro à travers les sources produites à Chypre,” in *Caterina Cornaro: Last Queen of Cyprus and Daughter of Venice*, edited by Candida Syndikus and Sabine Rogge (Münster: Waxmann, 2013), pp. 231–53, p. 242.
- 25 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, pp. 13 and 76.
- 26 Norwich, *The Middle Sea*, p. 252.
- 27 Norwich, *The Middle Sea*, pp. 252–53.
- 28 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, pp. 84–85.
- 29 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 102.
- 30 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 88.
- 31 Benjamin Arbel, “A Fresh Look at the Venetian Protectorate of Cyprus (1475–89),” in *Caterina Cornaro: Last Queen of Cyprus and Daughter of Venice*, edited by Candida Syndikus and Sabine Rogge (Münster: Waxmann, 2013), pp. 213–29, p. 214.
- 32 Terence Mullaly, “Caterina ‘Domina’ of Asolo: Lady of the Renaissance,” in *Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus*, edited by David Hunt and Iro Hunt (London: Trigraph, 1989), pp. 147–89, p. 147.
- 33 Hurlburt, “Body of Empire,” 73.
- 34 Norwich, *The Middle Sea*, p. 257.
- 35 De Girolami Cheney, “Caterina Cornaro,” p. 19.
- 36 De Girolami Cheney, “Caterina Cornaro,” p. 21.
- 37 Hurlburt, “Body of Empire,” p. 99.
- 38 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 167.
- 39 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 145.
- 40 Grivaud, “Un règne sans fastes,” p. 234.
- 41 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 72.
- 42 Grivaud, “Un règne sans fastes,” pp. 232 and 235.
- 43 De Girolami Cheney, “Caterina Cornaro,” p. 23.
- 44 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 207.
- 45 De Girolami Cheney, “Caterina Cornaro,” p. 25. On what the nine kingdoms were, see Maria Iacovou, “Mapping the Ancient Kingdoms of Cyprus: Cartography and Classical Scholarship during the Enlightenment,” in *Eastern Mediterranean Cartographies*, edited by George Tolia and Dimitris Loupis (Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research, 2004), pp. 263–85.
- 46 Hurlburt, “Body of Empire,” pp. 72 and 73.
- 47 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 87.
- 48 Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice*, p. 48.
- 49 Plutarch, *The Philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned Philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea*, translated by Philemon Holland (London: Arnold Hatfield, 1603), p. 1308.
- 50 Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, p. 1293.

- 51 Daniel Cadman, *Sovereigns and Subjects in Early Modern Neo-Senecan Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), p. 57 notes that swallows are mentioned in Daniel's *Cleopatra* too, when Cleopatra refers to "Summer Swallowes of felicitie" (1.44).
- 52 Though for a notable exception see Gilberto Sacerdoti, "Three Kings, Herod of Jewry, and a Child: Apocalypse and Infinity of the World in *Antony and Cleopatra*," in *Italian Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Michele Marrapodi and Giorgio Melchiori (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), pp. 165–84.
- 53 For comment on the Messianic resonances of this, see for instance Steve Sohmer, *Shakespeare's Mystery Play: The Opening of the Globe Theatre, 1599* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p. 122.
- 54 Arthur Little, *Shakespeare Jungle Fever: National-Imperial Re-Visions of Race, Rape, and Sacrifice* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 157–58.
- 55 Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, p. 1296.
- 56 Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, pp. 1287, 1291, and 1305.
- 57 Robert Lacey, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (London: Macdonald, 1973), p. 54.
- 58 Little, *Shakespeare Jungle Fever*, pp. 160–61.
- 59 See Paul Yachnin, "'Courtiers of Beauteous Freedom': *Antony and Cleopatra* in Its Time," *Renaissance and Reformation* 15 (1991): 1–20, p. 7.
- 60 Alessandro Scafi, *Mapping Paradise: A History of Heaven on Earth* (London: The British Library, 2006), p. 89.
- 61 Plutarch, *The Philosophie*, p. 1316.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 9

What Venus Did with Mars: Love and War in the Mediterranean

Thomas Rymer mockingly dismissed *Othello* as “a warning to all good wives, that they look well to their linen.”¹ Despite its flippancy, we might actually do well to pay serious attention to Rymer’s *canard*, because it can help us see how consistently Othello’s and Desdemona’s imaginations pull in different directions, with his drawn to the mythopoeic—and hence seeing the handkerchief as imbued with symbolic force—while hers hovers around the practical and personal, and sees it purely as an object. This difference is emblematised by a sustained tension in the play between women’s lived experience, embodied in its three female characters, and a culturally validated urge to see the feminine in terms of the abstract and symbolic, embodied in its setting on Cyprus, the legendary home of the goddess Venus.² Greek women typically represent absolutes: Hecuba grief; Penelope chastity; Helen beauty. Few such abstractions were more potent than the association between Venus and love, and a Cyprus setting made an association with Venus unescapable. Rebecca Nesvet notes that

Ortelius contends that Cyprus’s “people . . . generally . . . giue themselues to . . . voluptuousnesse: the women are very wanton and of light behaviour.” The geographer concludes “the lasciviousness of the nation” inspired the myth of Cyprus’s patronage by “*Venus* the Goddess of loue.”³

For Ortelius, it is the behaviour of the citizens which gives rise to the association with Venus; we might conclude it more likely that early modern observers were predisposed to read the inhabitants in the light of the myth, but whichever way round one wants to see it working, the connection with Venus was fundamental to early modern understandings of Cyprus. I shall discuss how that connection is explored not only in *Othello* but also in John Ford’s *The Lover’s Melancholy* (1628), which like so much of Ford’s work builds on and responds to *Othello*. Examining the two plays’ separate but interwoven representations of Cyprus, I shall argue, helps us to understand their representations of female characters, and helps us too to see that *The Lover’s Melancholy* is not only echoing *Othello* but also commenting on it.

Othello draws repeated attention to its setting on Cyprus. The one-page guide handed out at Othello’s Tower in Famagusta says that Shakespeare “must have heard of the Venetian governor of the island, Christophoro Mo[ro] whose surname means ‘moor,’” and Othello reminds us of the setting on Venus’s island

when he speaks of “feathered Cupid.”⁴ This most materially-minded of tragedies is particularly interested in Cyprus commodities.

Desdemona says “Believe me, I had rather have lost my purse / Full of crusadoes” (3.4.25–26); Honigmann’s Arden 3 edition is surely right to suggest in its note on this passage that though these coins are Portuguese, they are mentioned here “to remind us that Christian Venice was threatened by Muslim states. A *crusado* was also a crusader.” Cyprus was also famous for its lawn, as Emilia reminds us when she says, “I would not do such a thing for a joint-ring, nor for measures of lawn, nor for gowns, petticoats, nor caps, nor any petty exhibition” (4.3.72–74); Susan Frye notes that the purse to which Iago calls such attention is also probably a textile.⁵ What is less obvious is that an even more distinctively Cypriot crop is also alluded to. “The food that to him now is as luscious as locusts” (1.3.348–49) refers not to insects, but to carob: the note in Honigmann’s Arden 3 edition cites Gerard’s *Herball* “The carob groweth in Apulia . . . that which is translated *locusts*,” and Vivian Thomas and Nicki Faircloth confirm the identification.⁶ Carob production is first recorded in Cyprus in 1480, though it undoubtedly predated that; carob syrup, “the black gold of Cyprus,” was one of the island’s most important exports until the Turkish invasion, and since the seed of the carob was often thought to be the source and original of the carats in which jewels were measured, this might also leach into the play’s various references to precious stones. Holly Hurlburt notes too that “Pearls were a commodity characteristic of Caterina’s Cyprus,” and that in her portraits Caterina Cornaro is shown wearing a large quantity;⁷ Othello compares Desdemona to a pearl (5.2.345).

All these valuable crops and products speak not just of Cyprus but of money. Othello himself does not think about money; for him what matters is the soul. Iago, though, knows that in the material world money matters, as shown by his constant injunction to Roderigo to “put money in thy purse,” and that is underlined by Desdemona’s reference to crusadoes. Officially crusades were about the saving of souls; in practice they were about acquiring various forms of material advantage, particularly land and revenues. It was in this way that the kingdom of Cyprus originally came by its king, when Richard the Lionheart rewarded his ally Guy of Lusignan, already titular king of Jerusalem, with the gift of the island, and *Othello* seems to remember not only Cyprus itself but its royal family. When Iago swears “By Janus” (1.2.33), he might remind audiences not only of a Roman god but of a Lusignan king, King Janus of Cyprus, who reigned from 1398 to 1432. There had very nearly been a direct connection between the Cypriot and Scottish royal families when Louis, grandson of King Janus, became betrothed to Annabella Stewart, youngest daughter of James I of Scotland, in a ceremony at Stirling Castle in 1444; that marriage never took place—Louis

became instead the first husband of his cousin Charlotte, the last legitimate Lusignan queen—but the betrothal, and Louis’s visit to Scotland, show that the Lusignan kings were connected to Europe. Indeed, King Janus’s many descendants included Mary, Queen of Scots, and hence also her son James, who succeeded to the throne of England in 1603, the year before *Othello* was written,⁸ and Lusignan was in any case a familiar name in English history because Isabella of Angoulême, widow of King John, had married Hugh de Lusignan as her second husband and as Holinshed notes, the favour shown by her son Henry III to his Lusignan half-siblings was one of the prompts for the Barons’ War.

Above all, women and Cyprus are linked at every level of Shakespeare’s play. One thing that distinguishes *Othello* is the remarkable degree of attention paid to the secondary female character. There are three things of considerable significance about Emilia in *Othello*. First, her name: when Shakespeare reached for a female name for a character other than a heroine, his thoughts turned most frequently to Emilia, giving the Emilia of *Othello* something of an everywoman status. Second, the extent of the revisions which Shakespeare made to her part, showing that he regarded it as important. Third, her unusually well-developed role as confidante of the heroine, which in this play takes on something of the significance it was to assume in the French classical theatre, in the plays of Racine and Corneille. The exceptional prominence thus given to the supporting female role—and to a lesser extent also found in the handling of Bianca—is I think partly attributable to the play’s setting on Cyprus. For Shakespeare’s England, Cyprus was notable for various things, and Shakespeare draws on many of those associations, in ways which bear specifically on the representation of women.

Shakespeare had a number of existing representations of Cyprus to draw on, and does seem to show signs of responding to some of them. In Dekker’s *Old Fortunatus*, part of which is set on Cyprus, there is a reference to “the great bell of S. Michaels in Cyprus, that keepest most rumbling when men would most sleepe”;⁹ this might prefigure Othello’s “Silence that dreadful bell, it frights the isle” (2.3.171). Jealousy, the main theme of *Othello*, also figures in Dekker’s play when Shadow says he is “horne-mad,” and several of the characters literally acquire horns (sig. C1v) as Othello fears he may have done. Andelocia’s remark to Shadow, “I am glad to see thee thus mad” (sig. C1v), perhaps supplies the model for Othello’s otherwise baffling “I am glad . . . to see you mad” (4.1.239) to Desdemona. Most notably, when Fortunatus’s body disappears Andelocia says “I feare hees rysen againe” (sig. E4r). This is I think the most suggestive of the ideas about Cyprus which Shakespeare might have found in Dekker, because it picks up on an important aspect of Cyprus’s cultural identity which bears directly on *Othello*: its connection with Lazarus, and hence with the idea of resurrection.

Robert Allott in *Wits theater of the little world* declares that “Lazarus, whom Christ rayseed from *death*, was the first Bishop of Cyprus,”¹⁰ and what is said to be the tomb of Lazarus is still on display in Larnaca. This is an association which would explain Andelocia’s reaching for the idea of resurrection and which also seems to inform William Barksted and Lewis Machin’s *The Insatiate Countess*, where as soon as she sees the Count of Cyprus, Isabella says of her late first husband “I may not fear his resurrection.”¹¹

The association with resurrection is particularly appropriate for *Othello* as a play in which a character returns from apparent death when the smothered Desdemona speaks again after she appears to have died. This was a device that would in due course become virtually a standard way of generating surprise and tension on the Jacobean stage, most famously in the repeated “resurrections” of Lussurioso in *The Revenger’s Tragedy* and the Duchess’s agonised gasp of “Antonio” in *The Duchess of Malfi*; however, this was Shakespeare’s first use of it, and indeed the only one where there is no doubt about what is happening, since we cannot be sure whether Lear really does see Cordelia’s lips move or exactly what happens to Thaisa or Hermione. To connect Desdemona’s resurrection with that of Lazarus, which the Cyprus setting implicitly does, throws into sharp relief the extent to which Desdemona echoes both Martha and Mary, the two sisters of Lazarus, one of whom chooses to attend to the cares of the household while the other stays to listen to the words of Jesus. Desdemona too is drawn away by household cares like Martha, but her instinct is to listen like Mary:

This to hear
Would Desdemona seriously incline,
But still the house affairs would draw her thence,
Which ever as she could with haste dispatch
She’d come again, and with a greedy ear
Devour up my discourse.

(1.3.146–51)

Desdemona is a Martha by necessity and a Mary by choice, but there is also a difference, because while Mary is commended by Jesus for listening to what he has to say, Othello’s use of the word “greedy” should alert us to how difficult it is for women ever to appear wholly virtuous. It is also worth remembering that in the English dramatic tradition it was customary to equate Mary the sister of Lazarus with Mary Magdalene, the repentant prostitute who may be holy but is also radically tainted,¹² further underlining the extent to which women are always already guilty. If to remember Cyprus is to remember Lazarus, it is also to remember the ways in which the biblical story of Lazarus figures women, and

that has consequences for the play's own figuring of women in that it draws attention to the ways in which they are inescapably inscribed within pre-existing paradigms. The association reconnects Cyprus to Christendom, but in a way which potentially troubles our sense of the worth and purpose of Christendom.

As well as the island of Lazarus, however, Cyprus was also the island of Venus, as Shakespeare certainly knew since at the close of *Venus and Adonis*, he has the goddess setting off for Paphos. *Othello* can be seen as carefully and deliberately evoking the myth of Venus, Vulcan, and Mars. King James I's epic poem *Lepanto*, which may have been an influence on *Othello*, has a number of references to Mars, and Marjorie Garber, who has observed the relevance of the myth to *Othello*, proposes that "Iago is the Vulcan figure, a tortured looker-on; Othello himself the war hero,"¹³ though it is equally possible and I think more suggestive to see the warrior Othello as Mars, the beautiful, desired Desdemona as Venus, and Cassio lamed as Venus's lover Vulcan was, since failing to align Iago with any of the figures of the myth leaves open, as Shakespeare does, the question of his motivation. Whatever the precise way in which the characters are mapped on to it, though, an allusion to the myth could only confirm the status of Cyprus as Venus's isle, and help draw attention to *Othello*'s unusual degree of interest in the role of love and relationships. In this respect too one might detect the influence of various different models and intertexts, including Lyly's *Sapho and Phao*, which Shakespeare seems to have read and which has a number of suggestive intersections with *Othello*.¹⁴ Like *Othello* with its pearl and chrysolite, *Sapho and Phao* is interested in symbolic stones, which it talks about in conjunction with the effects of jealousy: Venus tells Cupid that she has an arrow whose head is "toucht with the stone Perillus," and that shooting this "at men that haue faire wiues . . . will make them rubbe the browes" (sig. F2v). *Sapho and Phao* is also interested in the relationship between "flesh colour" and "soul colour," as when Molus concludes that because the devil is black and Calypho is black, it must be the case that Calypho is the devil (sig. C2v). Lyly's play shares too *Othello*'s close observation of the effects of drunkenness ("Grapes are minde glasses," sig. C4v) and of women's intimate conversation: one waiting-woman tells another that "It is an vn lucky signe in the chamber of the sick to talke of mariages; for my mother saide, it foresheweth death" (sig. D4r), not unlike Desdemona's discussion with Emilia of the Willow Song, which similarly couples marriage and death. Both plays also think of swans, and associate them with women: Sapho soliloquises "O Venus, haue I not strawed thine Altars with sweete roses? kepte thy swannes in cleare ryuers?" (sig. D4v) and Emilia resolves, "I will play the swan / And die in music" (5.2.245–46). There are, then, a number of signs that Shakespeare is remembering Lyly's play when writing his own, and he would therefore have been aware that it stages a contest between a mortal woman and a goddess.

Othello, though, has no goddesses, and held in tension with its emphasis on the classical is an emphasis on the domestic. *Othello* has clear affinities with the genre of domestic tragedy, and the collocation of the domestic and the classical activates a potential culture clash which has particularly disturbing consequences for women. This can be seen very clearly in *Arden of Faversham*, in many ways the archetypal domestic tragedy, where throughout the text the extent of Alice's reading, and of her involvement in what she has read, is made repeatedly apparent to us, but is by no means clear that her smattering of learning has done her any good.¹⁵ Her husband reminds her,

Sweet love, thou know'st that we two, Ovid-like,
Have chid the morning when it 'gan to peep,
And often wish'd that dark Night's purblind steeds
Would pull her by the purple mantle back
And cast her in the ocean to her love.
But this night, sweet Alice, thou hast kill'd my heart;
I heard thee call on Mosby in thy sleep.¹⁶

Arden seeks to use Ovid—inappropriately enough—to bolster the affective bonds of married love, but Alice, ironically, comes closer to the original spirit of the work when she pursues adultery instead. Later, she explicitly connects classical learning to infidelity when she resolves that

Love is a god, and marriage is but words,
And therefore Mosby's title is the best.
Tush! whether it be or no, he shall be mine,
In spite of him, of Hymen, and of rites.

(Scene One, 101–4)

What Alice shows us here is a fundamental disconnect between the permissible parameters for the lived experience of actual women and the values implicit in the classical narratives so valorised by their culture. If the connection to Mary and Martha penalises and incriminates women, so too does the connection to Greek mythology.

Implicit in that disconnect is also a disjunction between the world of real people and the world of personified abstractions such as Hymen, Night, and Love. Within Shakespeare's *oeuvre*, Desdemona can be seen as part of an ongoing series of experiments in the representation of women as carrying symbolic freight, a common strategy in an age so prone to connect femininity with the abstract; as Venus notes in *Sappho and Phao*, "trueth is a she, and so alwaies painted" (sig. E3r). In the development of Shakespeare's tragic heroines, Desdemona stands midway between Ophelia and Cordelia. Ophelia's name is a transliteration of the Greek word

for help, but the fact that she is no help to anyone in the play, not even herself, makes it impossible to read her in terms of simple symbolism. Cordelia, who famously speaks fewer than a hundred lines, is plainly more at home in the realm of the symbolic than of the realistic in any meaningful sense. Desdemona, whose name, as Othello observes, means ill-starred, is nevertheless more at home in the realm of the real, and represents the intermediate stage in this trio. What distinguishes her above all is that whereas Cordelia's relationship with France is wholly nominal and Ophelia's with Hamlet tentative and unfulfilled, Desdemona's with Othello is fully developed. Even more unusually, both Emilia's with Iago and Bianca's with Cassio are also the subject of reasonably detailed sketches. In this *Othello* comes closer to Shakespearean comedy than to its fellow tragedies, except that the tonality of all three relationships is unmistakably dark; moreover, there is also a micro-tension between the real and the symbolic within the play itself, for if Emilia's name establishes her as the Shakespearean equivalent of an everywoman, Bianca's, in the context of a play with a black hero, has a much more obviously symbolic pull. Desdemona, like Alice Arden, is thus caught between the poles of symbolic femininity and lived reality.

This liminal and precarious position is neatly emblematised in the way that the Cyprus setting implicitly collocates Desdemona with Venus, and here too there is a tension between the abstract and the actual. Marlowe and Lyly both offered Shakespeare important precedents for understanding human women in direct relation to Venus, since *Hero and Leander*, *Dido*, *Queen of Carthage*, and *Sapho and Phao* all offer such a pairing (*Galatea* too features Venus), while in *Campaspe* Apelles calls Campaspe herself "the express image of Venus, but somewhat fresher,"¹⁷ and Mike Pincombe points out that there is also an ongoing extradiegetic beauty contest between Elizabeth and Venus which is inevitably won by Elizabeth.¹⁸ Collectively, these comparisons with Venus build up a tradition of treating her as being on a continuum with mortal women rather than securely separate from them. In *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, Aeneas fails to identify Venus when they meet in person, despite the fact that she is his mother; he mistakes her for one of the local maidens. In *Hero and Leander*, we are told of Hero that

Some say, for her the fairest Cupid pined,
And looking in her face, was strooken blind.
But this is true, so like was one the other,
As he imagined Hero was his mother.¹⁹

In *Sapho and Phao*, the confusion between goddess and mortal women becomes systematic: Venus herself undercuts the idea of her own godhead when she says "Venus waxeth old: and then she was a pretie wench, when Iuno was a young

wife” (sig. E3v). Shortly afterwards, Vulcan laments when Venus cools towards him that “I can say no more, but this which is enoughe, and as much as any can say: Venus is a woman” (sig. F2r). Finally, Sapho after asking Cupid to be her son resolves, “Ah vnkinde Venus, is this thy promise to Sapho? But if I gette Cupid from thee, I my selfe will be the Queene of loue” (sigs F3v–F4r); she subsequently tells Venus to her face that “You are not worthy to be the Ladye of loue, that yeelede so often to the impressions of loue” (sig. F4v). Goddesses and women are thus made to seem virtually interchangeable.

Venus does not appear in person in *Othello*, but the play’s setting on her island serves as an emblem of how the symbolic feminine presses down on Desdemona. Desdemona consistently fails to live up to the impression Othello has of her, in ways which are most powerfully symbolised by her total lack of interest in the symbolic value of the handkerchief, which for her is simply an object, useful for wiping brows in cases of fever; she never even dreams that it might be read by her husband as a proof of her supposed adultery. Like Alice Arden, she has led, and makes no bones about it, a woman’s life; she may have been Mary and loved Othello for his stories of something better and brighter, but she has been Martha too, and there is truth in Iago’s *canard* that she and Emilia are “Players in your housewifery, and housewives in . . . / Your beds” (2.1.112–13). She has talked to her mother’s maid in the past and talks to her own attendant in the present, and the web of her daily life is not the magical or exotic but the myriad tiny filaments of women’s interconnection and sharing of each other’s stories, which are focused not on adventure but on emotion. For her, a bedroom door is a bedroom door and a bedside lamp is a bedside lamp; for Othello, a bedroom door is the threshold of heaven or hell and a bedside lamp is a symbol of the soul. Ironically, though, if Othello had used his time on the island of Venus to read Elizabethan literary treatments of Venus, he would have realised that no woman is a goddess, and every goddess is also a woman, who cannot be confined to the realm of the abstract and symbolic.

Twenty years after *Othello*, John Ford’s *The Lover’s Melancholy* revisits and recasts some of the same ideas. *The Lover’s Melancholy* is also set on Cyprus, and draws our attention to the setting early on, when Amethus says to Menaphon,

This little isle of Cyprus sure abounds
In greater wonders, both for change and fortune,
Than any you have seen abroad.²⁰

Later, Sophronos mentions the arrival of ships from Crete (2.1.67–69), and the sense of place is further underlined when Aretus refers to “These near parts / Of Syria that adjoin” (2.1.70–71): Nestore Martinengo cites Pliny as saying that

Cyprus was once joined to Syria.²¹ We are also told that Eroclea fled first to Corinth and then to Athens, which contributes to the general impression of a Mediterranean setting.

Ford clearly had a strong general awareness of Cyprus. The island is mentioned in Sir Kenelm Digby's *Private Memoirs*, and I note in the conclusion that Ford seems to have been interested in this text;²² it is named too in Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, which was clearly in Ford's mind while writing this play. It also figures in what is likely to be another Ford play, *The Laws of Candy* (another name for Crete), where the Prince of Cyprus is a prominent character who is considered rich and powerful and acts as an arbiter in the affairs of Candy.²³ Perhaps such an interest should not surprise us, for if Ford has one single, recurrent interest it is love, and Cyprus, as the home of Venus, was strongly associated with love. The introduction to the Revels edition of *The Lover's Melancholy* notes the island's association with Venus but says "Ford makes nothing specific of that association despite the play's love concerns and there is only one mention of Venus (III.ii.60)" (p. 4). However, the play is in fact slightly more interested in Venus than this: apart from the reference the editor observes, Kala says of the supposed Parthenophill, "Sweet Venus, turn his courage to a snowball, / I do beseech you" (3.2.60–61); Meleander implicitly recalls Venus's doves when he says of Eroclea, "turtles in their down do feed more gall / Than her spleen mixed with" (2.2.36–37); and Eroclea herself refers to Cupid stealing feathers from his mother's doves (3.2.156–59). Ford does in fact seem to remember that the events of his play are set on Venus's island, and this is entirely appropriate for the narrative's overwhelming focus on love.

However, *The Lover's Melancholy* specifies that the events of the play take place not just in Cyprus in general but specifically in Famagusta. What might have prompted this particularisation? Famagusta is repeatedly named in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, and Ford collaborated with Dekker, so he might have met the name there. Perhaps, too, Ford associated Famagusta with *Othello*, because it would be obvious to anyone who thought about the matter that *Othello* must be set in Famagusta, where indeed a tower now bears Othello's name. *Othello*'s location is never specified, but Othello's purpose on the island is military: the Duke informs him plainly that "we must straight employ you / Against the general enemy Ottoman" (1.3.49–50), and all authorities were agreed that in terms of defence, Famagusta was Cyprus. George Abbot declares that "The chiefe Citie thereof is *Famagusta*";²⁴ Thomas Gainsford (whose work was to be an important source for Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*) refers to the loss of Famagusta as crucial to the fate of Cyprus;²⁵ and Nestore Martinengo calls "Famagosta the cheefe holde and fortresse in Cyprus" and says its loss meant the conquest of the whole island by the Turks and the imposition of Islam.²⁶ Even in far-off

Derbyshire, Bess of Hardwick received a letter from Hugh Fitzwilliam informing her that

It is written by lettres of the xxviiijth of the last from Venece that the Turk hathe landed in Cyprus a C.ml men and moo and hathe besiged the .ij great cities within that kingdome, Nicosia, and famagosta; at one assalte at famagosta thei lost .xij.ml men.²⁷

All Ford's plays of love revisit and rewrite *Othello*. There are echoes of it as well as of *Romeo and Juliet* in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, in the shape of Soranzo's murderous jealousy, and the debt is unmistakable in two other plays, *Love's Sacrifice* and *The Lady's Trial*. *The Lover's Melancholy* is much less obviously engaged with Shakespeare's tragedy, but it does nevertheless comment on it; indeed the naming of Famagusta in itself could perhaps be seen as making explicit what in *Othello* is only implicit. It also, however, activates a strong set of associations.

The events of the siege of Famagusta were famous. Michael J. K. Walsh mentions that both George Sandys and William Lithgow visited and wrote about Famagusta,²⁸ and suggests that "the Elizabethan public may have known the name Famagusta just as surely as that of Lepanto."²⁹ There is also said to have been a re-enactment of the siege during a circumcision celebration at the Ottoman court in 1582; this is uncertain, but an account of the supposed event appeared in French in 1626 and was translated into English in 1635.³⁰ Particular notoriety attached to the appalling fate which befell the Venetian governor Marcantonio Bragadin, who was flayed alive and whose skin was subsequently stuffed with straw and sent to Constantinople. There was acute contemporary awareness of the barbarity of which Turks might be capable: in Thomas Kyd's *The tragedye of Solyman and Perseda*, Perseda, hearing that her lover Erastus has been put to death by the Turks, asks apprehensively how he died, and Piston is clearly answering an unspoken question when he hastens to reassure her, "Nay, God be praised, his death was reasonable, / He was but strangled";³¹ it is implicit that some of the deaths which might be inflicted by Turks were *not* reasonable. In one sense, then, the fate of the unfortunate Bragadin came to emblematised not just Famagusta but the clash of Christendom with the Ottoman Empire, and it was extremely well publicised. It is, for instance, described (in grisly detail) in Gascoigne's *A Devise of a Maske for the Right Honorable Viscount Montacute*, written in 1573 for a double wedding between the son and daughter of Anthony Maria Browne and a son and daughter of the Dormer family. Torture may seem an odd topic for a marriage masque, but the prologue guilelessly explains that the masquers had to have a topic in some way connected with Venice because "there were eighte gentlemen . . . which had determind to present a maske . . ., and so farre they had proceeded therin that they had already bought furniture of silks & c. and had caused their garments

to be cut of the Venetian fashion . . . then they began to imagin that (without some speciall demonstration) it would seeme somewhat obscure to haue Venetians presented rather than other countrey men";³² they therefore approached George Gascoigne, who happened to have to hand Martinengo's account of the fall of Famagusta,³³ and duly obliged by producing a masque based on it.³⁴ Gascoigne's "Device for a Masque," as William Spates observes, "employs his primary fictional character, the young Mounthermer boy, to describe the Siege of Famagusta and the Battle of Lepanto from an Anglo-Catholic perspective," and Spates suggests that "By calling attention to the Montacutes' Venetian namesakes and the Mounthermers' ancient relationship with the Montacutes, Gascoigne's narrator bridges the world between English Catholics faithful to a Protestant Monarch and their Venetian Catholic counterparts." An entertainment that seems to perform cultural work about the Mediterranean thus also performs it about England.³⁵

It may seem that, unlike Gascoigne, neither *Othello* nor *The Lover's Melancholy* is prepared to engage directly with the fall of Famagusta, which was after all a collective trauma for Christendom, and that both rewrite and efface it. In *Othello*, the Turks are dispersed by a storm, and Othello's "smote him—thus!" (5.2.354) no longer refers to the Turk whom he once slew in Aleppo but only to himself. In *The Lover's Melancholy*, too, the fact that Cyprus was occupied by the Turks after 1572 is effaced by the resolutely Greek names of all the characters. Instead, what the play announces is an interest in the mind: Ford openly acknowledges a debt to Burtonian psychology,³⁶ and the focus is on the irony that on Venus's island, the characters cannot commit to love. At the beginning of the play, everyone except Menaphon is unhappy because Eroclea is missing, but since the first thing that happens is that Eroclea reappears again, albeit in disguise, there seems no obvious reason why she should not reveal herself at once and bring matters to a conclusion almost before they have begun. The only element of the plot that would not thus be solved is Menaphon's unhappiness, and all that is needed to remove that is for Thamasta to change her mind about marrying him, which she might credibly do at any point (it is notable that when she finally does do so, there has been no external stimulus to prompt it).

The resulting effect is of a widespread distrust of love both similar to and different from what is to be found in *Othello*. Meleander warns Cleophila against trusting the protestations of her suitor Amethus:

take heed: Amethus
Was son to Doryla, Agenor's sister.
There's some ill blood about him, if the surgeon
Have not been very skilful to let all out.

(2.2.54–57)

The distrust of Amethus is however both unfounded and also ironic given the fact that his name clearly derives from *amethustos*, literally “undrunk”—that is, sober. Amethus in turn warns his friend Menaphon not to trust Thamasta when she seems to repent of her earlier brusqueness:

’Tis a trick;
There is no trust in female cunning, friend,
Let her first purge her follies past, and clear
The wrong done to her honour, by some sure
Apparent testimony of her constancy,
Or we will not believe these childish plots.

(4.1.67–71)

Again, though, Amethus is mistaken: her own unrequited love for the supposed Parthenophill has in fact awakened in Thamasta a new sensitivity to the emotions of others. What we see is thus a repeated pattern of people shying away from love when there is no reason for them to do so.

Above all there is the story of Eroclea and Palador. Palador, like Viola’s imagined sister in *Twelfth Night*, keeps his love a secret even though there is no possible structural reason or motive why he should have to do so. The parallel with Viola is not an accidental one, for in general the affiliations of *The Lover’s Melancholy* are with Illyria and its world of concealment and cross-dressing: Cuculus has a page whom he believes to be a girl and Eroclea disguises herself as a boy with the result that Thamasta becomes infatuated with her just as Olivia does with Viola; Grilla calls Cuculus “As rare an old youth as ever walked cross-gartered” (3.1.2), and the distinctive imagery of *Twelfth Night* and its twin concerns with shipwreck and death are evoked in Corax’s

Men are like politic states, or troubled seas,
Tossed up and down with several storms and tempests,
Change and variety of wracks and fortunes,
Till, labouring to the havens of our homes,
We struggle for the calm that crowns our ends.

(5.1.5–10)

However, there are also significant differences from *Twelfth Night*, one of them being that *The Lover’s Melancholy* is not a comedy but a tragicomedy, and Corax’s speech is typical of that genre in that though it does not actually show death, it certainly implies danger of death. In Corax’s imagery, humans are figured as adrift on the sea, as opposed to *Twelfth Night* where they have been saved from shipwreck before the play begins. They are still hopeful of arriving safely at their destination, but they cannot feel sure of it.

In this respect it is notable that there was one particular aspect of the history of Famagusta which I think Ford could not have ignored. On his mother's side, he was related to the important South Welsh family of Stradling, who were based at St. Donat's Castle in Glamorgan, and his great-uncle Sir Edward Stradling's *Winning of the Lordship of Glamorgan* contains a detailed account of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem undertaken in 1476 by one of the Stradling ancestors, Sir Harry, who was made Knight of the Order of the Sepulchre but during his return voyage died and was buried at Famagusta; Ford might even have seen a book apparently sent by Sir Harry to his wife which was still at the castle as late as 1726.³⁷ To understand Cyprus in general and Famagusta in particular as the penultimate stop on the pilgrimage route (as hinted at in Heywood's *Four Prentices of London*) has to an early modern English mind an effect that is in some ways analogous to acknowledging its fall to the Turks, in that it presents it as a locus of the incomplete, a place that stands in sight and memory of an ideal spiritual state, an island that is defined not only as what it is but by where it leads to. In Ford the sense of characters not quite at the end of a journey is strong, and is not found only in Corax's speech. Thamasta says to Menaphon of Cleophila,

Here fix your heart and thus resolve: if now
You miss this heaven on earth you cannot find
In any other choice ought but a hell.

(5.1.101–3)

A concomitant of the sense of being still on a journey and of arrival at an ultimate destination not being guaranteed is a sense of uncertainty about other things too. The monstrous death of Bragadin meant that Famagusta was strongly associated in the public mind with laying bare of interiors and obscene display of bodies. Ford himself is by no means averse to doing this elsewhere in his plays: in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, Giovanni cuts out the heart of his sister Annabella and brings it to a birthday banquet on the point of his dagger. One might though notice that with the exception of *Perkin Warbeck*, which is a chronicle history, the greatest plays of his maturity divide into those set in Italy (*'Tis Pity* and *Love's Sacrifice*), which are violent, and those set in Greece or Cyprus (*The Lover's Melancholy* and *The Broken Heart*), and both the two Greek plays prefer an ethos of restraint to one of display.

In *The Lover's Melancholy*, a general interest in art is manifested chiefly in a sustained metatheatrical meditation on the relation between the physical and the metaphysical. This too fits very well with the Famagusta setting, for Famagusta was not only located on the pilgrimage route but was regarded as a masterpiece of human endeavour for the strength of its defences, which were

considered a triumph of the art of fortification: Ralph Carr of the Middle Temple (where Ford himself was located for at least part of his adult life) calls Famagusta “both by Nature and Art strongly fortified.”³⁸ Art lies at the centre of the play Ford sets there. In Menaphon’s set-piece description of the musical contest between Parthenophill and the nightingale, at the close of which the bird dies of grief when its song is bested by Parthenophill’s lute, two related borders are plotted, the first between art and nature and the second between art and imitation. The Prologue declares that

Our writer, for himself, would have ye know
That in his following scenes he doth not owe
To others’ fancies; nor hath lain in wait
For any stolen invention whose height
He might commend his own, more than the right
A scholar claims may warrant for delight.

(5–10)

Despite this declaration of originality, though, the introduction to the Revels edition of the play points out that the duel between Parthenophill and the nightingale is closely modelled on a passage from the Jesuit Famianus Strada’s 1619 *Prousiones* (pp. 4–5), so as well as the contest between the bird and the nightingale, there is also an extradiegetic contest between Ford’s text and its source. We cannot know whether Amethus is expected to believe the story that Menaphon tells him or whether we should consider him more likely to understand it as transparently a traveller’s tale in the same way as Othello’s of the anthropophagi clearly is, but we can be sure that we are expected to enjoy its poetic beauty and bravura and appreciate it as an artistic endeavour in its own right, an exploration of genre and style which floats free of its actual content and its tenuous relevance to the plot and exists for its own sake alone,³⁹ as art which may respond to nature but which is not in this instance telling us anything new or true about nature.

Ford thus chooses to connect Famagusta to a self-conscious and bloodless artifice rather than to the real and all too bloody end of Bragadin for which the fortress was already famous, and in so doing he offers a polarity similar to that which opposes representation of human women and representation of goddesses. Initially, Palador finds the physical reality of Eroclea inadequate: he says to her

Stand up;
’Tis not the figure stamped upon thy cheeks,
The cozenage of thy beauty, grace, or tongue,
Can draw from me a secret that hath been
The only jewel of my speechless thoughts.

(4.3.71–74)

The real woman cannot compete with his “speechless thoughts,” which have transmuted her into a “jewel.” Only gradually does he come to accept the real as a substitute for the ideal, and thus brings peace and calm back to Famagusta.

In setting *The Lover’s Melancholy* in Famagusta, then, Ford offers hints both on how to read his own play and also on how to read *Othello*. He makes explicit that the location of the second half of Shakespeare’s play must be not only Cyprus in general but Famagusta in particular, and in doing so he takes up three questions. In the first place, he calls attention to the fact that Cyprus was not only a frontier against the Turks but also defined by its status as the last stop before arriving at the Holy Land, and thus a place peculiarly suited to pondering the destiny of souls. This is a crucial question for *Othello*, who expects devils to have a particular appearance—he says of Iago, “I look down towards his feet, but that’s a fable” (5.2.283)—and who cannot predict what spiritual destiny awaits Desdemona; as in the case of a pilgrim journeying to Cyprus, the Holy Land may be known to be near at hand, but it is not possible to be sure whether one will reach it or whether one will be blown off course. In the second place, Famagusta spoke of the flaying of Bragadin. Flaying laid bare the body, putting on display the otherwise taboo sight of what lay behind the skin, but in fact that might seem merely to accentuate the ultimate unknowability of the soul, and to raise questions about the relationship between appearance and character, and the ways in which humans tend to read each other. The fates of both Eroclea and Desdemona are conditioned by their beauty, which makes men desire them but also makes men mistrust them. The fact that both plays are set in Cyprus, though, reminds the audience that everyone is equally far from spiritual perfection, and also reminds us that women are not goddesses, and should be read within the paradigm of the actual rather than the symbolic or exemplary.

Notes

1 Thomas Rymer, *A Short View of Tragedy* (1693).

2 On the importance of Venus/Aphrodite in early modern maps and descriptions of Cyprus, see Antoine Eche, “The Shores of Aphrodite’s Island: Cyprus and European Travel Memory,” in *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place, and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies*, edited by Robert Tally Jr. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 91–105, pp. 97–98.

3 Rebecca Nesvet, “Martinengo’s ‘Grecians’ and Shakespeare’s Cyprus,” *The Shakespearean International Yearbook* 6 (2006): 28–31, p. 293.

4 William Shakespeare, *Othello*, edited by E. A. J. Honigsmann (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997), 1.3.270.

- 5 Susan Frye, "Staging Women's Relations to Textiles in Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Cymbeline*," in *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, and Empire in Renaissance England*, edited by Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), pp. 215–50, p. 228.
- 6 Vivian Thomas and Nicki Faircloth, *Shakespeare's Plants and Gardens: A Dictionary* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), p. 213.
- 7 Holly Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice: Caterina Corner, Queen of Cyprus and Woman of the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), p. 207.
- 8 King Janus was given his name by his mother, Helvis of Brunswick-Grubenhagen, in recognition of the fact that he was born in Genoa, where his father, King James I of Cyprus, was being held captive; the god Janus was supposedly the founder of the city of Genoa, which was believed to take its name from him.
- 9 Thomas Dekker, *Old Fortunatus* (London: S. S. for William Apsley, 1600), sig. A3v.
- 10 Robert Allott, *Wits theater of the little world* (London: James Roberts for Nicholas Ling, 1599), p. 154.
- 11 William Barksted and Lewis Machin, *The Insatiate Countess*, in *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies*, edited by Martin Wiggins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 1.1.43. She also says to the next man she fancies "Come, Mars of lovers, Vulcan is not here" (4.2.247).
- 12 See for instance Katharine Goodland, *Female Mourning and Tragedy in Medieval and Renaissance English Drama* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 51, and Elizabeth Williamson, *The Materiality of Religion in Early Modern English Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 33.
- 13 Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Anchor Books, 2005), p. 589.
- 14 Venus's "I entreate where I may commaund" (John Lyly, *Sapho and Phao* [London: Thomas Cadman, 1584], sig. E3v) seems to be echoed by "I may command where I adore" in *Twelfth Night* (William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, edited by Keir Elam [London: Cengage, 2008], 2.5.113). For *Galatea* as a source for *Dream*, see Leah Scragg, "Shakespeare, Lyly and Ovid: The Influence of 'Gallathea' on 'A Midsummer Night's Dream,'" *Shakespeare Survey* 30 (1977): 125–34. Annaliese Connolly ("Princes Set on Stages: Royal Iconography on the Early Modern Stage" [unpublished PhD thesis, Sheffield Hallam University, 2008], p. 174) argues that *Dido* too is an influence on *Dream*.
- 15 For discussion of this, see Sybil Truchet, "Alice Arden and the Religion of Love," *Caliban* 1 (1980): 39–44.
- 16 *Arden of Faversham*, in *Three Elizabethan Domestic Tragedies*, edited by Keith Sturgess (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), Scene One, 60–66.
- 17 John Lyly, *Campaspe*, edited by G. K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 3.5.46–47.
- 18 Michael Pincombe, *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), p. 55.
- 19 Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander*, in *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, edited by Patrick Cheney and Brian J. Striar (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), First Sestiad, lines 36–40.
- 20 John Ford, *The Lover's Melancholy*, edited by R. F. Hill (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 1.1.86–88.
- 21 Nestore Martinengo, *The true report of all the successe of Famagosta* (London: John Day, 1572), sig. B2r.
- 22 Lisa Hopkins, "Venice in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore,'" *Early Theatre* 13.2 (2010): 79–88.

- 23 John Ford, *The Lawes of Candy*, in *Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1647).
- 24 George Abbot, *A briefe description of the whole worlde* (London: T. Judson for John Browne, 1599), sig. G2v.
- 25 Thomas Gainsford, *The glory of England* (London: Edward Griffin for Thomas Norton, 1618), p. 30.
- 26 Martinengo, *The true report of all the successe of Famagosta*, sig. A4v.
- 27 Hugh Fitzwilliam, Letter to Bess of Hardwick, 31 August 1570. Online: <http://www.bessofhardwick.org/letter.jsp?letter=170>.
- 28 George Sandys, *The Relation of a Journey begun an. Dom. 1610* (London: Richard Field for William Barrett, 1615); William Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse of the rare aduentures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares trauiayles* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632).
- 29 Michael J. K. Walsh, "Introduction: Into the Silent Centuries," in *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp. xi–xxii, pp. xiii and xvi.
- 30 See Tamás Kiss, "The Re-enactment of the Siege of Famagusta at the Ottoman Imperial Circumcision Festival of 1582: A Performance That Never Was?," in *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp. 7–12, p. 7: "One of the most often cited sources describing the performance is Edward Grimeston's 1635 English translation of Michel Baudier's *Histoire générale du sérail et de la cour du grand Turc* (1626)."
- 31 Thomas Kyd, *The tragedye of Solymán and Perseda Wherein is laide open, loues constancy, fortunes inconstancy, and deaths triumphs* (London: Edward Allde for Edward White, 1592), sig. H2v.
- 32 George Gascoigne, *Gascoignes deuise of a maske for the right honorable Viscount Mountacute*, in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (London: Henry Binneman and Henry Middleton for Richard Smith, 1573), p. 382.
- 33 On Gascoigne's debt to Martinengo, see Robert Ralston Crawley, "George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta," *Modern Language Notes* 43.5 (May 1928): 296–300.
- 34 Vassiliki Markidou argues that the masque "constitutes Gascoigne's effort to record and interpret the internal 'Other'—the Turkish/Venetian—in order to reinforce as well as subvert English identity . . . the masque upholds yet also challenges the status of Christian Europeans as the defenders of their civilization against the military, religious and cultural threat of the 'barbaric' Turk, so as to respond to early modern England's own struggles with domestic, and in particular, sectarian divisions" ("I goe outlandishe lyke, yet being Englishe borne": Catholic England, the Ottoman Empire, Venice and Fragile Identities in George Gascoigne's *A Deuise of a Maske for the Right Honorable Viscount Montacute*," *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 37.2 [Winter 2011]: 79–95, p. 29).
- 35 William Spates, "Gascoigne's Device for a Masque: An Anglicized 'True Report' of the Siege of Famagusta," in *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp. 13–21, pp. 16 and 18.
- 36 Ford, *The Lover's Melancholy*, edited by R. F. Hill, introduction, pp. 5–7.
- 37 Graham C. G. Thomas, "The Stradling Library at St. Donat's, Glamorgan," *National Library of Wales Journal* 24 (Winter 1986): 402–19, p. 411.

38 Ralph Carr of the Middle Temple, *The Mahumetane or Turkish historie* (London: Thomas Este, 1600), sig. Ff1v.

39 Similarly, though Corax may be a doctor, Paola Pugliatti points out that he shares his name with a Greek rhetorician from Syracuse and hence with a rhetorical figure (Paola Pugliatti, *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England* [Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003], p. 169).

Conclusion

When John Ford set *The Broken Heart* in Sparta in the late 1620s or early 1630s, he drew on Philip Sidney, but Greece had become a different place from the one in which Philip Sidney set the *Arcadia* half a century before, for travel had revealed a Greece quite unlike that of Sidney's imagination, and Ford may have known some of those travellers. In the Prologue to *The Broken Heart*, Ford begins by unequivocally placing his play within its geographical location: "Our scene is Sparta" are the first words spoken on stage.¹ He goes on first to define the play as a serious piece of work, and then to make an assertion which has aroused considerable speculation:

What may be here thought a fiction, when time's youth
Wanted some riper years, was known a truth.

(Prologue, 14–15)

This has often been taken to refer to the real-life relationship between Penelope Rich, sister of the Earl of Essex and the "Stella" of *Astrophil and Stella*, and Sir Philip Sidney.² The story of Orgilus and Penthea certainly does have elements in common with that of Sidney and his Stella, while the names of Ford's characters may well seem to echo those of Argalus and Parthenia, who feature in one of the numerous subplots of the new *Arcadia*, and "the general indebtedness of Ford's play to Sidney's *Arcadia* has been noticed."³ There is, though, also a second set of echoes in the play of a later figure, Sir Kenelm Digby, who sailed to a number of Greek islands in the late 1620s.

There are several possible links between Ford and Digby. Henry A. Bright notes that "Sir Kenelm Digby's second son, John Digby . . . was married first to a daughter of the Earl of Arundel,"⁴ who had been an early dedicatee of Ford's, and it is perhaps also worth observing that Ford himself actually refers to Sir Kenelm Digby's ancestor, Sir John Digby, in *Perkin Warbeck*, where we hear of "Digby, the Lieutenant of the Tower."⁵ On his journey around the Mediterranean Digby's vice-admiral was Ford's cousin Sir Edward Stradling, whom one of his biographers describes as "an old friend";⁶ Matthew Steggle points out that in 1629 Richard Holford sold parts of the same plot of land to Sir Edward Stradling and Sir Kenelm Digby and in 1630 they jointly petitioned the king for permission to develop it.⁷

Digby can be seen as a bridge between Ford and Sidney. Digby's marriage to Venetia Stanley attracted a great deal of interest; Digby himself told their story in his memoir *Loose Fantasies*, fictionalised as Theagenes and Stelliana. R. T. Petersson dismisses *Loose Fantasies* entirely:

This odd history of himself and Venetia, which spans about a decade of their lives, is the strangest mixture of Arcadian love, heroic exploits, shallow philosophy, baroque fantasy, and special pleading for a lady's reputation, ever to be written down. Of concrete detail almost nothing is to be found in it, and of actual names, places, and dates, nothing at all.⁸

However, Joe Moshenska points out that in writing *Loose Fantasies* Digby was inspired not only by Heliodorus but also by Sidney, "who had admired the *Aethiopica* above all for its central love story,"⁹ and the work, which Digby wrote in 1628, is in itself intertextually linked with Sidney's—Vittorio Gabrieli notes that "Stelliana probably stems from a contamination of Sidney's Stella with the maiden family name of Lady Digby,"¹⁰ that is, Stanley, while Henry Rich, son of Sidney's Stella, is represented as the Earl of Arcadia. (Robert Petersson observes that Digby was friendly with Rich.¹¹) *Private Memoirs* certainly seems to have been known to Ford, despite the fact that it was not published: Gabrieli suggests an echo of it in *The Lover's Melancholy*, and it foreshadows the plot of *The Broken Heart*, since Stelliana initially refuses Theagenes on the grounds that she had agreed to marry Mardontius and "she would never suffer that one man should possess her, and another such a gage of a former, though half-constrained, affection," just as Penthea says she will never marry Orgilus even if Bassanes should die.¹² Moreover, Stelliana's father is called Nearchus, the name of an important character in *The Broken Heart*; Theagenes's mother Arete sends him to Athens to separate him from Stelliana just as Orgilus ostensibly travels there to forget Penthea; and Theagenes leaves Athens because of plague just as Orgilus says he has had to do. It is, therefore, worth noting that Stelliana tells Theagenes she loves him "as much as ever sister did a brother" and that we hear, in typically Fordian imagery, of "such a flood of tears, true witnesses of her bleeding heart."¹³ Moshenska also brings Digby close to Ford's circle when he notes that he went to Delos in order to emulate the Earl of Arundel by collecting classical statues.¹⁴ In *The Broken Heart*, "A has shook hands with death" looks like a direct reference to a common trope of ancient Greek funerary statuary (as seen for instance in the Kerameikon in Athens) of the dead person shaking hands with a young friend or relative; bloodless, Orgilus becomes like a statue. Ford's vision of Greece is thus likely to be inflected by Digby's experiences of it.

Lithgow's *Total discourse*, of which the final version appeared the year before Ford's play was published, also chimes with it in a number of respects. Ford may well have known or known of Lithgow, who met Sir Robert Mansel, a connection of Ford's on the mother's side (it was on suspicion of aiding Mansel that Lithgow was arrested and tortured in Malaga), and who comes close to the world of *Perkin Warbeck* when he mentions the family of "Dalliell" and "Robert Second, First, whence Stewarts Spring."¹⁵ Lithgow observes that "It was a saying amongst the Ancients, that thrice happy and

blest was that Kingdome, when Old Men bore sway, and ruled the State; and Young Men travailed abroad";¹⁶ this is the situation we apparently see at the start of the play when Orgilus pretends that he will travel to Athens, and like Lithgow his reason is woman trouble. Lithgow's declaration that "Yet shal the spotlesse HEART, triumph in truth, / When worth reaps fame, and vertue conquers youth" also has a Fordian ring to it.¹⁷ Above all, the bleakness of his Greece parallels Ford's comfortless Sparta: he found "Lacedemon sackt, and Sparta rent / From ancient worth: Arcadia poore and shent"; "In this desert way I beheld many singular Monuments, and ruinous Castles, whose names I know not, because I had an ignorant guide: But this I remember, amongst these Rocks my belly was pinched, and wearied was my body, with the climbing of fastidious mountaines, which bred no small grieffe to my breast"; finally "wee entred in the Easterne plaine of Morea, called anciently Sparta, where that sometimes famous City of Lacedemon flourished, but now sacked, and the lumpes of ruines and memory onely remains."¹⁸ In marked contrast to Sidney's, Ford's Sparta is a similar place of privation, where hope withers and Penthea starves. Fifty years after Sidney, Greece has become a place of death and disappointment, while Troy, always already destroyed, remains an emblem of loss beyond recall. And yet for all this Ford still wants to set his play there, because he can make Greece speak of exemplarity (most of the characters have Greek names betokening abstract qualities), of pathos, and of estrangement.

The plays I have discussed in this book show the extraordinary range of what Greece and Troy might mean on the early modern stage, and what topics they could be used to address. The first two chapters, "What's Actaeon to Aeneas?" and "Aeneas and the Voyagers," and the fourth, "Where Is Hector Now?," all trace different aspects of the way the Troy story both moved in itself and could also be used to instigate and legitimise movement by others, whether in the shape of colonisation or as part of a conscious attempt to validate the marriage of an English princess to a little-known German prince and her subsequent departure from the kingdom. In both cases, destinations which initially seem fearsome are ameliorated and acculturated by being presented in classicising terms; they are, in effect, brought within the *oikoumene*, the world as known by the Greeks, and chapter 4 also shows how Troy might be used to negotiate the meanings of Rome. In between the first two chapters and the fourth, chapter 3, "*Troilus and Cressida*: Shakespeare's Wooden World," notes the importance of visual imaginations of Troy and also explores the emotional pull of the tale of Troy. The affective potential of the Troy story is something further developed in chapter 5, "Making Troy New," along with the ways in which Greek and Trojan figures could be mobilised in the cause of female self-expression.

In the third part of the book, “Striking Too Short at Greeks,” I focused particularly on drama, with one chapter, “The Greek Actor: Art, Aesthetics, and Drama,” exploring tragedy and the other, “Metatheatre and Metamorphosis in Thomas Tomkis’s *Albumazar*,” considering a specific comedy. Both suggest that using Greek models allows dramatists to explore the tension between exemplarity and particularity and also to explore potentially dangerous ideas in an innocuous-seeming guise. In the final two chapters I turned to Cyprus, but also continued to explore the legacy of Greek processes of thought and expression and their effect on the early modern English imagination. On one level, Othello suspects his wife because he thinks like a Greek, that is to say he thinks in terms which seek out the abstract and the mythopoeic rather than the literal and practical. Prince Palador too cannot seem to see the woman who stands in front of him; it is as if both men, standing on Venus’s island, are blinded by Venus. Extradiegetically, early modern playwrights are also acutely aware of Greek thought processes and protocols for expressing emotion, as the second of these two chapters explores, but they also know that the world has changed, and that while the drama of Greece had power, it needs to be reinvented for a modern world. For early modern audiences, Greece and Troy represented dead languages, closed lands, and lost lives; yet one English female aristocrat sewed herself as Penelope and another chose the story of Iphigenia as a vehicle for an elegy on her cousin, while playwrights in London brought the characters of the Trojan War repeatedly onto the stage, because however radically they were transformed, the stories of Greece and Troy continued to matter and to move.

Notes

1 John Ford, *The Broken Heart*, edited by T. J. B. Spencer (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), Prologue, 1.

2 See for instance S. P. Sherman, “Stella and *The Broken Heart*,” *PMLA* 24 (1909): 274–85, and Verna Ann Foster and Stephen Foster, “Structure and History in *The Broken Heart*: Sparta, England, and the ‘Truth,’” *English Literary Renaissance* 18 (1988): 305–28.

3 Ford, *The Broken Heart*, edited by Brian Morris (London: Ernest Benn, 1965), introduction, p. xi.

4 Henry A. Bright, *Poems from Sir Kenelm Digby’s Papers in the Possession of Henry A. Bright* (London: Nichols and Sons, 1877), p. i.

5 John Ford, *Perkin Warbeck*, in *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore and Other Plays*, edited by Marion Lomax (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 5.2.119.

6 Roy Digby Thomas, *Digby: The Gunpowder Plotter’s Legacy* (London: James Publishing Company, 2001), p. 81.

7 Matthew Steggle, *Richard Brome: Place and Politics on the Caroline Stage* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 39.

- 8 Robert T. Petersson, *Sir Kenelm Digby, The Ornament of England* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956), p. 43.
- 9 Joe Moshenska, *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby* (London: William Heinemann, 2016), p. 291.
- 10 Kenelm Digby, *Private Memoirs. Loose Fantasies*, edited by Vittorio Gabrieli (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e letteratura, 1968), p. 10, n.
- 11 Petersson, *Sir Kenelm Digby, The Ornament of England*, p. 63.
- 12 Digby, *Private Memoirs*, pp. 186–87, n. and 121.
- 13 Digby, *Private Memoirs*, pp. 144 and 124–25.
- 14 Moshenska, *A Stain in the Blood*, pp. 300–303.
- 15 William Lithgow, *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares traavailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* (London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632), pp. 504 and 510.
- 16 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, p. 1.
- 17 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, p. 6.
- 18 Lithgow, *The Totall discourse*, pp. 44, 69, and 70.

This page intentionally left blank

Works Cited

- Abbot, George. *A briefe description of the whole worlde*. London: T. Judson for John Browne, 1599.
- Adams, Thomas. *The deuills banquet described in foure sermons*. London: Thomas Snodham for Ralph Mab, 1614.
- Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Alexander, William. *The Alexandraean Tragedie*. London: Thomas Harper, 1637.
- Alexeyev, A. Yu., E. F. Korolkova, T. V. Rjabkova, and E. V. Stepanova. "The Scythians and Their Cultural Contacts." In *Scythians: Warriors of Ancient Siberia*, edited by St. John Simpson and Svetlana Pankova, 276–321. London: Thames and Hudson, 2017.
- Alford, Stephen. *London's Triumph: Merchant Adventurers and the Tudor City*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2018.
- Allott, Robert. *Wits theater of the little world*. London: James Roberts for Nicholas Ling, 1599.
- Andrea, Bernadette. "Lady Sherley: The First Persian in England?" *The Muslim World* 95.2 (April 2005): 272–95.
- Angus, Bill. *Intelligence and Metadrama in the Early Modern Theatre*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018.
- Anonymous. *Arden of Faversham*. In *Five Elizabethan Tragedies*, edited by A. K. McIlwraith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- . *Edward III*. In *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, edited by Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, and William Montgomery. 2nd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2005.
- . *The marriage of Prince Fredericke, and the Kings daughter, the Lady Elizabeth*. London: Thomas Creede for William Barley, 1613.
- Arbel, Benjamin. "A Fresh Look at the Venetian Protectorate of Cyprus (1475–89)." In *Caterina Cornaro: Last Queen of Cyprus and Daughter of Venice*, edited by Candida Syndikus and Sabine Rogge, 213–29. Münster: Waxmann, 2013.
- Arnold, Janet. *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd*. London: Maney, 1988.
- Arrell, Douglas. "Heywood, Shakespeare, and the Mystery of Troye." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 19.1 (2016). Online: <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/journal/index.php/emls/article/view/267>.
- Arshad, Yasmin, Helen Hackett, and Emma Whipday. "Daniel's *Cleopatra* and Lady Anne Clifford: From a Jacobean Portrait to Modern Performance." *Early Theatre* 17.2 (2014): 167–86.
- Astington, John. *Stage and Picture in the English Renaissance: The Mirror Up to Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Baldo, Jonathan. "Necromancing the Past in *Henry VIII*." *English Literary Renaissance* 34.3 (Autumn 2004): 359–86.
- Baldwin, William. *A memorial of suche princes, as since the tyme of king Richard the seconde, haue been vnfortunate in the realme of England*. London: John Wayland, 1554.
- Barksted, William, and Lewis Machin. *The Insatiate Countess*. In *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies*, edited by Martin Wiggins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Bartels, Emily. *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Bate, Jonathan. *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare*. London: Viking, 2008.
- Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher. *The Maid's Tragedy*. Edited by T. W. Craik. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

- Bednarz, James. *Shakespeare and the Poets' War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Belchier, Dabridgcourt. *Hans Beer-Pot his inuisible comedie, of see me, and see me not*. London: Bernard Alsop, 1618.
- Birnie, William. *The blame of kirk-buriall, tending to persuade cemiteriall ciuillitie*. Edinburgh: Robert Charteris, 1606.
- Black, James. "Hamlet Hears Marlowe; Shakespeare Reads Virgil." *Renaissance and Reformation* 28.4 (1994): 1–27.
- Bolam, Robyn. *Stage Images and Traditions: Shakespeare to Ford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Bonahue, Edward T., Jr. "Citizen History: Stow's Survey of London." *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 38.1 (Winter 1998): 61–85.
- Bowers, Fredson. "Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany, and the Ur-Hamlet." *Modern Language Notes* 48.2 (February 1933): 101–8.
- . "The Date and Composition of *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*." *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* 15 (1933): 165–89.
- Bowle, John. *A sermon preached at Flitton in the Countie of Beford at the funerall of the Right Honourable Henrie Earle of Kent, the sixteenth of March 1614*. London: William Stansby for Richard Woodroffe, 1615.
- Bradbrook, M. C. "The Inheritance of Christopher Marlowe." *Theology* 47 (1964): 298–305.
- Brinton, Ann Cox. "The Ships of Columbus in Brant's Virgil." *Art and Archaeology* 26 (1928): 83–86.
- Brome, Richard. *The Sparagus Garden*. Edited by Julie Sanders. Online: <https://www.dhi.ac.uk/brome/viewOriginal.jsp?play=SG&type=CRIT>.
- Brotton, Jerry. *This Orient Isle* [2016]. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2017.
- Buckley, Emma. "'Live false Aeneas!': Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and the Limits of Translation." *Classical Receptions Journal* 3.2 (2011): 129–47.
- Burnell, Henry. *Landgartha*. Dublin, 1641.
- Bushnell, Rebecca. "Shakespeare and Nature." In *Shakespeare in Our Time: A Shakespeare Association of America Collection*, edited by Dympna Callaghan and Suzanne Gossett, 327–34. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Butler, Martin. "Romans in Britain: *The Roman Actor* and the Early Stuart Classical Play." In *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard, 139–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Cadman, Daniel. *Sovereigns and Subjects in Early Modern Neo-Senecan Drama*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.
- Camoens, Luis de. *The Lusiads*. Translated by William C. Atkinson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1952.
- Caro-Barnes, Jennifer M. "Marlowe's Tribute to His Queen, in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*." Online: <http://www.uta.edu/english/ees/caro-barnes.html>.
- Carr, Ralph. *The Mahumetane or Turkish historie*. London: Thomas Este, 1600.
- Cartwright, Kent. "The Comedy of Errors and 'Farthest Greece.'" In *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, 45–67. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Cavell, Stanley. "Who Does the Wolf Love?: *Coriolanus* and the Interpretation of Politics." In *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, edited by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman, 245–72. London: Methuen, 1985.

- Cavendish, Jane, and Elizabeth Brackley. *The Concealed Fancies*. In *Renaissance Drama by Women: Texts and Documents*, edited by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. London: Routledge, 1996.
- "Cecil Papers: July 1592," *Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House*, vol. 4: 1590–1594 (1892), pp. 216–33. Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=111583>.
- Chapman, George. *Chapman's Homer: The Iliad and the Odyssey*. London: Wordsworth, 2000.
- . *The tragedy of Alphonsus, Emperour of Germany*. London: Humphrey Moseley, 1654.
- Chapman, Hester. *Lady Jane Grey*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1962.
- Charnes, Linda. "'So Unsecret to Ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1989): 413–40.
- Charney, Maurice. "The Voice of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* in Early Shakespeare." *Comparative Drama* 31.2 (1997): 213–23.
- Cheney, Liana De Girolami. "Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus." In *The Emblematic Queen: Extra-Literary Representations of Early Modern Queenship*, edited by Debra Barrett-Graves, 11–34. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Chettle, Henry. *The tragedy of Hoffman*. In *Five Revenge Tragedies*, edited by Emma Smith. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2012.
- Christiansen, Eric. *The Northern Crusades*. London: Penguin, 1997.
- Christofides, R. M. *Othello's Secret: The Cyprus Problem*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Clubb, Louise George. *Giambattista Della Porta, Dramatist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Cole, Douglas. "Myth and Anti-Myth: The Case of *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (Spring 1980): 76–84.
- Connolly, Annaliese F. "Evaluating Virginity: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and the Iconography of Marriage." In *Goddesses and Queens: The Iconography of Elizabeth I*, edited by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins, 136–53. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- . "Guy of Warwick, Godfrey of Bouillon, and Elizabethan Repertory." In *Early Modern England and Islamic Worlds*, edited by Bernadette Andrea and Linda McJannet, 139–58. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- . "Princes Set on Stages: Royal Iconography on the Early Modern Stage." Unpublished PhD thesis, Sheffield Hallam University, 2008.
- Coryate, Thomas. *The Odcombian Banquet*. London: Thomas Thorp, 1611.
- Coureas, Nicholas. "Participants or Mediators? The Hospitallers and Wars Involving 15th Century Lusignan Cyprus." *Ordines Militaires: Yearbook for the Study of the Military Orders* 28 (2013): 193–203.
- Crawley, Robert Ralston. "George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta." *Modern Language Notes* 43.5 (May 1928): 296–300.
- Crowley, Roger. *Empires of the Sea: The Final Battle for the Mediterranean 1521–1580*. London: Faber and Faber, 2008.
- Crowley, Timothy D. "Arms and the Boy: Marlowe's Aeneas and the Parody of Imitation in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*." *English Literary Renaissance* 38.3 (2008): 408–38.
- Curran, John. *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism and the Historical Imagination in England 1530–1660*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002.
- Daborne, Robert. *A Christian Turned Turk*. In *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England*, edited by Daniel Vitkus. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Daniel, Samuel. *Philotas*. Edited by Laurence Michel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.

- Day, John, William Rowley, and George Wilkins. *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*. In *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*, edited by Anthony Parr. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- De Grazia, Margreta. *Hamlet without Hamlet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- De Lisle, Leanda. *After Elizabeth: The Death of Elizabeth and the Coming of King James* [2004]. London: HarperPerennial, 2006.
- Degenhardt, Jane Hwang. *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Dekker, Thomas. *Old Fortunatus*. London: S. S. for William Apsley, 1600.
- Demers, Patricia. "On First Looking into Lumley's Euripides." *Renaissance and Reformation* 23.1 (Winter 1999): 25–42.
- Demetriou, Tania, and Tanya Pollard. "Homer and Greek Tragedy in Early Modern England's Theatres: An Introduction." *Classical Receptions Journal* 9.1 (2017): 1–35.
- Desmet, Christy. "Afterlives of the Prose *Brut* in Early Modern Chronicle and Literature." In *Readers and Writers of the Prose Brut (Trivium 36)*, edited by William Marx and Raluca Radulescu, 227–46. Lampeter: Trivium, 2006.
- Devereux, Robert. *An apologie of the Earle of Essex*. London: J. Smethwick?, 1600.
- Dimmock, Matthew. *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Durant, David N. *Bess of Hardwick: Portrait of an Elizabethan dynast* [1977]. London: The Cromwell Press, 1988.
- Eche, Antoine. "The Shores of Aphrodite's Island: Cyprus and European Travel Memory." In *Geocritical Explorations: Space, Place, and Mapping in Literary and Cultural Studies*, edited by Robert Tally Jr., 91–105. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Elliott, J. H. *The Old World and the New 1492–1650* [1970]. Cambridge: Canto, 1992.
- Eriksen, Roy. "Marlowe and Company in Barnfield's *Greene's Funeralls* (1594)." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12.2 (2013): 71–80.
- Euripides. *Hecabe*. In *Medea and Other Plays*, translated by Philip Vellacott. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
- Farabee, Darlene. "The Critical Backstory: *Edward II*'s Critics in History to 1990." In *Edward II: A Critical Reader*, edited by Kirk Melnikoff, 21–41. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Fennor, William. "A description of the Palsgraves Countrey, as it was delivered in a speech before the King, the Prince, the Lady Elizabeth, at White-Hall." In *Fennors descriptions, or a true relation of certaine and diuers speeches*. London: Edward Griffin for George Gibbs, 1616.
- Fielitz, Sonja. "Jacobean Troys." In *Urban Encounters: Experience and Representation in the Early Modern City*, edited by Per Sivefors, 54–69. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra editore, 2013.
- Findlay, Alison, and Vassiliki Markidou. "Introduction." In *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, 1–44. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- . "Reshaping Athens in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Two Noble Kinsmen*." In *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, 196–216. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Fitzwilliam, Hugh. Letter to Bess of Hardwick, 31 August 1570. Online: <http://www.bessofhardwick.org/letter.jsp?letter=170>.
- Fisher, Jasper. *Fuimus Troes*. Edited by Chris Butler, 2007. Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/iemls/renplays/fuimustroes.htm>.

- Ford, John. *The Lawes of Candy*. In *Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher*. London: Humphrey Moseley, 1647.
- . *The Lover's Melancholy*. Edited by R. F. Hill. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- Franklin, Colleen. "'An Habitation of Devils, a Domicill for Unclean Spirits, and a Den of Goblins': The Marvelous North in Early Modern Literature." In *The Mysterious and the Foreign in Early Modern England*, edited by Helen Ostovich, Mary V. Silcox, and Graham Roebuck, 27–38. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- Frye, Susan. "Sewing Connections: Mary Stuart, Elizabeth Talbot, and Seventeenth-Century Anonymous Needleworkers." In *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances in Early Modern England*, edited by Susan Frye and Karen Robertson, 165–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . "Staging Women's Relations to Textiles in Shakespeare's *Othello* and *Cymbeline*." In *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, and Empire in Renaissance England*, edited by Peter Erickson and Clark Hulse, 215–50. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.
- Gainsford, Thomas. *The glory of England*. London: Edward Griffin for Thomas Norton, 1618.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Shakespeare After All*. New York: Anchor Books, 2005.
- Gascoigne, George. *Gascoignes devise of a maske for the right honorable Viscount Mountacute*. In *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. London: Henry Binneman and Henry Middleton for Richard Smith, 1573.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. *The History of the Kings of Britain*. Translated by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.
- Gilchrist, Kim. "'The Wonder Is, He Hath Endured so Long': King Lear and the Erosion of the Brutal Histories." *Shakespeare* (2019). Online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2018.1561503>.
- Golding, Arthur. *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe*. London: William Ponsonby, 1592.
- Goldstein, David. "Woolley's Mouse: Early Modern Recipe Books and the Uses of Nature." In *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity*, edited by Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Laroche, 105–27. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Goodland, Katharine. *Female Mourning and Tragedy in Medieval and Renaissance English Drama*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Goulding, Robert. "Thomas Hariot's Optics, Between Experiment and Imagination: The Case of Mr. Bulkeley's Glass." *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 68 (2014): 137–78.
- Goy-Blanquet, Dominique. "'This Realm is an Empire': Tales of Origins in Medieval and Early Modern France and England." In *Interweaving Myths in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, edited by Janice Valls-Russell, Agnès Lafont, and Charlotte Coffin, 65–85. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Greene, Robert. *The Comicall Historie of Alphonsus, King of Arragon*. London: Thomas Creede, 1599.
- . *Euphuus his censure to Philautus*. London: John Wolfe for Edward White, 1587.
- Griffin, Andrew. "The Banality of History in *Troilus and Cressida*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 12.2 (September 2006). Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/12-2/grifbana.htm>.
- Gristwood, Sarah. *Arbella: England's Lost Queen*. London: Bantam Books, 2003.

- Grivaud, Gilles. "Un règne sans fastes—Catherine Cornaro à travers les sources produites à Chypre." In *Caterina Cornaro: Last Queen of Cyprus and Daughter of Venice*, edited by Candida Syndikus and Sabine Rogge, 231–53. Münster: Waxmann, 2013.
- Hadjianastasis, Marios. "Corsair Tactics and Lofty Ideals: The 1607 Tuscan Raid on Cyprus." In *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh, 22–36. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. Glasgow: James MacLehose and sons, 1904.
- Hanna, Sara. "Shakespeare's Greek World: The Temptations of the Sea." In *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*, edited by John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan, 107–28. London: Associated University Presses, 1998.
- Harding, Samuel. *Sicily and Naples, or, The Fatall Vnion*. Oxford: William Turner, 1640.
- Harvey, Richard. *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes*. London: John Wolfe, 1593.
- Hattaway, Michael. "Christopher Marlowe: Ideology and Subversion." In *Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture*, edited by Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts, 198–223. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996.
- Heavey, Katherine. *The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature, 1558–1688*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- . "'Properer Men': Myth, Manhood and the Trojan War in Greene, Shakespeare and Heywood." *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 7 (2015). Online: <http://www.northernrenaissance.org/properer-men-myth-manhood-and-the-trojan-war-in-greene-shakespeare-and-heywood/>.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. Translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt [1954]. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003.
- Heywood, Thomas. *An Apology for Actors*. London, 1612.
- . *The Fair Maid of the West*. London: Richard Royston, 1631.
- . *The Four Prentices of London*. London: Nicholas Okes for John Wright, 1615.
- . *The Iron Age contayning the rape of Hellen: the siege of Troy: the combate between Hector and Ajax: Hector and Troilus slayne by Achilles: Achilles slaine by Paris: Ajax and Vlisses contend for the armour of Achilles: the death of Ajax, &c.* London: Nicholas Okes, 1632.
- Hiscock, Andrew. "'Achilles Alter': The Heroic Lives and Afterlives of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex." In *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*, edited by Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins, 101–32. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.
- . "'Will You Walk In, My Lord?': Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Anxiety of *Oikos*." In *Shakespeare and Hospitality: Ethics, Politics, and Exchange*, edited by David B. Goldstein and Julia Reinhard Lupton, 17–38. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Hodgson-Wright, Stephanie. "Jane Lumley's *Iphigenia at Aulis: Multum in parvo*, or, Less Is More." In *Readings in Renaissance Women's Drama: Criticism, History, and Performance 1594–1998*, edited by S. P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies, 129–41. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The Third volume of Chronicles*. London: Henry Denham, 1586.
- Honigmann, E. A. J. *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text*. London: Arnold, 1965.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *Christopher Marlowe, Dramatist*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- . *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

- . "Englishmen Abroad: Mobility and Nationhood in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Edward II*." *English* 59 (Winter 2010): 324–48.
- . *From the Romans to the Normans on the English Renaissance Stage*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017.
- . "Harington, *Troilus and Cressida* and the Poets' War." In *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*, edited by Michele Marrapodi, 127–40. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- . "Profit and Delight? Magic and the Dreams of a Nation." In *Magical Transformation on the Early Modern Stage*, edited by Lisa Hopkins and Helen Ostovich, 139–51. Burlington: Ashgate, 2014.
- . *Renaissance Drama on the Edge*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.
- . "Venice in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore." *Early Theatre* 13.2 (2010): 79–88.
- Howard, Douglas. "Massinger's Political Tragedies." In *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment*, edited by Douglas Howard, 117–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Hurlburt, Holly. "Body of Empire: Caterina Corner in Venetian History and Iconography." *Early Modern Women* 4 (2009): 61–99.
- . *Daughter of Venice: Caterina Corner, Queen of Cyprus and Woman of the Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Iacovou, Maria. "Mapping the Ancient Kingdoms of Cyprus: Cartography and Classical Scholarship during the Enlightenment." In *Eastern Mediterranean Cartographies*, edited by George Tolia and Dimitris Loupis, 263–85. Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research, 2004).
- Jacobson, Miriam. *Barbarous Antiquity: Reorienting the Past in the Poetry of Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Johnson, Richard. *The Most Famous History of the Seaven Champions of Christendome*. London: Cuthbert Burbie, 1596.
- Jonson, Ben. *The Alchemist*. Edited by Peter Bement. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Kathman, Dave. "The Freeman's Honour, William Smith, and the Lord Chamberlain's Men." Paper given at the Shakespeare Association of America annual meeting, 2017.
- Kiss, Tamás. "The Re-Enactment of the Siege of Famagusta at the Ottoman Imperial Circumcision Festival of 1582: A Performance That Never Was?" In *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh, 7–12. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Kliman, Bernice W. "At Sea about *Hamlet* at Sea: A Detective Story." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.2 (Summer 2011): 180–204.
- Knutson, Roslyn L. "Edward II in Repertory." In *Edward II: A Critical Reader*, edited by Kirk Melnikoff, 119–44. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Kyd, Thomas. *The Spanish Tragedy*. Edited by David Bevington. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- . *The tragedye of Solymán and Perseda Wherein is laide open, loues constancy, fortunes inconstancy, and deaths triumphs*. London: Edward Allde for Edward White, 1592.
- Levenson, Jill L. "Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and the Monumental Tradition in Tapestries and Literature." *Renaissance Drama* 7 (1976): 43–84.
- Levey, Santina M. *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles*. London: The National Trust, 1998.

- Linton, Joan Pong. *The Romance of the New World: Gender and the Literary Formations of English Colonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Lithgow, William. *The Totall Discourse of the rare aduentures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares traauayles*. London: Nicholas Okes for Nicholas Fussell and Humphrey Moseley, 1632.
- Lockey, Brian C. "Elizabethan Cosmopolitan: Captain Thomas Stukeley in the Court of Dom Sebastian." *English Literary Renaissance* 40.1 (2010): 3–32.
- Lovascio, Domenico. "Leicester's Men and the Lost *Telomo* of 1583." *Early Theatre* 20.1 (2017): 9–26.
- Lovell, Mary S. *Bess of Hardwick: First Lady of Chatsworth* [2005]. London: Abacus, 2006.
- Lyly, John. *Campaspe*. Edited by G. K. Hunter. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- . *Sapho and Phao*. London: Thomas Cadman, 1584.
- MacDougall, Hugh A. *Racial Myth in English History*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1982.
- McInnis, David. "Ajax Flagellifer (Oxford)." *Lost Plays Database*. Online: [https://www.lostplays.org/index.php?title=Ajax_Flagellifer_\(Oxford\)](https://www.lostplays.org/index.php?title=Ajax_Flagellifer_(Oxford)).
- . *Mind-Travelling and Voyaging in Early Modern Drama*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Maguire, Laurie. *Helen of Troy: From Homer to Hollywood*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Malay, Jessica L. "Viewing the Jacobean Cleopatra Portrait: Literary and Visual Intersections in Female Devisership." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 18.1 (Winter 2018): 29–65.
- Mallia-Milanes, Victor. "Introduction to Hospitaller Malta." In *Hospitaller Malta 1530–1798: Studies on Early Modern Malta and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem*. Edited by Victor Mallia-Milanes, 1–42. Msida: Moreva, 1993.
- Mallin, Eric S. *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Markidou, Vassiliki. "'I goe outlandishe lyke, yet being Englishe borne': Catholic England, the Ottoman Empire, Venice and Fragile Identities in George Gascoigne's *A Deviser of a Maske for the Right Honorable Viscount Montacute*." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 37.2 (Winter 2011): 79–95.
- . "Performing Identity: Early Seventeenth-Century Travelers to the Ruins of Troy." *Journeys* 19.2 (2018): 67–81.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*. Edited by Patrick Cheney and Brian J. Striar. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . *The Complete Plays*. Edited by Mark Thornton Burnett. London: J. M. Dent, 1999.
- . *Edward II*. Edited by Charles Forker. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Marshall, Tristan. *Theatre and Empire: Great Britain on the London Stages under James VI and I*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Marston, John. *The Malcontent*. Edited by G. K. Hunter. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975.
- Martinengo, Nestore. *The true report of all the successe of Famagosta*. London: John Day, 1572.
- Maslen, Rob. "The Decay of Exemplarity in *Troilus and Cressida*." In *Troilus and Cressida: A Critical Reader*, edited by Efterpi Mitsi, 107–28. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Massinger, Philip. *The Roman Actor*. Edited by Martin White. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

- Mayne, Jasper. *The City Match*. Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1639.
- Mazzola, Elizabeth. *Women's Wealth and Women's Writing in Early Modern England: "Little Legacies" and the Materials of Motherhood*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Miller, Jaroslav. "The Henrician Legend Revived: The Palatine Couple and Its Public Image in Early Stuart England." *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 11.3 (2004): 305–31.
- Miola, Robert. "Early Modern Antigones: Receptions, Refractions, Replays." *Classical Receptions Journal* 6.2 (2014): 221–44.
- . "Timon in Shakespeare's Athens." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 31.1 (Spring 1980): 21–30.
- Mitsi, Efterpi. "Greece 'Digested in a Play': Consuming Greek Heroism in *The School of Abuse* and *Troilus and Cressida*." In *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, 93–114. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- . *Greece in Early English Travel Writing, 1596–1682*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Moffat, Alistair. *The Reivers*. Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2010.
- Monter, William. *The Rise of Female Kings in Europe, 1300–1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Moshenska, Joe. *A Stain in the Blood: The Remarkable Voyage of Sir Kenelm Digby*. London: William Heinemann, 2016.
- Mullaly, Terence. "Caterina 'Domina' of Asolo: Lady of the Renaissance." In *Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus*, edited by David Hunt and Iro Hunt, 147–89. London: Trigraph, 1989.
- Nardizzi, Vim. *Wooden Os: Shakespeare's Theatres and England's Trees*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
- Nashe, Thomas. "The Terrors of the Night." In *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, edited by J. B. Steane. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Neill, Edward D. *History of the Virginia Company of London with Letters to and from the First Colony Never Before Printed*. Albany, NY: Munsell, 1869.
- Nesvet, Rebecca. "Martinengo's 'Grecians' and Shakespeare's Cyprus." *The Shakespearean International Yearbook* 6 (2006): 28–31.
- Netzlöff, Mark. *England's Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004.
- Nicholl, Charles. *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1992.
- Nixon, Anthony. *The Three English Brothers*. London: John Hodgets, 1607.
- Norwich, John Julius. *The Middle Sea: A History of the Mediterranean*. London: Vintage, 2007.
- Nuttall, A. D. "Action at a Distance: Shakespeare and the Greeks." In *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, 209–22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Oakley-Brown, Liz. "Embodying Greece in Elizabethan England: A Rhizomatic Review of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *Love's Labour's Lost*." In *Shakespeare and Greece*, edited by Alison Findlay and Vassiliki Markidou, 69–91. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Orlens, Jan Jensen. *The Triumphs of Nassau*. Translated by William Shute. London: Adam Islip, 1613.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by Mary M. Innes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955.
- Parker, Roszika. *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine* [1984]. London: I. B. Tauris & Co, 2010.
- Peele, George. *The araygnment of Paris*. London: Henrie Marsh, 1584.

- . *The Battle of Alcazar*. In *The Stukeley Plays*, edited by Charles Edelman. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- Pettegree, Jane. *Foreign and Native on the English Stage, 1588–1611*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011.
- Piggott, Stuart. *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- Pincombe, Michael. *The Plays of John Lyly: Eros and Eliza*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Plowden, Alison. *Lady Jane Grey*. Stroud: Sutton, 2003.
- Plutarch. *The Philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned Philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea*. Translated by Philemon Holland. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1603.
- Pollard, Tanya. *Greek Tragic Women on Shakespearean Stages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- . "What's Hecuba to Shakespeare?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 65.4 (Winter 2012): 1060–93.
- Potter, Lois. "Topicality or Politics: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1613–34." In *The Politics of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare and After*, edited by Gordon McMullan and Jonathan Hope, 77–91. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Publicover, Laurence. *Dramatic Geography: Romance, Intertextuality, and Cultural Encounter in Early Modern Mediterranean Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Pugliatti, Paola. *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Purkiss, Diane. "Blood, Sacrifice, Marriage: Why Iphigeneia and Mariam Have to Die." *Women's Writing* 6.1 (1999): 27–45.
- Quinn, David Beers. "Sir Thomas Smith (1513–1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89.4 (December 1946): 543–60.
- Raitière, Martin N. *Faire Bits: Sir Philip Sidney and Renaissance Political Theory*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1984.
- Reid, Lindsay Ann. "Beaumont and Fletcher's Rhodes: Early Modern Geopolitics and Mythological Topography in *The Maid's Tragedy*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 16.2 (2012). Online: <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/16-2/16-2toc.htm>.
- Rhodes, Neil. "Marlowe and the Greeks." *Renaissance Studies* 27.2 (2011): 199–218.
- Richardson, Ruth Elizabeth. *Mistress Blanche: Queen Elizabeth I's Confidante*. Wootton Almeley, Herefordshire: Logaston Press, 2007.
- Robb, Graham. *The Ancient Paths*. London: Picador, 2013.
- . *The Debatable Land: The Lost World between Scotland and England*. London: Picador, 2018.
- Robinson, Philip. "The Multiple Meanings of Troy in Early Modern London's Mayoral Show." *Seventeenth Century* 26.2 (2011): 221–39.
- Rowley, William. *The Birth of Merlin*. London: printed by Thomas Johnson for Francis Kirkman and Henry Marsh, 1662.
- Rubright, Marjorie. *Doppelgänger Dilemmas: Anglo-Dutch Relations in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- Rutter, Tom. "Marlovian Echoes in the Admiral's Men Repertory: *Alcazar*, *Stukeley*, *Patient Grissil*." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1 (Spring 2009): 27–38.
- . "Marlowe, Hoffman, and the Admiral's Men." *Marlowe Studies* 3 (2013): 49–62.
- Sandys, George. *The Relation of a Journey begun an. Dom. 1610*. London: Richard Field for William Barrett, 1615.

- Scragg, Leah. "Shakespeare, Lyly and Ovid: The Influence of 'Gallathea' on 'A Midsummer Night's Dream.'" *Shakespeare Survey* 30 (1977): 125–34.
- Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by Emrys Jones. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977.
- . *As You Like It*. Edited by Agnes Latham. London: Methuen, 1975.
- . *Coriolanus*. Edited by Peter Holland. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . *Hamlet*. Edited by Harold Jenkins. London: Methuen, 1980.
- . *Julius Caesar*. Edited by Norman Sanders. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
- . *Macbeth*. Edited by Nicholas Brooke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . *Macbeth*. Edited by Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- . *The Merchant of Venice*. Edited by W. Moelwyn Merchant. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
- . *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Harold F. Brooks. London: Methuen, 1979.
- . *Othello*. Edited by E. A. J. Honigmann. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1997.
- . *Richard II*. Edited by Stanley Wells. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.
- . *Timon of Athens*. Edited by G. R. Hibbard. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. Edited by Jonathan Bate [1995]. London: Thomson Learning, 2003.
- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by David Bevington [1988]. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- . *Twelfth Night*. Edited by Keir Elam. London: Cengage, 2008.
- Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Edited by R. W. Maslen. 3rd ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Silk, Michael. "Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship." In *Shakespeare and the Classics*, edited by Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor, 241–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Simpson, St. J., and S. V. Pankova. "Introduction." In *Scythians: Warriors of Ancient Siberia*, edited by St. John Simpson and Svetlana Pankova, 10–15. London: Thames and Hudson, 2017.
- Smith, Robert A. H. "Doctor Faustus and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*." *The Review of English Studies* 43.171 (August 1992): 395–97.
- Smith, [William]. *The Hector of Germany. Or The Palsgrave, prime Elector*. London: Thomas Creede for Josias Harrison, 1615.
- Spates, William. "Gascoigne's Device for a Masque: An Anglicized 'True Report' of the Siege of Famagusta." In *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh, 13–21. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Spencer, Terence. "Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance." *Modern Language Review* 47.3 (July 1952): 330–33.
- Staines, John D. *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots, 1560–1690*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Stanivukovic, Goran. "Cruising the Mediterranean: Narratives of Sexuality and Geographies of the Eastern Mediterranean in Early Modern English Prose Romances." In *Remapping the Mediterranean World in Early Modern English Writings*, edited by Goran V. Stanivukovic, 59–74. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Steen, Sara Jayne, ed. *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Steggle, Matthew. *Digital Humanities and the Lost Drama of Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.

- . “William Cavendish: Amateur Professional Playwright.” In *A Companion to the Cavendishes: Writing, Patronage and Material Culture*, edited by Lisa Hopkins and Tom Rutter. Leeds: ARC Humanities Press, 2020.
- Stepanova, E. V., and S. V. Pankova. “Personal appearance.” In *Scythians: Warriors of Ancient Siberia*, edited by St. John Simpson and Svetlana Pankova, 88–151. London: Thames and Hudson, 2017.
- Stow, John. *A suruay of London*. London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598.
- . *A Survey of London Written in the Year 1598*. Introduced by Antonia Fraser. London: The History Press, 2009.
- Strachey, William. *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*. London: Hakluyt Society, 1849.
- Strauss, Barry. *The Trojan War*. London: Arrow, 2008.
- Strong, Roy. *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1986.
- T., D. *Asylum veneria, or A sanctuary for ladies*. London: Edward Griffin for Laurence L'isle, 1616.
- Tatlock, John S. P. “The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature. Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood.” *PMLA* 30.4 (1915): 673–770.
- Taylor, John. *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy*. London: E. Alde for Joseph Hunt, 1613.
- Teramura, Misha. “The Admiral's Vayvode of 1598,” *Early Theatre* 18.1 (July 2015): 79–99.
- Thomas, Graham C. G. “The Stradling Library at St. Donat's, Glamorgan.” *National Library of Wales Journal* 24 (Winter 1986): 402–19.
- Thomas, Vivian, and Nicki Faircloth. *Shakespeare's Plants and Gardens: A Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Tomkis, Thomas. *Albumazar*. London: Nicholas Okes for Walter Burre, 1615.
- . *Lingua*. London: G. Eld for Simon Waterson, 1607.
- Trapp, J. B. “The Grave of Vergil.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 47 (1984): 1–31.
- Truchet, Sybil. “Alice Arden and the Religion of Love.” *Caliban* 1 (1980): 39–44.
- Vines, Amy Noelle. “‘Thys ys her owne boke’: Women Reading the Middle English Prose *Brut* Chronicle.” In *Readers and Writers of the Prose Brut (Trivium 36)*, edited by William Marx and Raluca Radulescu, 71–96. Lampeter: Trivium, 2006.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Translated by W. F. Jackson Knight. London: Harmondsworth, 1956.
- . *The whole xii bookes of the Aeneidos of Virgil*. Translated by Thomas Phaer. London: William How for Abraham Veale, 1573.
- Waller, Gary. “An Erasmian Pilgrimage to Walsingham.” *Peregrinations* 2.2. Online: <http://peregrinations.kenyon.edu/vol2-2/current.html>.
- Walsh, Michael J. K. “Introduction: Into the Silent Centuries.” In *City of Empires: Ottoman and British Famagusta*, edited by Michael J. K. Walsh, xi–xxii. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.
- Warner, William. *Albions England* [1612]. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1971.
- Werner, Hans. “The Hector of Germanie, or The Palsgrave, Prime Elector and Anglo-German Relations of Early Stuart England: The View from the Popular Stage.” In *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture*, edited by R. Malcolm Smuts, 113–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wiggins, Alison. *Bess of Hardwick's Letters: Language, Materiality and Early Modern Epistolary Culture*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Wiggins, Martin. “Things that Go Bump in the Text: Captain Thomas Stukely.” *PBSA* 98.1 (2004): 5–20.

- Wiggins, Martin and Catherine Richardson. *British Drama, 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, vol. 6, 1609–16. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Williams, Martin T. "The Temptations in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*." *Modern Language Quarterly* (1955): 226–31.
- Williamson, Elizabeth. *The Materiality of Religion in Early Modern English Drama*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Wilson, Mary Floyd. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wilson, Richard. "Visible Bullets: Tamburlaine the Great and Ivan the Terrible." *ELH* 62 (1995): 47–68.
- Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. "Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare's *Tempest*." *ELH* 70.3 (Fall 2003): 709–37.
- Wolfe, Jessica. *Homer and the Question of Strife from Erasmus to Hobbes*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.
- Wood, Michael. *In Search of Shakespeare*. London: BBC Books, 2005.
- Wroth, Mary. *The First Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Edited by Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. *Women Writers and Familial Discourse in the English Renaissance: Relative Values*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

- Abbott, George, Archbishop of Canterbury 4, 195
- Achilles 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 18, 31, 48, 69–70, 71, 88, 98, 114, 130, 138, 149
- Actaeon 6, 9, 15, 27–8, 36–9
- Adelman, Janet 110
- Admiral's Men (playing company) 7
- Aeneas 1, 6, 8, 14, 15, 16–17, 27–9, 31–9, 43, 44, 45–9, 59, 60, 67, 81, 88, 93, 103, 111, 112, 130, 138, 174, 193
- Aeschylus
– *Seven Against Thebes* 8
- Africana, Cornelia 168
- Africanus, Scipio 168, 174
- Agamemnon 12, 14, 116, 132, 134
- Ajax 1, 6
- Ajax Flagellifer* (play) 67–8
- Alexander, William
– *The Alexandraean Tragedie* 12, 176
- Alexander the Great 3, 9, 12, 17–18, 35, 66, 124, 128, 134, 150, 176, 182
- Alexandria 168
- Alexandria Troas 66, 77
- Alford, Stephen 108
- Alice of Jerusalem–Champagne 174
- Allott, Robert 190
– *Wits theater of the little world* 190
- Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* (play) 82, 89, 90, 91–4
- Andrea, Bernadette 48
- Andromache 16–17, 81
- Angelos, Christophoros 3
– *Christopher Angell, a Grecian who tasted of many stripes and torments inflicted by the Turkes for the faith which he had in Christ Jesus* 3
- Angus, Bill 135
- Anna of Denmark, Queen 89
- Annabella (Stewart) of Scotland 188–9
- Anne of Lusignan 175
- Antony (Mark) 165, 176, 178
- Apollo 127
- Arbel, Benjamin 172
- Archer, John Michael 84
- Archimedes 113
- Arden of Faversham* (play) 17, 53, 192, 193, 194
- Aristophanes 18, 149, 161
– *Pax* 155
- Aristotle 17–18, 72, 78, 127, 149
– *Poetics* 127
- Arnold, Janet 107
- Arrell, Douglas 71
- Arthur, King 112
- Ascanius 29, 112, 130
- Ascham, Roger 6
– *Philoctetes* (translation of Sophocles's play) 6
- Asolo 172–3
- Astington, John 27, 68, 71
- Athena 14
- Atlas 31
- Augustus, Caesar 38, 66, 111, 177–8
- Baldwin, William
– *A memorial of suche princes, as since the tyme of king Richard the seconde, haue been vnfortunate in the realme of England* 8
- Barksted, William and Lewis Machin
– *The Insatiate Countess* 190
- Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher
– *The Maid's Tragedy* 18, 104, 124–5, 137–42
- Belchier, Dabridgcourt 53, 54, 56, 59
– *Hans Beer–Pot his inuisible comedie, of see me, and see me not* 16, 43, 51–60
- Bess of Hardwick 12, 14–15, 17, 68, 74, 104, 107–10, 112, 115, 196, 208
- Birnie, William 159–60
- Black, James 59
- Blackfriars Theatre 89, 153
- Boadicea 51
- Bolam, Robyn 71, 77
- Bowers, Fredson 89
- Bragadin, Marcantonio 166, 196, 199, 200, 201
- Brandt, Sebastian
– *Aeneid* (illustrated edition) 27

- Bright, Henry A. 205
 Brome, Richard
 – *The Sparagus Garden* 7
 Brooke, Samuel
 – *Adelphe* 145
 Brounker, Sir Henry 113
 Bruno, Giordano 157
 Brutus 1, 4, 27, 36, 37, 43, 49, 67, 93, 97,
 103, 112, 130
 Buckley, Emma 33
 Burnell, Henry
 – *Landgartha* 16, 43, 59
 Burton, Robert 197
 – *The Anatomy of Melancholy* 195
 Bushnell, Rebecca 73
 Butler, Chris 95, 98
 Butler, Martin 129
- Cadman, Daniel 12
 Camber 27
 Camilla 114
 Camoens, Luis Vaz de
 – *The Lusids* 15, 17
 Carr, Ralph 200
 Cartwright, Kent 123
 Cassandra 16–17, 81
 Catherine of Alexandria, Saint 173, 175
 Catherine of Aragon 55
 Cavendish, Henry 109
 Cavendish, Lady Jane and Lady Elizabeth
 Brackley 112–13
 – *The Concealed Fancies* 113
 Cavendish, William 68, 112–13
 Cecil, Robert 52
 Chancellor, Richard 28
 Chapman, George 69, 82, 89
 – *Iliad* (translation) 7, 9, 12, 16, 69–70, 71,
 130, 176
 – *Odyssey* (translation) 75, 135
 Charlemagne 86
 Charles I, King 12, 69, 98
 Charles, Prince (the future King Charles II) 12
 Charla of Lusignan 171, 172
 Charlotte of Lusignan 165–7, 169–70, 174–5,
 176, 189
 Charnes, Linda 65
- Chaucer, Geoffrey
 – *“The Wife of Bath’s Tale”* 147
 Cheney, Patrick 36, 37–8
 Chester, Charles 52
 Chettle, Henry 137
 – *The Tragedy of Hoffman: Or a Revenge
 for a Father* 18, 124, 131–7,
 142, 153
 Christ, Jesus 177–8, 190
 Cicero 131
 Circe 123
 Cleopatra 108–9, 113, 165–7, 176–8
 Clifford, Lady Anne 113
 Clubb, Louise George 145, 148, 154, 157
 Clytemnestra 17, 103, 116, 134
 Coke, John
 – *The Debate betwene the Heraldes of
 Englande and Fraunce* 86
 Cole, Douglas 65
 Coligny, Admiral Gaspard II de 34
*The Copie of a Letter sent by the French king
 to the people of Artoys and Henault,
 requesting them to remooue the forces
 gathered by the king of Spaine, from the
 Borders of France, otherwise
 denouncing open warre* 84
 Corinthus, King of Corinth 4
 Cornaro, Andrea 166
 Cornaro, Caterina 18, 165–76, 188
 – *Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus*
 (painting by Gentile Bellini) 175
 – *Portrait of Caterina Cornaro* 175
 Cornaro, Vincenzo 166
 Corneille, Pierre 189
 Coryate, Thomas 59, 66
 – *The Odcombian Banquet* 59
 Coureas, Nicholas 169
 Craik, T. W. 138–9, 140
 Creon 8
 Cressida 7, 65
 Crete 166, 195
 Creusa 8
 Crispo, Fiorenza 168
 Crispo, Niccolò, Duke of Naxos 168
 Cromwell, Oliver 12
 Crowley, Timothy D. 34

- Curran, John 93
 – *Roman Invasions* 93
- Cyprus 18–19, 165–77, 182–3, 187–91,
 193, 194–5, 196, 197, 199, 201, 208
- Cyrus 13, 31
- Daborne, Robert
 – *A Christian Turned Turk* 16, 49–51
- Dallam, Thomas 77
- Danaus 4
- Danett, Thomas 84
 – *A continuation of the historie of France
 from the death of Charles the eight
 where Comines endeth, till the death of
 Henry the second* 84
- Daniel, Samuel
 – *Cleopatra* 113
 – *Philotas* 12
- Dansiker, Simon 49, 51
- Dardanus 4
- Darius 31
- Day, John, William Rowley and George
 Wilkins
 – *The Travels of the Three English
 Brothers* 16, 43, 46, 47, 48–9
- De Chailly, Jean 169–70
- De Combort, William 170
- Dee, John 155
- Degenhardt, Jane Hwang 49
- De Girolami Cheney, Liana 167–8, 175
- Dekker, Thomas 14, 195
 – *The Magnificent Entertainment* 14
 – *Old Fortunatus* 189, 195
- De Corogna, Niccolò 169–70
- De Fenollet, Louis, Archbishop of
 Nicosia 172
- Delawarr, Thomas West, Lord 44
- De Lisle, Leanda 114, 115
- Della Porta, Giambattista 1, 154, 157
 – *L'Astrologo* 145, 146, 148,
 154, 161
 – *Chirofisonomia* 154
 – *La Turca* 148
- Demers, Patricia 116
- Desmet, Christy 4
- Devereux, Penelope 1, 7, 114, 205
- Devereux, Robert, Second Earl of Essex 7,
 16, 52, 56, 70, 82, 114–15, 205
 – *An Apology of the Earl of Essex Penned by
 Himself* 52
- Devereux, Walter 1
- Diana 37, 38, 173
- Dido 15, 27, 28, 34, 44–6, 48–9, 59, 83,
 141, 174
- Digby, John 205
- Digby, Sir John 205
- Digby, Sir Kenelm 205–6
 – *Loose Fantasies* 205–6
 – *Private Memoirs* 195, 206
- domestic performance 17
- Dowland, John
 – “*Flow my tears*” 147
- Dragut Rais 148
- Dryden, John 147
- Dudley, Robert, First Earl of Leicester 166
- Dürer, Albrecht 173
- East India Company 148
- Edward the Black Prince 90
- Edward II, King 11, 81, 84
- Edward III, King 81, 84
- Egypt 18, 165, 168, 176–9, 182–3
- Eleanor of Toledo 109
- Elizabeth I, Queen 11, 12, 34–5, 38, 45, 52,
 72, 82, 83, 85, 105, 107–8, 112, 114, 115,
 170–1, 176, 178, 193
- Elizabeth, Princess (daughter
 of Charles I) 12
- Elizabeth, Princess (daughter of James I
 and Anna of Denmark) 17, 81,
 82, 87, 89, 90, 91–3,
 98–9, 207
- Elliott, J. H. 93
- Endymion 134
- English College, Rome 158
- Ethelstane, King of the West Saxons 67
- Euripides 12, 116, 139
 – *Bacchae* 126
 – *Hecuba/Hecabe* 11, 103, 104
 – *Iphigenia at Aulis* 12, 116
 – *Medea* 18, 150
- Eurypilus 9

- The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley* (play) 16, 43, 45, 47, 48–9
- Fennor, William
- “A description of the Palsgraves Countrey, as it was delivered in a speech before the King, the Prince, the Lady Elizabeth, at White–Hall” 91, 93
- Fielitz, Sonja 6, 14
- Findlay, Alison 13
- Findlay, Alison and Vassiliki Markidou 2, 66
- Fisher, Jasper
- *Fuimus Troes* 94–9
- Fitzalan, Henry, Twelfth Earl of Arundel 116
- Fitzwilliam, Hugh 196
- Ford, John 19, 195, 196, 197, 199, 200–1, 205, 206–7
- *The Broken Heart* 19, 123, 199, 205, 206
 - *The Lady’s Trial* 196
 - *The Laws of Candy* 195
 - *Love’s Sacrifice* 196, 199
 - *The Lover’s Melancholy* 19, 187, 194–6, 197, 198, 199–201, 206, 208
 - *Perkin Warbeck* 195, 199, 205, 206
 - *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* 196, 199
- Fortune (playhouse) 147
- Francis, Duke of Alençon 34–5
- Francis I, King of France 84
- Frederick V, Elector Palatine 17, 81, 87, 89, 90, 91–3, 95, 98–9, 207
- Frye, Susan 107, 109, 110, 188
- Gabrieli, Vittorio 206
- Gager, William
- *Dido* 45
- Gainsford, Thomas 195
- Garber, Marjorie 191
- Gascoigne, George 197
- *A Devise of a Maske for the Right Honorable Viscount Montacute* 196–7
- Geoffrey of Anjou 81
- Geoffrey of Monmouth 37, 39
- *The History of the Kings of Britain* 27, 37
- Gerard, John
- *Herball* 188
- Gilchrist, Kim 1
- Globe Theatre 78
- Golding, Arthur 52
- *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe* 52
- Goldstein, David 104
- Goodman, Bishop Godfrey 113–14
- Gorboduc (Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville) 12
- Gosson, Stephen 123
- *The Schoole of Abuse* 123
- Goy–Blanquet, Dominique 1, 5
- Gracchus, Gaius 168
- Gracchus, Tiberius 168
- Greene, Robert
- *Euphues his censure to Philautus* 12, 16
- Grey, Lady Catherine 112, 115, 116
- Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent 113
- Grey, Lady Jane 12, 17, 115, 116, 208
- Grey, Lady Mary 116
- Griffin, Andrew 70
- Gristwood, Sarah 115
- Grivaud, Gilles 170, 174
- Guy of Lusignan 88, 167, 188
- Hainault, Sir John of 83–4
- Hakluyt, Richard 43, 166
- Halliwell, Edward
- *Dido* 45
- Hanna, Sara 2, 5–6, 10
- Harding, Samuel
- *Sicily and Naples, or, The Fatall Vnion* 34
- Hardwick Hall (New and Old) 12, 14, 17, 105, 107–10, 112–13
- Hardyng, John
- *Chronicle* 4
- Harington, Sir John 1
- *Metamorphosis of Ajax* 1
- Hariot, Thomas 28, 44, 157
- Harrison, William 74
- Harvey, Richard 103
- *Philadelphus, or a defence of Brutes* 103
- Hawkesworth, Walter
- *Labyrinthus* 145
- Heavey, Katherine 1, 12, 132
- Hebe 98

- Hector 3, 5, 7, 16–18, 69, 70, 72, 81, 99, 115, 138
 Hecuba 6, 16, 81, 131, 187
 Helen of Troy 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17, 35, 46, 59, 65, 66, 69, 71, 93, 94, 103, 132, 138, 187
 Helena Paleologa, Queen Consort of Cyprus 169, 174
 Heliodorus 206
 – *Aethiopica* 206
 Henri II, King of France 1
 Henry I of Cyprus 174
 Henry III, King of England 189
 Henry III, King of France 35
 Henry, King of Navarre (later Henry IV, King of France) 34–5, 84
 Henry V, King 88
 Henry VII, King 68, 103, 113–14
 Henry VIII, King 27, 53, 69, 112
 Henry, Prince 4, 87, 90, 98
 Henry Frederick, Electoral Prince of the Palatinate (son of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart) 92
 Hephestion 124
 Hera 14
 Heraclitus 78
 Herbert, William, First Earl of Pembroke 103
 Herbert, Lady Blanche, of Troy 103
 Herbert, Sir William, of Troy 103
 Hercules 5, 9, 11, 96, 98, 127
 Hesione 17, 103
 Heywood, Thomas 17, 71, 87
 – *An Apology for Actors* 17–18
 – *The Brazen Age* 71
 – *The Fair Maid of the West* 16, 43, 46
 – *The Four Prentices of London* 67, 82, 86–9, 167, 199
 – *The Iron Age* 71, 77, 81
 Hiscock, Andrew 73, 114
 Hodgson–Wright, Stephanie 116
 Holbein, Hans, the Younger 108
 Holford, Richard 205
 Holinshed, Raphael
 – *The Third volume of Chronicles* 189
 Holland, Peter 109–10
 Holland, Philemon 178
 Homer 1, 5, 7, 16, 35, 66, 69, 89, 123, 130, 149
 – *Iliad* 7, 9, 15, 70, 132, 149
 – *Odyssey* 10–11, 15, 75, 107, 108, 130–1, 149
 Honigmann, E. A. J. 188
 Howard, Alethea, Countess of Arundel 113
 Howard, Douglas 127
 Howell, James 167
 – *Epistolæ Ho–Eliaenæ* 167
 Hugh de Lusignan 189
 Hunyadi, Jan 57, 58
 Hurlburt, Holly 169, 172, 173, 175–6, 188
 Iasius 4
 Icarus 36
 Ingalls, Henry 145
 Iphigenia 6, 17, 116, 131, 208
 Isabella, Queen (wife of Edward II) 81
 Isabella of Angoulême, Queen 189
 Isis 176–7, 178
 Jacobson, Miriam 5
 James, Heather 1, 65, 70
 James I of Scotland 188
 James I and VI, King 4, 12, 14, 35, 82, 87, 91, 92, 113, 178, 189
 – *Lepanto* 191
 James II of Cyprus 166, 168, 169–71
 James III of Cyprus 166, 171
 Jane (Seymour), Queen 115
 Janus of Cyprus, King 188–9
 Janus of Lusignan 171
 Jason 49, 96, 132
 Jegon, John, Bishop of Norwich 3
 Jesuits 158
 John, King 92, 189
 John II of Cyprus 169
 John IV of Trebizond 168
 John VIII Palaiologos, Emperor of Constantinople 66
 John of Portugal, Prince of Antioch 175
 Johnnys, Maude 66

- Johnnys, Sir Hugh 66
 Johnson, Richard 14
 – *The Most Famous History of the Seaven Champions of Christendome* 13–14
 Jonson, Ben 6, 13, 14, 53, 147, 161
 – *The Alchemist* 147–8, 149, 150
 Joseph, Anastasios 4
 Juana II of Naples 174
The Judgement of Paris (carpet) 108
 Juno 37, 96

 Knapp, Jeffrey 83
 Knights of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem 169–70, 174, 176
 Knolles, Richard
 – *Generall Historie of the Turkes* 167
 Knutson, Roslyn 3
 Koronaios, Dionysios 4
 Kosovo, Battle of 57–8
 Kyd, Thomas 28
 – *The Spanish Tragedy* 50, 133, 147, 148
 – *The tragedye of Solymán and Perseda* 196

 Lavinia 111–12
 Lazarus 189–91
 Lepanto, Battle of 166
 Levenson, Jill 65, 69, 71
 Levey, Santina 112
 Liliiani, Giambattista 174
 Lithgow, William 2–3, 4, 5, 16, 73, 166, 196, 206
 – *The Totall discourse, of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travailes from Scotland, to the most famous kingdomes in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* 2–3, 13, 206–7
 Little, Arthur 178
 Lockey, Brian 47
 Locrine 27
Locrine (play) 12
 Louis XII, King of France 95
 Louis of Savoy 170, 174, 175, 188–9
 Lovascio, Domenico 6
 Lovell, Mary S. 107, 115
 Low Countries 52–4, 56, 57, 58, 59, 83, 84, 90

 Lucian 6, 27
 Lucrece 85
 Lumley, Lady Jane 17, 116, 208
 – *Iphigenia at Aulis* (translation of Euripides's play) 12, 17, 116
 Lycaon (son of Priam) 69
 Lydgate, John
 – *Troy Book* 59
 Lyly, John 19, 161
 – *Campaspe* 123, 124, 128, 130, 138, 142, 155, 193
 – *Endymion* 134
 – *Galatea* 193
 – *Sapho and Phao* 191, 192, 193–4

 MacDougall, Hugh A. 81
 McInnis, David 43
 – *Lost Plays Database* 67–8
 Maguire, Laurie 103
 Mahomet II, Emperor 5, 13
 Mallin, Eric S. 7
 Malta, Siege of 57–8
 Mansel, Sir Robert 206
 Manteo 28
 Margaret, Queen of Scots (sister of Henry VIII) 112
 Margaret of Valois 34
 Mark, Saint 167, 168, 169
 Markidou, Vassiliki 5, 27
 Marlowe, Christopher 5, 6, 7–8, 13, 15–16, 18, 27, 28–9, 31–2, 36, 38–9, 43–5, 47, 48–9, 51–2, 53, 55–6, 58–9, 60, 83, 84, 112, 116, 131, 145, 147, 157, 159
 – *All Ovid's Elegies* 38
 – *Baines Note* 28, 44
 – *Dido, Queen of Carthage* 27, 28–36, 39, 43, 44–5, 47, 59, 60, 83, 114, 131, 193
 – *Doctor Faustus* 8, 27, 35–6, 37, 38, 59, 71, 83, 98, 123, 133, 145, 150, 157–8, 159, 160–1
 – *Edward II* 8–11, 36–7, 38, 39, 82, 83–4
 – *Hero and Leander* 83, 105, 108, 140, 193
 – *The Jew of Malta* 51
 – *The Massacre at Paris* 34, 39
 – *Tamburlaine the Great* 7, 13, 27, 31–2, 38, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51–2, 55–6, 58–9, 60, 91, 131

- The marriage of Prince Fredericke,
and the Kings daughter,
the Lady Elizabeth*
(pamphlet) 92
- Marshall, Tristan 87, 89, 90
- Marston, John
– *The Malcontent* 3, 52–3
- Martha (sister of Lazarus) 190, 192, 194
- Martinengo, Nestore 195
– *The True Report of All the
Success of Famagosta*
(translated by William Malim)
166, 197
- Mary Magdalene 190
- Mary, Mother of Jesus 178
- Mary (sister of Lazarus) 190, 192, 194
- Mary, Queen of Scots 12, 103, 110, 115,
178, 189
- Mary Tudor, Queen of France 95, 112
- Maslen, Rob 65
- Massinger, Philip
– *The Roman Actor* 18, 124, 125–30, 142
- Maximilian I, Holy Roman
Emperor 173
- Mayne, Jasper 68
– *The City Match* 68
- Mazzola, Elizabeth 115
- Medea 103, 132, 150, 151, 152
- Meleager 32
- Melville, James 178
- Menelaus 94, 132, 138
- Middleton, Thomas
– *The Revenger's Tragedy* 190
- Miller, Jaroslav 90, 92
- Miola, Robert 12–13
- Mitsi, Efterpi 2, 3, 4, 73, 123, 165
- Mocenigo, Pietro 171–2
- Montaigne, Michel de 1, 5
- Monter, William 169
- Moro, Cristophoro, Doge of Venice 187
- Moryson, Fynes 166
- Moshenska, Joe 4–5, 206
- Mouskes, Philippe 1
- Mullaly, Terence 172
- Munster, Sebastian
– *Cosmographia* 108
- Muscovy Company 43
- Nardizzi, Vim 74
– *Wooden Os: Shakespeare's Theatres and
England's Trees* 74
- needlework 17, 68–9, 104–12,
116, 208
- Nestor 46
- Nesvet, Rebecca 187
- Netzloff, Mark 44
- Nixon, Anthony
– *The Three English Brothers* 46–7
- Norwich, John Julius 171–2, 173
- Nuttall, A. D. 6
- Oakley–Brown, Liz 7, 9
- Octavia 166–7
- Odysseus 10–11, 130
- Oenone 141
- Ogle, Sir John 53, 59
- Olson, Rebecca 109
- Orpheus 36, 96
- Ortelius, Abraham 84, 187
– *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* 84
- Ovid 36, 37–8, 39, 54, 73, 112, 150, 192
– *Metamorphoses* 104, 126
- Pagello, Bartolomeo 171
- Palfrey, Simon and Emma Smith 72
- Pandarus 7
- Paris (son of Priam) 69, 96, 132, 138
- Parker, Rozsika 107
- Paten, William 83
- Patroclus 9, 16, 69, 130
- Patterson, W. B. 3–4
- Peacham, Henry
– *Prince Henrie Revived* 92
- Peele, George
– *The araygnment of Paris* 66–7
– *The Battle of Alcazar* 16, 43, 46, 47–9
- Penelope 5, 10–11, 12, 17, 104, 107, 108, 109,
110, 112, 187, 208
- Petersson, R. T. 205–6
- Pettegree, Jane 89, 92
- Phaedra 125
- Phaer, Thomas 67
– *Aeneidos* 67
- Phaethon 36
- Philip, Duke of Burgundy 1

- Philippe IV, King of France 81
 Philomel 111, 134
Phoenissae (lost play) 8
 Pincombe, Mike 193
 Pius II, Pope 5, 169
 Plato 78
 Plautus 139
 Plutarch 113, 177, 178
 – *The Philosophie* (translated by Philemon Holland) 177, 182
 Pollard, Tanya 6, 11, 12, 116, 131
 Polyxena 16, 81
 Priam 4, 14, 18, 29, 33, 34, 46, 69–70, 81, 130, 131, 132
 Proserpina 178
 Publicover, Laurence 48–9
 Purkiss, Diane 116
 Pythagoras 159
- Qaitbay, Abu Al–Nasr Sayf ad–Din Al–Ashraf, Sultan of Egypt 169, 170
 Queen's Men (playing company) 109
- Racine, Jean 189
 Raleigh, Sir Walter 178
 Red Bull Theatre 147
 Reid, Lindsay Ann 138
The Return of Ulysses to Penelope (painting) 108
 Rhodes 18, 169
 Rhodes, Neil 27
 Rich, Henry 206
 Richard I (the Lionheart), King 167, 188
 Richard II, King 8, 11, 36
 Richard of Cornwall (son of King John) 92
 Richardson, Ruth Elizabeth 103
 Robert II, Duke of Normandy 87
 Robinson, Philip 1
 Romulus 28
 Rowley, William
 – *The Birth of Merlin* 156
 Rubright, Marjorie 52
 Ruggle, George
 – *Ignoramus* 145
 Rutter, Tom 47
 Rymer, Thomas 187
- Sandys, George 27, 196
 Sanudo, Fiorenza, Lady of Milos 173
 Scafì, Alessandro 179
 – *Mapping Paradise: A History of Heaven on Earth* 179
 Scota 4
 Selene 134
 Seymour, Edward, First Earl of Hertford 115
 Seymour, Edward, Lord Beauchamp (grandson of Edward Seymour, First Earl of Hertford) 115
 Seymour, Francis, First Baron Seymour of Trowbridge (grandson of Edward Seymour, First Earl of Hertford) 115
 Seymour, William, Marquess of Hertford (husband of Arbella Stuart and grandson of Edward Seymour, First Earl of Hertford) 114, 115
 Shakespeare, William 1–2, 6, 13, 16, 38–9, 43, 53, 55, 60, 65, 66, 68, 70–1, 72, 75, 77–8, 82, 109, 110, 123, 124, 136, 145, 146, 147, 178, 180, 182, 183, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193
 – *Antony and Cleopatra* 18, 109, 165–6, 176–83
 – *As You Like It* 38–9
 – *The Comedy of Errors* 146
 – *Coriolanus* 54–5, 109–12, 146
 – *Cymbeline* 109, 111, 177
 – *Edward III* 82, 84–5
 – *Hamlet* 8, 10–11, 18, 50, 54, 124, 129, 130–1, 132, 133, 136, 137, 140, 142, 160, 192–3
 – *Henriad* 7
 – *Henry V* 82, 85–6, 88, 89
 – *Henry VI* (parts 1, 2 and 3) 82, 85
 – *King Lear* 190, 192–3
 – *Love's Labour's Lost* 9, 127
 – *Macbeth* 12
 – *The Merchant of Venice* 51
 – *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 38
 – *A Midsummer Night's Dream* 13, 104–7, 135, 136–7, 140, 150, 156
 – *Othello* 18–19, 110, 165–7, 187–94, 195–6, 197–8, 200, 201, 208
 – *Pericles* 106–7
 – *Richard II* 8–9

- *Richard III* 17, 71
- *Romeo and Juliet* 136, 196
- *The Tempest* 45, 123, 146
- *Timon of Athens* 12–13, 123
- *Titus Andronicus* 12, 111–12, 152
- *Troilus and Cressida* 1–2, 7, 12, 13, 16, 65, 68, 70–1, 72–8, 88, 103, 123, 124, 138
- *Twelfth Night* 7, 198
- *Two Noble Kinsmen* 13, 105–6
- *Venus and Adonis* 191
- Shakespeare, William and John Fletcher
 - *Henry VIII* 55
- Shelley, Mary 156
 - *Frankenstein* 156
- Sherley, Sir Anthony 165
- Sherley, Theresia, Lady 48
- Shute, William 59
 - *The Triumphs of Nassau* (translation) 59
- Sidney, Sir Philip 54, 58, 60, 205, 206, 207
 - *Arcadia* 205, 207
 - *Astrophil and Stella* 205, 206
- Sidney, Sir Robert 56
- Silk, Michael 6
- Silvius 37, 112, 130
- Singer, S. W. 74
- Smith, Sir Thomas 28, 45
- Smith, William 90
 - *The Hector of Germany. Or The Palsgrave, prime Elector* 82, 90–4
- Socrates 153
- Spates, William 197
- Spencer, Terence 66
- Stanivukovic, Goran 14
- Stanley, Venetia 205–6
- Steen, Sara Jayne 113
- Steggle, Matthew 6, 68, 205
- Sthenoboea 125
- Story of Aeneas, The* (tapestries) 27
- Stow, John 67
 - *A Survey of London* 67, 77
- Strachey, William 67
 - *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia* 67
- Strada, Famiamus
 - *Prolusiones* 200
- Stradling, Sir Edward 199, 205
 - *Winning of the Lordship of Glamorgan* 199
- Strauss, Barry 66
- Stringer, Philip 67–8
- Strong, Roy 89
- Stuart, Arbella 14–15, 109, 112–16
- Stuart, Charles, First Earl of Lennox 112
- Stukeley, Captain Thomas 1, 47
- Talbot, George, Earl of Shrewsbury 108
- Tamburlaine (Timur) 32–3, 38, 83
- Tatlock, John S. P. 7
- Taylor, John 87, 93
 - *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy* 87, 93
- Teiresias 153
- Telemachus 11, 130
- Tereus 134
- Theseus 138
- Thomas, Vivian and Nicki Faircloth 188
- Tomkis, John 159
 - *Albuzar* 18, 66, 145–61
 - *Lingua* 149, 151, 153
- Towerson, William 28
- translatio imperii* 8, 15, 16, 27–8, 36, 38, 39, 43, 48, 94, 130
- Trinity College, Cambridge 145, 152, 154, 155
- Troilus 7, 18, 65
- Troye* (play) 71
- Tudor, Owen 114
- Turnus 32, 88
- Ulysses 3, 12, 16, 59
- The Valiant Welshman* (play) 51
- Venice 165–76, 188, 196
- Venus 19, 35, 37, 96, 124, 128, 165, 171, 173, 175, 177, 187, 191, 192, 193–4, 195, 208
- Vere, Sir Francis 59
- Vergil, Polydore 114
- Virgil 35, 37, 39, 47, 111, 114
 - *Aeneid* 15, 27, 33, 35, 67, 71, 88, 114
- Virginia 44–5
- Virginia Company 27

- Waad, Armagill 27
- Wake, Sir Isaac 68
- Walsh, Michael J. K. 196
- Wanchese 28
- Ward, John 49–50
- Warner, Walter 27–8
- Warner, William 27–8, 36
 - *Albions England* 27, 36
- Wase, Christopher 12
- Webster, John
 - *The Duchess of Malfi* 153, 190
- Werner, Hans 90
- Wiggins, Alison 108
- Wiggins, Martin 47, 71
- William the Conqueror 81, 86–7, 167
- Williams, John 4
- Wilson, Mary Floyd 45
- Wilson–Okamura, David Scott 44
- Wolfe, Jessica 70
- Xenophon 6, 27
 - *Cyropaideia* 27
- Young, Patrick 4
- Zamora Cathedral Museum 68