THE POLITICS OF RAPE

SEXUAL ATROCITY, PROPAGANDA WARS, AND THE RESTORATION STAGE

JENNIFER L. AIREY

The Politics of Rape

The Politics of Rape

Sexual Atrocity, Propaganda Wars, and the Restoration Stage

Jennifer L. Airey

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE PRESS
Newark

Published by University of Delaware Press
Co-published with The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706
www.rowman.com

10 Thornbury Road, Plymouth PL6 7PP, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2012 by Jennifer L. Airey

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Airey, Jennifer L., 1980-
The politics of rape : sexual atrocity, propaganda wars, and the Restoration stage / Jennifer L. Airey.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-61149-404-4 (cloth : alk. paper) -- ISBN 978-1-61149-405-1(electronic)
1. English drama--Restoration, 1660-1700--History and criticism. 2. Rape in literature. 3. Rape victims in literature. 4. Violence in literature. 5. Politics and literature--England--History--17th century. 6. Theater--Political aspects--England--History--17th century. 7. Propaganda, British--History--17th century. I. Title.
PR698.R345A37 2012
822'.4093552--dc23
2012021813

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction 1

1 Rape and the Rehabilitation of Royalist Identity, 1660–1665 31

Political Propaganda in the 1640s: The Trope of the Debauched Cavalier 33

Redeeming the Cavaliers: Orrery's *The Generall* 38

Porter, Howard, and the Trope of the Debauched Usurper 45

Howard's *The Usurper* and the Trope of the Poisonous Catholic Bride 51

Conclusion 59

2 Rape and the Roots of Discontent, 1666–1677 65

Dryden's *Amboyna* and the Trope of the Demonic Dutchman 70

Male Libertinism and the Poisonous Catholic Mistress: 1670s Propaganda 77

Male Abdication, Female Poison: Settle's *Love and Revenge* 85

The Debauched Libertine and the Failure of Female Revenge: Shadwell's *The Libertine* 94

Conclusion: Behn's *The Rover, Part I* and Political Ambivalence on the Eve of the Popish Plot 100

3 Lucrece Narratives: Rochester, Lee, and the Ethics of Regicide 111

Rochester's *Valentinian* and the Limits of Monarchical Authority 116

Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* and the Dangers of Revolt 128

Conclusion 143

4 Rape and the Cannibal Father, 1678–1687 147

The Exclusion Crisis and the Politics of Familial Collapse 152

Staging Intrafamilial Conflict: Otway and Lee 159
Crowne's *Thyestes* and the Horrors of the Cannibal Father 165
Defending Absolute Monarchy: Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* 174
Conclusion 181

5 Rape in the Aftermath of Revolution: Images of Male Rape, 1688–1699 189
Warring Words: Propaganda in the 1690s 192
Articulating Jacobite Sympathies: Settle's *Distress'd Innocence* 203
Defending the Revolution: Variations on the Trope of Male Rape 207
Conclusion 216

Works Cited 223

Index 243

About the Author 251

Acknowledgments

I want to begin by expressing my deep gratitude to Boston University's James A. Winn, who has supported this project every step of the way from inception to completion. I am extremely thankful for his mentorship, his wisdom, and his unfailingly correct advice over the years. I could not have completed this book without the support of Erin Murphy, whose unwavering enthusiasm and shrewd commentary guided me through the writing process. I am also very thankful to have had the opportunity to work with Anna Battigelli, whose insightful remarks guided the complete transformation of this project from doctoral dissertation to its present form. I would like to express my gratitude to Bill Carroll, who has supported me at each stage of my career. And I would like to thank John-Paul Riquelme, who first suggested I write about sexual violence in a graduate seminar on Yeats, planting the intellectual seeds for this project.

I have been fortunate to complete this book at the University of Tulsa, where I enjoy a wonderfully caring and brilliant group of colleagues. Lars Engle and Laura Stevens have provided me with unstinting encouragement and advice, and I am extremely grateful for their mentorship. I am especially grateful to Holly Laird for her intellectual generosity; she went above and beyond the call of duty reading drafts of every chapter, and her incisive commentary greatly improved the manuscript. Thanks also to Mark Rideout, my graduate assisstant, for his time and careful attention to this manuscript.

This project has been supported by several grants that enabled me to complete my research. I would like to thank the Boston University Humanities Foundation for funding a research trip to London. I am also grateful to the University of Tulsa's Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, which awarded me two Faculty Development Summer Fellowships, enabling me to spend my summers writing. I am also grateful to the staff at Harvard Univer-

sity's Widener and Houghton Libraries, Yale University's Beinecke Library, and the University of Tulsa's McFarlin Library, as well as to the staff at the British National Archives for enabling my research.

I would like to offer my thanks to the insightful readers of the University of Delaware Press, whose feedback has led to a stronger work. I would also like to thank Donald Mell and Julia Oestreich for guiding my book to publication.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Barbara and Ron Airey, for their love and support, and my uncle, Stuart Millner, who has read more drafts of each chapter than I could begin to count.

Introduction

A Bloody Tragedie, Or Romish Maske. Acted by five Iesuites and sixteene young Germaine Maides, a 1607 anti-Catholic propaganda tract, claims to offer its reader proof of the dangers posed by Roman Catholicism and Roman Catholic priests. Supposedly a true story, the tract details the actions of five Jesuit priests who took up residence in the town of Miniken, Germany, ostensibly to serve the spiritual needs of the townspeople. Cruel and lascivious by nature, they quickly became enamored of sixteen innocent young women with whose spiritual welfare they had been entrusted: The "five Iesuites became five lascivious Lovers; & no fewer than Sixteen Virgins must sacrifice their chast bodies, to satisfie their lust."[1] Initially, the women refuse to sacrifice their virtue, but the priests assuage their fears, promising to use the powers of their office to absolve the women of sin and shelter them from secular shame. One priest explains, "If you feare to commit the sinne, I can absolve you; if you feare your parents anger, I have strength (by vertue of my Order) to defend you from them; if you feare the scandall of the world, I can plucke out the stings of envie, that they shall not hurt you, and stop up the mouth of slander, that she shall not dare to name you."[2] The priests also insist that no one will know if the women succumb; the sanctity of the confessional is such that "the Infant in the mothers bosome is not more safe, than you are in my chamber," underscoring the anti-Catholic belief that the privacy of the confessional concealed a multitude of sexual sins.[3] Finally, the virgins succumb, some to seduction, others to rape. "[N]ow no more maidens, but holy-mens harlots," they are imprisoned in the church, leaving their families distraught and the women pregnant and miserable: "All of them were great with childe, and more great with calamite."[4]

After several months of imprisonment, the women begin to beg for their freedom. One woman pleads, “if she might not be suffered to behold the face of her parents any more, nor to breathe that ayre in which she was borne, that then [the priests] would commit her to the handes of any hard hearted man, who (as they might not kill her) should bee inioyned to let her upon any foreigne shoare, were it never so farre from her . . . native Countrie.”[5] Unfortunately, the Jesuits cannot risk discovery, and with the women becoming more of a liability than a pleasure, they devise a plan of their own. They write and eventually perform a masque: In a parody of the Holy Mass, each woman, big with child, is led to the altar of the church where, instead of being offered the sacrament, she is forced to plead for her life. Then the Jesuits come forward as a group and “with a great Iron Bullet; beate out her braines.”[6] None of the women survives the massacre, and the priests are eventually exposed and punished harshly for their crimes: “All the five Iesuites being placed in a Wagon, and drawne through the Citie, had their flesh at nine severall times pinched with hot burning pincers from them; and in three severall parts of their bodies, great peeces sliced along with knyves; then were their arms and legges broken on the Wheele, and were they left languishing till they expired.”[7] Thus the town of Minikin—and via the pamphlet, all of England—learns of the dangers posed by the treacherous and violent Jesuit order.

Written in the wake of the successfully disrupted 1605 Gunpowder Plot, *A Bloody Tragedie* represents an example of the most virulent anti-Catholic propaganda. The pamphlet begins by leveling a series of charges at Jesuit priests:

> They say the Iesuites are bloody, and stirrers up [sic] sedition in Christian kingdomes, that they are lyars, that they are proude, that they delight in rich apparell, that they are wherried up and down by Coaches, that they have traines of followers at their heels, as if they were great Earles . . . that they are Epicures, and make their belly their god, that they are lascivious, and love women, having Gentlewomen for their chamber-maides and young wenches for their bedfellowes.[8]

The Jesuits are unspiritually obsessed with secular powers and pleasures; that they are also sexually violent and dangerous links rape imagery with the rhetoric of anti-Catholicism. By constructing the scene of murder as a form of theatrical production in which the priests serve as principal actors, the text also links the combined rhetorics of rape and anti-Catholicism with the discourse of antitheatricalism. The theater in *A Bloody Tragedie's* construction becomes a place of perverted religion, idolatry, sexual immorality, and ultimately hellish murder.

The story of *A Bloody Tragedie*, while horrifying, is not unique in the political culture of the seventeenth century, and it encompasses many of the accusations that would be made against Catholics and Catholic clergy throughout the century. The events that provoked the spread of propaganda—the Gunpowder Plot, the so-called Spanish match,[9] the Irish Rebellion and English Civil Wars, and after the Restoration, the Popish Plot, Exclusion Crisis, and Glorious Revolution—varied throughout the century; the litany of charges remained remarkably static. Perhaps most central to the construction of rape as political discourse, however, was the reaction to the Irish Rebellion of 1641, an event that elicited a powerful contemporary response and whose emotional resonance persisted for over a hundred years. The rhetoric of the Irish Rebellion tracts would be repeatedly resurrected from 1641 onward, providing a consistent set of rhetorical tropes for subsequent generations of propagandists; to reference the Irish Rebellion was to encode via shorthand the worst instances of Catholic barbarity. Historically, the rebellion began on October 23, 1641, feast day of Jesuit founder Ignatius Loyola, when Ireland's Catholic population rose up against the English Protestants. The English were taken by surprise, and before the rebellion could be quashed, anywhere from two thousand to three hundred thousand English Protestants had been killed in extremely brutal and sometimes sexually violent ways.[10] According to the deposition of survivor Occar Butts, the rebels "threatned to Murther him this deponent and his wife, And also some of that Companye offered divers tymes, to violate and ravishe some of his Chilldren."[11] While Butts and his family escaped, others were not so lucky. George Burne described how "the barbarous rebells first ravished" the Protestant "Mr Allens Wiffe as before her husbands face as the rest were murthering him: and instantly after they murthered heir alsoe."[12] Similarly, Samson Moore of Cork County described the death of Robert Scott, along with his wife and children: The Irish confiscated

> most of the said Scotts Goods. And the night following they murdered the said Scott & his ffamily [sic] . . . the Rogues Ravished 2 of the said Scotts Daughters before they murdered them, and that Scotts wife being a lusty woman & passionatley [sic] moued, with these outrages towards her husband & daughters, Stroue & fought with them . . . but therein shee was wounded by them, & therewith falling downe, before shee was dead, they threw her & the rest, into a saw pitt, and Scotts wife yet aliue they threw earth vpon her, & buried her.[13]

Within the year, accounts of the uprising had spread throughout England through a series of tracts that described the inconceivably barbarous acts of violence committed against innocent English citizens. According to the eighteenth-century account included in John Foxe's highly influential *Acts*

and Monuments, Irish ruffians attacked the elderly, the young, and the infirm alike, without compassion or surcease. Hundreds were mutilated and left to die painful, lingering deaths:

> Many women, of all ages, were put to deaths of the most cruel nature. Some, in Particular, were fastened with their backs to strong posts, and being stripped to their waists, the inhuman monsters cut off their right breasts with shears, which, of course, put them to the most excruciating torments; and in this position they were left, till, from the loss of blood, they expired.[14]

Nor were pregnant women safe from the carnage. *Acts and Monuments* continues: "Many unhappy mothers were hung naked in the branches of trees, and their bodies being cut open, the innocent offsprings were taken from them, and thrown to dogs and swine. And to increase the horrid scene, they would oblige the husband to be a spectator before suffering himself."[15]

Texts such as Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* constructed a discourse of English Protestant martyrdom in which the events of the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the Irish Rebellion, and later the Popish Plot revealed the continuing dangers posed by the Catholic presence in England. But the *Book of Martyrs* was not alone in describing such atrocities. The violent Irish Catholic savage—what I am terming the figure of the demonic Irishman who vented his spleen on innocent English Protestant martyrs—is omnipresent in the political tracts of the period. *A Bloody Battell: Or the Rebels Overthrow, and Protestants Victorie* (1641), for instance, describes the deaths of one Mr. Atkins and his wife, who were attacked by the Irish. After beating the husband to death, the rebels "layd hold on his wife being big with child, & ravisht her, then ript open her wombe, and like so many *Neroes* undantedly viewing natures bed of Conception, afterward tooke her and her Infant and sacrifiz'd in fire their wounded bodies."[16] James Salmon, author of *Bloudy Newes from Ireland* (1641), likewise relates how the rebels attacked a town of rich merchants, "first deflowering many of the women, then cruelly murdering them, and pulling them about the street by the haire of the head, and dashing their childrens brains out against the posts and stones in the street, and tossing their children upon their pikes."[17] The anonymous author of *The Bloudy Persecution of the Protestants in Ireland* (1641) describes how the Irish rebels raped Sir Patricke Dunson's wife before his eyes and then "cut out his tongue, and afterward to put him out of his paine, they ran a red hot Iron into his bowels and so he died."[18] The encounter between Sir Patricke and the rebels begins with the rape of the wife and concludes with an act of sodomitical rape that implicitly recalls both the death of King Edward II and the accusations of sodomy that frequently followed Catholic clergy.[19]

Similarly violent representations of the demonic Irishman were resurrected after the Restoration, becoming particularly prevalent between the years of the Popish Plot (1678–1681) and the Glorious Revolution (1688–1689), when authors sought either to defend or delegitimize James II's right to the English throne. *A Full and True Account Of The Inhumane and Bloudy Cruelties Of The Papists To The Poor Protestants In Ireland, In the Year. 1641* (1689) reprints the stories of Mr. Atkins and his wife from the 1641 tract *A Bloody Battell*, while *The Manner of the Burning the Pope in Effigies in London On the 5th of November, 1678* (1678) describes how three hundred thousand people were killed or dismembered in Ireland, "some of their Tongues, others of their Hands and Privities."[20] Catholics are, such tracts claim, trained to foment "cruel Massacres, / To murder Kings, and burn their Palaces; / Lay Cities low in Dust, no Treason spare, / Embroil the Nations in a Civil War."[21] They "breathe after the blood of the King, and of all Protestants," and hunt "the blood of Innocents" as they await another opportunity to rebel. [22] Thus *A Scheme Of Popish Cruelties or A Prospect of what wee must Expect under a Popish Successor* (1681) offers a vision of England under Catholic rule: "Ruffians and Hectors, Popish Priests, Jesuites, Monks, and the rest of the Black Guard to the Prince of Darkness, endeavou[r] to Ravish your Wives, your Daughters, your Sisters, and your Mothers."[23] The Catholics beat "out the Brains of Infants, and snatc[h] them out of their tender Mothers Arms; which being done, they likewise put the Mothers also to the Sword."[24] Such threats persisted throughout the century; as late as 1700, *An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland* described how the rebels attacked Protestant ministers and violated their wives:

> their manner was first to strip them, and after bind them to a Tree or Post, where they pleased, and then to ravish their Wives and Daughters before their faces (in sight of their merciless rable) with the basest Villain they could pick out, after they hanged up the Husbands and Parents before their faces, then cut them down before they were half dead then quarter'd them, after dismember'd them and stopped their mouths therewith.[25]

William III's rule is all that stands between England and the violence of a Catholic Stuart monarch.

Taken together, all of these tracts reveal how deeply images of rape and sexualized violence saturated the discourse of seventeenth-century English political culture. Sexual violence pervades the pamphlet debates, appearing regularly in works of political propaganda and religious controversy and suggesting that authors relied on the language of rape both to reinforce the righteousness of their positions and to spur the populace to swift and often violent action. Authors of pamphlet tracts also counted on the use of sexual assault to garner popular interest and ensure commercial success. Propaganda sheets openly advertised their sexually violent contents on their cover

pages; popular descriptions include a *true relation of all those cruell rapes and murders which have lately beene committed by the Papists in Ireland*,[26] *The Rebels Turkish Tyranny . . . shewing how they . . . ravished religious women*,[27] and *Bloudy News from Ireland, Or The barbarous Crueltie by the Papists used in that Kingdome. By putting men to the sword, deflowring Women; and dragging them up and downe the Streets, and cruelly murdering them, and thrusting their Speeres through their little Infants before their eyes.*[28] The promise of sexually violent atrocities could sell copies to a scandal-obsessed consumer audience.

If rape imagery was particularly popular with audiences of newssheets and propaganda tracts, it was also popular among London's seventeenth-century theater audiences. The Restoration stage, like the propaganda sheets, was suffused with depictions of onstage sexual violence, leading John Dennis to complain in 1721 that "Rape is the peculiar Barbarity of our English stage."[29] Dennis wondered why female spectators would "sit . . . quietly and passively at the Relation of a Rape in a Tragedy, as if they thought that Ravishing gave them a Pleasure."[30] Recently, modern critics have attempted to account for the popularity of such material. Elizabeth Howe and Jean Marsden, for example, have linked the prevalence of onstage rape with the arrival of the first English actresses. Rape, they argue, allowed playwrights to showcase the salacious spectacle of the female body in all its violated and seminude glory. According to Marsden, "the audience, like the rapist, 'enjoys' the actress, deriving its pleasure from the physical presence of the female body."[31] Elizabeth Howe concurs: "Rape became a way of giving the purest, most virginal heroine a sexual quality. It allowed dramatists to create women of such 'greatness' and 'perfect honour' as was felt to be appropriate to tragedy and heroic drama, but at the same time to exploit sexually the new female presence in the theatre."[32] More recently, however, Derek Hughes has disputed such claims, pointing out that very few rape plots accompanied the actual advent of the English actress: "Although the portrayal of rape has been associated with the advent of the actresses, the first scene of accomplished rape in Restoration drama is in fact not until 1672."[33] Although scenes of rape were undeniably titillating, it wasn't until the late 1670s and 1680s that rape became a regular dramatic occurrence, suggesting that a desire to display female flesh did not immediately spark an interest in sexually violent drama.

Perhaps more satisfyingly, then, Susan J. Owen has linked an increase in dramatic sexual violence to the political unrest of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. The image of the rapist, she argues, merges with the image of the monarchical tyrant, and thus rape features frequently in both Whig and Tory propaganda: "Both Whigs and Tories used rape as a trope of the monstrous, associated by Tories with rebellion, and by Whigs with popery and arbitrary government."[34] Owen's argument is certainly convincing, but it does not

account for the growth and change in representations of rape during the wider period, nor does it consider the relationship between the drama and the broader culture of contemporary political writings. To understand fully the treatment of dramatic rape, we need to examine the continuities between depictions of rape onstage and the culture of sexually violent propaganda offstage. This monograph therefore takes as its starting point the assertion that English Civil War propagandists constructed a triad of stock figures or tropes—the aforementioned demonic Irishman, along with what I have named the debauched Cavalier and the poisonous Catholic bride—that were co-opted by the English stage. The demonic Irishman, as we have already seen, was a rapist, a thief, and an infanticide. Closely associated with the demonic Irishman was his political ally, the debauched Cavalier, the royalist supporter who wandered the country like a roving demon in the night, spreading violence, mayhem, and destruction in his wake. The debauched Cavalier, Roundhead polemicists argued, was a thief, a blasphemer, a murderer and a rapist, a drunkard, a cannibal, and most damningly, a secret Catholic, seeking to extend the dominion of the pope's tyranny in England. Frequently, he was married to a poisonous Catholic bride who, as parliamentarian propagandists famously wrote of Queen Henrietta Maria, used her sexual desirability and nighttime access to her husband to poison him against natural English Protestant interests. The poisonous Catholic bride was not herself a rapist, but she suborned, incited, and celebrated sexual assault, encouraging the debauchery of her Cavalier and Catholic allies in an effort to martyr and destroy innocent Protestant women. In all of these instances, authors link the discourse of royalism with descriptions of rape and Catholicism.

Similar rhetoric would be resurrected throughout the latter half of the century, images of rape coming to the political forefront in each new instance of social and governmental turmoil. After the Restoration, the demonic Irishman, debauched Cavalier, and poisonous Catholic bride were joined by a new group of stock political figures also intimately associated with acts of sexual violence: The demonic Dutchman, the ravished monarch, and the cannibal father. The demonic Dutchman, villain of the Anglo-Dutch wars and of early Jacobite writings, was the Protestant counterpart of the demonic Irishman. A rapist, a liar, a murderer, and a thief, the demonic Dutchman was obsessed with the destruction of English trade, seeking to commit "rapes" upon English liberties and to undermine English economic stability by any means possible. Jacobite propaganda, as we shall see, frequently linked such imagery with the trope of the ravished monarch, using the image of a male rape victim to describe and condemn the nation's treatment of James II. James had been "ravished" of his throne by his ungrateful daughter and her corrupt Dutch husband, leaving England at the mercy of the hypocritical and treacherous United Provinces. In contrast, Whig propagandists foregrounded

the dangerous figure of the cannibal father, the evil patriarch who rapes his sons' wives before finally and horrifyingly ingesting his own offspring. Through the figure of the cannibal father, Whig authors responded to and dismissed the tenets of patriarchal political theory: If the monarch is allowed absolute and unfettered power, such tracts insisted, even rape and cannibalism are permissible under his regime. Together with the English Civil War stock figures, then, these new characters pervaded late seventeenth-century propaganda and theater, reflecting the centrality of rape imagery to political culture both onstage and off.

The Politics of Rape is a book about sexual violence as a pivotal attribute of the late seventeenth century's literature of atrocity. This literature amasses a shifting and overlapping matrix of tropes used throughout the period to evince feelings of political impotence, hatred, or fear. Integral to all representations of political atrocity, whether Roundhead or Cavalier, Whig or Tory, Williamite or Jacobite, are descriptions of constant, perverse, and explicit sexual violence; to examine the rhetoric of seventeenth-century political tracts is to uncover a deep morass of violent imagery, united above all by the trope of the raped body. From the poisonous Catholic bride of English Civil War pamphlets to the cannibal father of the Exclusion Crisis and the ravished monarch of the Jacobite tracts, the stock characters of propaganda culture are defined by their relationship to sexual assault. While such violence may be unpalatable to the modern reader, it is crucial to understanding contemporary responses to political movements both onstage and off in the later seventeenth century. That authors on either side of each political conflict drew on a single pool of atrocity imagery also helps to explain the difficulty royalists, Tories, and later Jacobites faced in deflecting accusations of violence and developing their own effective counterpropaganda apart from the language of their enemies.

The prevalence of rape imagery in seventeenth-century political discourse begs the question of why such acts feature prominently throughout the period. First and foremost, images of rape could elicit a swift and powerful response from the reader, even as they provided an efficient shorthand for encoding multiple forms of social, political, and economic violation. Legally, rape was treated as a form of property crime until well into the eighteenth century, and thus it provided an emotionally charged vocabulary for property loss. As a woman belonged to her husband or father in accordance with the rules of coverture, her violation represented an encroachment on male property rights. The original financial conception of the crime is evident in the Latin word *rapere*, "to seize," from which the English word "rape" is derived. To commit a rape is to take without permission the female chattel of the man—father, brother, husband—to whom she rightfully belongs. Emily Detmer-Goebel comments, "Early statutory law dating from the late thirteenth-century conflated sexual assault with abduction, blurring the distinc-

tion between the two. Long understood as a property crime, 'rape' either by physical abduction (which would often include a forced marriage and sexual consummation) or by 'defilement against her will' fell into the same category of wrong."[35] The First Statute of Westminster (1275)—one of the earliest instances of antirape legislation—emphasized the conflation of abduction with sexual assault when it decreed that "none do ravish, nor take away by Force, any Maiden within Age (neither by her own Consent, nor without) nor any Wife or Maiden of full Age, nor any other Woman against her Will."[36] Ten years later, the Second Statute of Westminster increased the penalty for rape from a fine and two years' imprisonment to death and enacted a provision making rape a capital crime, even in cases where the victim "consent[ed] afterward."[37] Since, in J. B. Post's words, "it is arguable that some couples used [rape accusations] to offset family objections to socially disparaging matches,"[38] through Westminster II, a woman could no longer consent to sex after the fact by agreeing to marry her attacker; this provision limited abductions to circumvent parental matrimonial disapproval. Westminster II thus decreased the law's reliance upon the victim's testimony in the prosecution of rape cases: by "discounting a woman's consent, the wishes of others—technically the Crown, but, by extension, family—were allowed to override her own, despite her nominal status as victim."[39] Rape in this construction is an assault on a family and, more specifically, on a patriarchal estate, not a crime against an individual's will.

Later laws diminished even further the importance of female sexual consent. *6 Richard 2* (1382) established that proof of a woman's permission could no longer free an accused rapist, emphasizing the irrelevance of female subjectivity to the prosecution of rape. According to T. E., author of *The Lawes Resolutions of Womens Rights: Or, the Lawes Provision for Women* (1632), *6 Richard 2* "was made to punish women, which consented to their ravishers."[40] If a woman agreed to marry her attacker, she forfeited her dowry and family inheritance, once again ensuring the economic stability of noble families. Later, *3 Henry 7* (1487) and *4 & 5 Phi. & Mary* also emphasized the economic dangers of rape, declaring that ravishment would be considered a felony only in the case of "takers for lucre, of maids, widdowes, or wives, having substance of lands or goods, or being heires apparent."[41]

The treatment of rape in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* exemplifies the fiscal understanding of sexual violence, while also moving beyond it to reflect new laws established in consideration of consent. Initially, the men of *Titus Andronicus* overwhelmingly view any assault on Lavinia in the older tradition of property crime. When Bassianus seizes Lavinia from Saturninus, the Emperor labels that action a rape: "Traitor," he calls his brother. "[I]f Rome shall have law or we have power, / Thou and thy faction shall repent this rape."[42] Given that Bassianus has not yet consummated his relationship with Lavinia, Saturninus's accusation of rape here refers to Bassianus's un-

lawful capture of a woman who belongs to another, in this case, Saturninus himself. In response, Bassianus retorts, "'Rape' you call it, my lord, to seize my own, / My true betrothed love, and now my wife? / But let the laws of Rome determine all; / Meanwhile am I possessed of that is mine" (1.1.410–13). Bassianus cannot, he insists, rape a woman who legally and morally belongs to him. His actions are not theft, but rather the redemption of his own property, a legal reclamation of something that had been stolen from him. Importantly, the status of Lavinia's consent to the abduction is irrelevant for the accusation of rape to be leveled; Saturninus subscribes to the older understanding of rape, which made a woman's consent irrelevant before her family's matrimonial wishes.

Lavinia's rape and mutilation at the hands of Chiron and Demetrius, however, subsequently reveal the difference between rape/abduction as a form of property crime and rape as an act against an individual. Bassianus injures his brother and Titus, Lavinia's father; Chiron and Demetrius injure Lavinia herself. A cultural acknowledgment of this distinction was increasingly being enshrined in the laws of the period. From the time of Elizabeth I onward, "statutes begin to redefine rape as a violent crime against a woman rather than as a property crime against her guardians."[43] Modifications to the law under *18 Eliz. 1* (1576) not only reclassified sexual assault as a felony punishable by death without benefit of clergy, but also established that a child under the age of ten could not consent to sex—"the Law adjudgeth her unable to consent, at so tender age"[44] —confirming in the process that a woman over the statutory age did have the ability and the right to exercise the power of sexual choice. *18 Eliz. 1* "redirects the statutory law's attention back to the crime where it is enforced copulation that has nothing to do with a 'taking' for 'lucre.'"[45] While sexual violence was still most easily prosecuted when linked to a form of property crime (i.e., theft), the modern understanding of rape as a crime against an individual's will had begun to emerge.[46]

Anti-Catholic and anti-Cavalier propaganda throughout the Civil War era also reinforced the law's association between loss of property and sexual violation. According to *A barbarous and inhumane Speech Spoken by the Lord Wentworth, Sonne to the late Earle of Straford* (1642), Wentworth reportedly ordered his armies to "Pillage and plunder, ransacke all their Chests," and "Being laden with Wealth, . . . ravish their Virgins, force the timorous maides to clip with you in dalliance, and wreake your utmost spleen upon the roundheads."[47] The Cavaliers will punish their Roundhead enemies first by stealing their goods, then by ruining their women. Later, in the years between the Popish Plot and the Glorious Revolution, Restoration anti-Catholic polemicists resurrected stories of the Irish rebellion to remind English Protestants that neither their lives nor their livelihoods would be safe under

Catholic rule. *An Appeal From the Country To the City, For the Preservation of His Majesties Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion* (1679), for instance, asks its reader to

> Imagine you see the whole Town in a flame, occasioned this second time, by the same Popish malice which set it on fire before. At the same instant fancy, that amongst the distracted Crowd, you behold Troops of Papists, ravishing your Wives and your Daughters, dashing your little Childrens brains out against the walls, plundering your Houses, and cutting your own throats, by the Name of Heretick Dogs.[48]

The tract's author recalls the horrifying devastation of the 1666 Great Fire (supposedly ignited by Catholic treachery[49]) and treats Catholic plundering as a form of atrocity on a par with Catholic ravishments and infanticides. Likewise, *An Abstract Of The Unnatural Rebellion And Barbarous Massacre Of The Protestants In the Kingdom of Ireland, In the Year 1641* (1689) explains that the Irish Catholics sought to establish the supremacy of their faith "by destroying the Lives and Properties of different perswasions."[50] The tract proceeds to enumerate crimes committed against both persons and property, "Murthers, Rapes, and the most notorious Robberies."[51] The author lists violation of person alongside violence to possessions, reflecting the correlation of the two in the cultural imagination.

The use of sexually violent imagery to decry the loss of property was not unique to anti-Catholic writings. Throughout the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch wars (1665–1667, 1672–1674), pro-Stuart propagandists adopted a similar rhetoric to foment popular outrage against the United Provinces, describing Dutch attacks on innocent English women and accusing them of "Treachery, and deceit, Cruelty and contempt."[52] In the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, Jacobite tracts likewise adopted the rhetoric of rape to decry the Dutch effect on English trade; as Robert Ferguson complains, they have committed "Rapines . . . upon our Trade."[53] Such tracts also described the theft of James II's rightful crown as a form of ravishment. According to Charles Blount, for instance, the king's "Crown, as well as his Life" were "most unjustly ravished from him."[54] Meanwhile, Whig proponents of contractual monarchy used the language of rape to condemn kingly overreaching. To rape a man's wife was to attack his property and take something over which fathers or even kings have no claim. According to James Tyrrell, "if a Father . . . should go about to violate his Sons Wife in his presence, or to kill her, or his Grandchildren, I suppose [the son] may as lawfully use the same means for their preservation."[55]

Here we see a point of divergence between the Restoration understanding of rape and our own. For modern critics, the act of rape is an expression of masculine power—in Susan Brownmiller's words, "the vehicle of [the rapist's] victorious conquest over [his victim's] being, the ultimate test of his

superior strength, the triumph of his manhood."[56] In contrast, Restoration propaganda most often highlights the *failure* of sexual violence to reaffirm patriarchal prerogative. While the threat of sexual assault momentarily empowers each rapist, the actual moment of physical penetration becomes, paradoxically, the moment of ultimate *dis*empowerment and the justification for political overthrow. Acts of rape prove each of the stock figures of seventeenth-century propaganda unfit to rule. The debauched Cavalier, the demonic Dutchman, the cannibal father, and through her acts of incitement, the poisonous Catholic bride, all seek in their own ways to destroy the English nation, a malicious intent that is revealed in their willingness to violate innocent English women. Throughout the propaganda, rape exposes the degeneracy (and hence illegitimacy) of the governmental regime and authorizes political rebellion. Rape in this construction does not equate phallic power with social and political success. Rather, acts of sexual violence encourage political reactions and undermine patriarchal power structures. They also allegorize wider disturbances to the political realm and emphasize the need for more general civic change.

Acts of rape in political tracts and stage plays therefore transform the female body into a symbol of the suffering nation, a physical representation of the horrific consequences of Catholic, Cavalier, Whig, Tory, Dutch, or Stuart rule. The political resonance of the rape narrative becomes particularly apparent in the dramatic popularity of the story of Lucrece, both a tale of personal violation and a myth of imperial upheaval. Karen Bamford points out that Jacobean plays were constantly rehearsing variants of the stories of Lucrece and Philomel. While the "Lucretia story idealizes the self-destructive rape victim, the Philomela story . . . demonizes the vengeful rape victim."[57] Restoration plays, however, feature primarily variations of Lucrece. Early in the Earl of Rochester's *The Tragedy of Valentinian*, for instance, Lucina expresses her intent to recreate Lucrece's story and kill herself should she find herself similarly victimized. One of the Emperor's bawds reports,

> I askt her
> After my many offers, walking with her,
> And her many downe denyalls, How
> If the Emperour growne mad with love should force her:
> She pointed to a Lucrece that hung by,
> And with an angry looke that from her Eyes
> Shot Vestall Fire against mee, she departed.[58]

Lucina will become Lucrece, reenacting the myth through her own suicide, exposing Valentinian's tyranny, and ensuring the destruction of his regime. Her actions also expose the political power of rape imagery. The Lucrece narrative is the story of the tyrant overthrown; in Bamford's words, the "death of a sexually threatened/violated female becomes instrumental in liberating her community. . . . As an innocent victim she absorbs the evils of

political repression—expressed sexually—and pays for them with her death."[59] She also forces the tyrant to pay for his crimes with his demise, her body becoming a rallying symbol for the men of the nation. The spectacle of the violated female body, the Lucrece narrative suggests, can spur real-world political change when effectively harnessed by authors and orators, further accounting for the trope's prevalence in the propaganda of the period.

An analysis of Dryden's 1685 opera, *Albion and Albanius*, also reveals the extent to which female bodies and the sexuality of those female bodies could function as symbolic embodiments of political situations. Dryden's opera opens with a vision of the wretched Augusta, symbol of London. Augusta has been abandoned by her husband, Albion (England/Charles II), in the wake of her infidelity:

> Mercury: Not unknowing came I down,
> Disloyal Town!
> Speak! did'st not Thou
> Forsake thy Faith, and break thy Nuptial Vow?
> Augusta: Ah 'tis too true! too true!
> For what cou'd I, unthinking City, do?
> Faction sway'd me,
> Zeal allur'd me,
> Both assur'd me,
> Both betray'd me.[60]

In depicting Augusta as an unfaithful and abandoned lover, Dryden sexualizes the relationship between monarch and city/subjects and reimagines the English Civil War as an act of marital infidelity.[61] Mercury draws on the language of sexual pollution when he orders Augusta to redeem herself: "Then by some loyal Deed regain / Thy long lost Reputation, / To wash away this stain / That blots a Noble Nation!" (1.1.67–70). Augusta has been soiled by her sexual behavior, and even when she returns to fidelity, her chastity is not safe from assault. Instead, the forces of Democracy and Zealotry cooperate in her attempted rape:

> Democracy: Pull down her Gates Expose her bare;
> I must enjoy the proud disdainful fair.
> Haste, Archon, Haste
> To lay her Waste!
> Zeal: I'll hold her fast
> To be embrac'd. (1.1.117–22)

Dryden represents political strife in the nation as a form of sexual assault; in James Winn's words, Dryden "describes the City, which had been a center of parliamentary opposition to Charles I and remained a hotbed of resistance to Charles II, as the passive victim of a series of violent rapists."[62] Augusta's punishment for her infidelity is her attempted rape at the hands of Democracy; sexual assault is used to regulate and police female rebellion. At the same

time, Augusta's experience demonstrates the extent to which sexual violence could serve as an eroticized metaphor for the body politic's inappropriate political choices.

When Dryden's Mercury condemns Augusta's sexual infidelity, he does so using the language of soiling and stains, a rhetoric frequently applied to victims of sexual violence. Rochester's Lucina similarly adopts the language of diseases and blots, warning Valentinian that rape will make her "leprous," a "Blott to Cesars fame" (4.2.150, 1.1.203). In each case, the stain of extramarital sexual contact represents both a personal tragedy and a political act: Augusta has betrayed her rightful monarch, while Lucina has fallen victim to an unscrupulous tyrant. And in each case, the broken body of the rape victim offers a physical manifestation of the spiritual, moral, and political contaminants threatening the nation. Representations of rape both in propaganda and onstage frequently couple images of sexual violence with representations of illness and disease, depicting noncorporeal societal illnesses as real physical woes. This combination of rape and contagion is most apparent at the end of Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*. In a curious twist on disease imagery, when Shakespeare's Lucrece stabs herself, her blood flows out in two separate streams, her own pure, healthy blood separating from the black, poisonous evidence of Tarquin's assault. In death, the "black" blood "that false Tarquin stained" divides from "some of her blood still pure and red," her black blood evidence both of her tragic personal corruption and of the nation's political contamination.[63] Shakespeare literalizes the metaphoric taint of rape, physicalizing Lucrece's mental and emotional suffering and making horribly apparent the dangers of aristocratic and monarchical tyranny. The foul crime of rape bridges the gap between actual political events and their terrible but hypothetical consequences.

Like Shakespeare, seventeenth-century propagandists trafficked in images of diseased raped bodies to provide concrete evidence of metaphorical contamination. Pamphlet authors treated Roman Catholicism in particular as an insidious form of poison, a disease that infects the individual moral consciousness, destroys the Protestant family, and threatens the body politic with chaos or tyranny. The author of *A Catholick Pill To Purge Popery* (1677) describes the "Poyson and Infection of that Soul and Body destroying Religion,"[64] while Luke Beaulieu, author of *Take heed of Both Extremes* (1675), urges his reader to use truth as "an Antidote against the Infection of some sugared Poisons, which many venture to drink of, not knowing their deadly Qualities."[65] The Roman Catholic Church has caused God's truth to grow "more, and more polluted,"[66] as Jesuit priests seek to "infuse their Mortal Poison of *Adders*, which is under their Lips, into the Souls of *Credulous* Men, through their Ears and Eyes."[67] Papists fill "the Air with Poison in their Word," and traffic in "Poysons, Rapes," and "Massacres."[68] The "Pernicious Swarms of Popish Men / Are such a Plague, we can't enough condemn,"[69]

and they cause literal illness in the realm; according to Benjamin Keach's 1679 poem, *Sion in Distress: Or, The Groans Of The Protestant Church*, the "sweeping Plague" of 1666 was the "Messenger of [God's] Wrath" at continued Catholic sacrilege.[70]

The myriad diseases caused by Roman Catholicism come to bear on the rape victim, whose suffering symbolizes the effects of unwelcome penetration and infection. Keach's *Sion in Distress* features one such example of this allegorical use of rape imagery. According to Keach, the English realm has grown sick from a combination of Catholic treachery and Protestant schism, until nature itself has begun to manifest the illness. Keach asks, "What dismal Vapour (in so black a form) is this, that seems to *Harbinger* a Storm? . . . / What interposing *Fog* obscures our *Sun*? / What dire *Eclipse* benights our *Horizon*?"[71] Keach's Sion, allegorical representative of the Protestant Church, then appears in the guise of a rape victim. Although she does not explicitly state she has been sexually assaulted, her cries and disheveled appearance—she comes before the reader with "Arms expanded" to "implore the Skies," with "Streaming Rivulets, flow[ing] from thine Eyes," and she expresses her grief with "deep and piercing sobs" and a "Heart-relenting Moan"—suggest the theater of sexual violation.[72] Sion's suffering form personifies the outrages heaped on the Anglican Church, a physical manifestation of church and state infected, blotted, and insidiously destroyed by the infiltration of Catholic (and for Keach, Nonconformist) evils. If Shakespeare's Lucrece symbolizes the deadly repercussions of kingly overreaching, Sion offers a visible example of the pernicious effects of Catholic poison left to fester in the realm. Rape imagery is here again useful to authors insofar as it transforms esoteric political or religious concerns into literal and wrenching images of physical suffering.

Sion's anguish, horrifying in itself, becomes a bleak foil for the pleasure the "Babylonish Whore," embodiment of the Catholic Church, takes in Sion's distress.[73] While Sion deplores her harsh treatment, begging for the reader's sympathy, the Catholic Church celebrates and compounds her misery: "[M]y pleasure must be done," the Catholic Church insists.[74] The Catholic Church and Sion function as ideological inversions of each other, vividly instancing of the propagandistic tendency to juxtapose a martyred Protestant rape victim and a poisonous Catholic bride who revels in Protestant annihilation. Protestant Sion suffers at the hands of England's enemies; the Catholic Whore revels in her destruction. Protestant Sion represents all that is good and virtuous in English society; the Catholic Whore imports foreign customs, foreign religion, and foreign malice. Protestant Sion is a rape victim; the Catholic Whore commissions rapes and celebrates their accomplishment. Frequently, Catholic female savagery leads to demonic Catholic births. Children raised by Keach's Catholic Church are described as "meer lump[s] of Sin,"[75] while the monstrous women of *A Nest of Nunnes Egges* (1680) "sit on

Egges, with Diligence and Care,"[76] until a priest and a nun finally hatch. Deformed harpies celebrate the birth of the new clergy: "Two Harpies, o're their heads strange Gesture makes, / With heads like Men, and bodies like to Snakes."[77] Catholic women are grotesque fiends whose physical deformities bespeak their inner corruption and who give birth to equally deformed children. Such binaries also play out on the Restoration stage in the contrast between virtuous and evil female characters, Edward Ravenscroft's Lavinia and Tamora, Nathaniel Lee's Teraminta and Tullia, and Elkanah Settle's Aphelia and Fredigond, among others.[78] As we shall see, these plays, like the political tracts, emphasize the contrast between the purity of female English Protestant martyrs and the wickedness of poisonous Catholic brides.

Despite this propensity to demonize Catholic women with images of grotesque physical degeneracy and satanic fertility, female agents of the Catholic Church are almost universally described as seductive, sexualizing the relationship between credulous Protestant and Catholic proselytizer. The Whore of Babylon, in Allison Shell's words "the most powerful anti-Catholic icon of all," represented both the Church's seductive power and the "perennial threat" it posed "to one's spiritual chastity."[79] In the Whore of Babylon, the figure of the dangerous female seducer merges with that of the monstrous mother. The author of *Battering Rams Against Rome's Gates* (1641), for example, describes the Church as the "Whore of Rome and Mother of all our Sorrows," and names her "the Cause of all . . . your Pain, Sorrow and Misery."[80] The Church is both a promiscuous, seductive witch and an unnatural mother who brings harm to her own offspring. She is able to retain her foothold in the kingdom, spreading her poison and destroying her female Protestant rivals because (as we shall see of Ravenscroft's Tamora) her exotic customs and foreign beauty are so dangerously and poisonously enticing.

Catholic women are not, however, the only females capable of producing monstrous progeny. Central to the language of blots and stains so common to rape propaganda is the very real fear that Protestant women could conceive monstrous children, their wombs poisoned by the act of rape. By violating a woman, the rapist creates the possibility that the mother will give birth to an illegitimate child, one that will undermine the sanctity of Protestant lineage and be viewed in the eyes of its society as a monster. In Dolan's words, when a woman is assaulted, "the rapist father puts his stamp on the fetus, erasing the impress of the virtuous English mother."[81] The demonic Irishman and debauched Cavaliers of English Civil War and Exclusion Crisis propaganda, along with the demonic Dutchman of Stuart tracts, thus seek to humiliate Protestant men, first by murdering their legitimate heirs and then by replacing them with monstrous children of their own nonconsensual creation.

Beyond the theft of reproductive rights and heritage, throughout much of the most horrifying anti-Catholic polemic, violence against women is accompanied by violence to children, as England's enemies attempt to destroy

future generations of Protestants. Pregnant women in particular become the focus of brutal attacks. The rebels of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* mutilate women's breasts, attacking their capacity to nurse, and by extension, their capacity to function as mothers. Other tracts describe even more graphic assaults on pregnant women. According to *An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland* (1700), "A *Scotish* man they stript, and hewed to pieces, ript up his wifes belly so that her Child dropt out; many other Women they hung up with Child, ript their bellies, and let their infants fall out; some of the Children they gave to the Dogs."[82] Likewise, *An Abstract of Some few of those Barbarous, Cruell Massacres and Murthers, of the Protestants* (1662) describes "one woman great with childe, through whose belly the Rebels thrust their Pikes as shee was hanging, because the childe should not live."[83] Other accounts describe "the most barbarous and execrable Murthers, Villainies, sparing neither Man, Woman, or Child, ripping up Women with Child, ravishing chast Matrons, drowning, putting to the Sword, &c. many thousands of innocent Protestants."[84] Even when the children are not murdered, they are left behind to starve. As *A Collection of Certain Horrid Murthers in Several Counties of Ireland* (1679) describes, "In *Kilbeggan* a boy, and a woman hanged, one of them having a sucking child, desiring it might be buried with her, knowing it would suffer afterwards, but it was cast out, and starved to death."[85] In these various tracts, Catholics seek to destroy future generations of Protestants by whatever violent means possible.

Underscoring seventeenth-century atrocity narratives, then, is anxiety over not only political instability and legitimacy or legal and financial security, but also Protestant lineage and Protestant maternity. Where the suffering of the martyred Protestant rape victim emphasizes the monstrosity of the poisonous Catholic bride, this figuration also reflects the unsettling fear that a raped Protestant virgin may one day become a monstrous Catholic mother. Here fears over lost property—in this case, female chattel and potential heirs—combine with anxieties over societal contagion and poisoned lineage to create an urgent case for the expulsion of the Catholic political threat. A glance at John Milton's *Comus* provides a literary example of such motifs. The Lady's encounter with Comus has most frequently been interpreted as a conflict between Cavalier and Puritan ideologies, or between the demands of desire and the importance of chastity.[86] Comus speaks the language of Cavalier carpe diem rhetoric, asking the Lady, "Why should you be so cruel to your self, / And to those dainty limms which nature lent / For gentle usage, and soft delicacy?"[87] while the Lady responds with the language of Puritan restraint. Comus's status as the son of Circe, however, also invokes the rhetoric of anti-Catholicism, insofar as anti-Catholic propagandists occasionally treated Circe as interchangeable with the Whore of Babylon. In a 1572 tract, Henry Bullinger referred to the people who have "been bewitched by the sorceries of the Roman Circe and her Idolatrous hypocrites,"[88] while in

1603, Samuel Harsnett warned against a Catholic religion "composed of palpable fiction, and diabolicall fascination, whose enchaunted chalice of heathenish drugs . . . hath the power of Circes, and Medaeas cup, to metamorphose men into asses, bayards, & swine."[89] *The English Pope* (1643) also uses Circe to describe the Church's pernicious and seductive influence on European monarchs:

> That cup of fornication which the Circe of Rome, (as the Scripture describes it) mingles and prepares for the K[ing]s of the earth, must needs be very delicious to the sense, as well as it is pernicious to the understanding, it must needs please, as well as intoxicate, or else why should the great Potentates of the world be more apt to yeeld to the infatuation of it than common persons? . . . [T]hat there is a purpose of mischiefe in that strumpet, whose intoxications are so strong to captivate and delude, cannot be doubted.[90]

As Circe is linked with the Catholic Church, Comus is linked with his mother; he is "Deep skill'd in all his mothers witcheries" (l.523). When Comus urges the Lady to drink from his cup, he is therefore symbolically offering her the "false" religion of Catholicism.

The sexually violent overtones of the text thus transform the encounter between Comus and the Lady into a conflict between the monstrous mother, Circe, embodiment of the Catholic Church, and the innocent Protestant virgin who would be victimized by it. The danger for the Lady is twofold. Comus may rape her, leading to the conception of an illegitimate (and hence monstrous) child, or she may succumb to Comus's attractive rhetoric and, like the women of *A Bloody Tragedie* who "are now no more maidens, but holy-mens harlots,"[91] become monstrous herself (and indeed the "gumms of glutenous heat" [l.917] fastening her to Comus's chair may suggest that perhaps the Lady's resolve had begun to waver). In *Comus*, then, Milton merges sexual violence with royalism, Catholicism, and maternal monstrosity. That the text links the figure of Circe with Comus's use of Cavalier rhetoric and carpe diem ideology underscores the propagandistic tendency to link Cavaliers with Catholicism and female poison.

Problems with fertility caused by rape or maternal monstrosity pervade both the drama and the political tracts. The individual Englishwoman martyred by the sexually violent Catholics is contrasted with the monstrous Catholic mother who would infect the individual conscience, commission the rape of the innocent, and destroy the nation to satisfy her Popish masters. As we shall see in detail in chapter 1, Queen Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I, in particular attracted public hatred, both for her supposed control over her husband and for her insistent Catholicism. Henrietta Maria emerges from the English Civil War tracts as the archetypal poisonous Catholic bride, the Circe inside the kingdom, working from within to poison and destroy. Even after her death, Henrietta Maria's memory would be invoked on the Restoration

stage to remind the realm of the dangers posed by Catholic wives. Since, as Frances Dolan points out, Henrietta Maria's fertility was nearly constantly on display in her numerous pregnancies, she became England's own monstrous mother, the inverse mirror of the martyred rape victim.[92] Such parallelisms were adopted again later in the century, when motherhood had a direct impact on history. It was Queen Catherine of Braganza's infertility that necessitated the Exclusion Bill (1679–1681), while Mary of Modena's fertility and successful birthing of a Catholic male heir directly precipitated the Glorious Revolution. Thus rape both in propaganda and onstage offered a way of discussing the place of the maternal in society and in government.

As part of their campaign to humiliate and disenfranchise Protestant men, the monstrous males of propaganda culture frequently attack pregnant women. Such acts are horrifying in themselves, yet Catholic and Cavalier behavior frequently degenerates even further from there. As propaganda authors sought as far as possible to transform their enemies into a distant and fearful monolithic Other, Catholics in these tracts transition from acts of rape and murder to acts of cannibalism and vampirism. Catholics are "barbarous Blood-suckers,"[93] while their mother church is a female vampire who has "drunk of your Blood, until she is made to vomit it up."[94] Demonic Irishmen and debauched Cavaliers are all-too-quick to follow their Church's example, engaging in disgustingly literal acts of blood drinking and flesh eating. In *The Rebels Turkish Tyranny,* for instance, one child is forced to roast his own brother on a spit, possibly as a meal for the rebels, before being himself burned to death. Meanwhile, the author of *The Kings Maiesties speech On the 2. day of December, 1641* describes a young woman gang raped by four Irish rebels. When she stabs one of her attackers, they punish her as follows: they "drew their swords & cut off, first, her right arme, then her left, then both her legs, then they tied a rope about her middle, and drag'd it about, which having done they ript ope her belly, and saved as much of her blood as they could, saying that her puritane sisters should be glad of that to drinke."[95] The tract clearly links the evils of the demonic Irishmen with the horrifying behavior of the royalist faction; allied, these groups commit unimaginable atrocities against Protestant parliamentarians and their families. Thus the author of *Battering Rams* urges his reader to "scale" the Church's "Walls, throw down her Bullworks and Fortresses, and cause to fall to the ground all her Towers of Defence."[96] Given that the language of imperial conquest is often used as a euphemism for rape—women's bodies are towns to be conquered by force—what the author of *Battering Rams* is urging is a rape of the Church to prevent the "Murthers, Rapes, Villaines," and vampiristic acts that this "Whore of Rome, or bad Woman" will perform when left unchecked.[97]

The association of Catholicism with vampirism and cannibalism is primarily designed both to mock and render monstrous the concept of transubstantiation. As Maggie Kilgour explains, "By cleverly pushing the sacrament

to a grotesque extreme unimagined by most Catholics and misrepresentative of the official interpretation of the rite, the reformers made the other extreme, their own position, appear as the only alternative for those who did not wish to be cannibals."[98] If Catholics believe in eating the flesh and blood of Christ, anti-Catholic polemicists argue, it is only natural that they would enjoy eating the flesh and blood of their Protestant enemies. At the same time, such accounts deliberately linked the Catholics with other types of distrusted religious and cultural Others. Anthony Horneck likens Catholic rituals of penance to those of the "*Brahmanes* in the Indies, and the religious *Pagans* dispersed through all the Eastern parts."[99] The Irish come to be regarded as more savage than even the Turks—note that Whetcombe's pamphlet *The Rebels Turkish Tyranny* is actually about *Irish* acts of violence—lending credibility to the most outlandish stories of Catholic atrocity. Such stories "were credible not only because Protestant contemporaries believed that Catholics were capable of, if not eager to perform, such acts of barbarity, but also because such acts were committed by the native Irish, commonly regarded by the English as wild and savage heathens who were capable of greater barbarities than the fearsome Turk."[100] Thus the author of *The Manner of the Burning the Pope in Effigies in London On the 5th of November, 1678* says of the Gunpowder Plot, "All the Treacheries of *Europe* compounded would not come near it; nor all the Inhumanity of the *Turks* and *Pagans* give it but a faint resemblance."[101] Such imagery participates in the process of racialization designed to foment hatred of the Irish. According to Dolan, the "difference and inferiority of the Irish, often associated with their Catholicism, was already sometimes understood as racial; that is, as a matter of blood. This racialization would gain momentum in the following centuries."[102] The Irish Catholics, with their blood-drinking and sexually violent ways, are more violent than the Turks and more dangerous than the pagans. They are Other from the English, a different and inferior race of people whose treachery is innate, yet they are allowed to live among virtuous English Protestants.

In the latter half of the century, Catholic and Tory polemicists attempted to redirect accusations of rape, cannibalism, and vampirism against their own enemies, with mixed results. Descriptions of Dutch Protestant cannibalism—Dryden, for instance, accuses the Dutch at Amboyna of ingesting the body fat of their English victims—were never particularly effective as a form of pro-Stuart propaganda. The Whigs adapted the stock images of English Civil War propaganda much more successfully, not only to condemn James II's reign, but to construct an overarching condemnation of absolutist philosophy. The Whig figure of the cannibal father exhibited the worst excesses of the demonic Irishman—he was a rapist and a consumer of human flesh—and, like the demonic Irishman, he was rendered Other by his acts of fearsome excess. John Locke explicitly linked the absolute monarch with the discourse

of New World savagery. He warns his reader against the dangers of absolutism in England by condemning the behavior of the tyrannical king of Peru. As that king was all powerful, Locke warns ominously, he could not be stopped from "beg[etting] Children on purpose to Fatten and Eat them."[103] The cannibal father makes himself frighteningly foreign through his combined acts of rape and cannibalism, overstepping himself so far as to become indistinguishable from the "savage" king of Peru. Such rhetoric represented a powerful argument on behalf of contractual monarchy and a potent justification of the Glorious Revolution. Here, then, is the use of rape and cannibal imagery as a means of Othering, one that justifies the subjugation of a vile and antisocial enemy.

The popularity of rape imagery in seventeenth-century propaganda can finally be explained by its conjoint powers as an emotional weapon and a political tool. Frequently intertwined with the language of cannibalism, contagion, savagery, and monstrosity, images of rape were designed in a variety of ways to redirect readerly revulsion into political action. Depictions of rape served both as a shorthand for the ills plaguing the nation and as a call to arms, one frequently coupled with an appeal to English chivalric masculinity. G. S., author of *A Briefe Declaration Of The Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northern Irish Rebels*, for instance, has taken pen to paper on behalf of innocent women and children and hopes "to Excite the English Nation to relieve our poor Wives and Children, that have escaped the Rebels savage crueltie."[104] He also begs England to "send aid of men, and means forthwith to quell their boundlesse insolencies."[105] Rape is both a reason for and a spur to social and political change.

This is not to suggest that representations of rape remained static during the latter half of the seventeenth century. As political circumstances shifted and changed, authors altered and adapted the tropes of sexual violence to serve different political ends. My analysis of Restoration representations of rape thus begins in chapter 1 with the early years of the Restoration, when dramatic depictions of rape were few and devoted to rehabilitating the monarchy from two decades of horrifically violent parliamentary attacks. The specter of Cavalier violence, an all-too-common theme throughout the propaganda of the Civil Wars and Interregnum, haunted both the politics and drama of the 1660s as authors sought to unwrite, erase, and replace the memory of the debauched Cavalier with the more positive figure of the chivalric knight suffering nobly for king and country. As a result, a struggle to redeem the Cavaliers and recast the Roundheads as the ultimate societal villains underlies much of the drama of the period. Theatrical depictions of sexual violence produced throughout the 1660s redirect accusations of rape, murder, and tyranny onto the defeated parliamentary faction. While only three plays produced between 1660 and 1669, the Earl of Orrery's *The Generall* (1662), Thomas Porter's *The Villain* (1664), and Edward Howard's *The*

Usurper (1664), actually feature scenes of rape or attempted sexual assault, each play contrasts Cavalier honor and fidelity with Roundhead treachery and sexually violent aggression. Each author draws on the atrocity propaganda of the Civil War tracts to demonize the Puritans and reestablish the moral righteousness of royalism. It is not the rightful king's supporters, the plays argue, but the illegitimate Roundhead faction that brings sexual violence, property destruction, and finally popery to the realm.

In 1673, the future James II refused to take Anglican communion, stepping down from his position as Lord High Admiral of the Navy and publicly acknowledging his long-rumored conversion to Roman Catholicism. Occurring in the midst of the already unpopular Third Anglo-Dutch War, James's announcement fed a growing popular discomfort with royal policy and a concomitant fear of the growth of Catholic power at court. Set in this context, chapter 2 argues that treatments of onstage rape in the first half of the 1670s mirrored the growing divide within the culture between those who would support Charles II's anti-Dutch policies and those who feared the spread of popery and French-style absolutism. The chapter begins by examining John Dryden's 1673 play *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*. A work of pro-royalist propaganda, the play foregrounds evil, demonic Dutchmen while emphasizing the comparative harmlessness of French Catholics. Dryden's Dutch commit rapes upon English liberties and English trade along with English women. Like Orrery, Porter, and Howard, then, Dryden displaces atrocity imagery onto a hated foreign Other, justifying in contrast Stuart foreign policy and suggesting that ties of mutual religion should not be the sole determining factor in the construction of international loyalties.

While Dryden uses the tropes of Civil War propaganda to defend the royal court from charges of corruption, contemporaneous plays by Elkanah Settle, Thomas Shadwell, and Aphra Behn offer a more critical look at court culture. In both Settle's *Love and Revenge* (1675) and Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1675), the world stands on the brink of societal collapse. For Settle, that disintegration stems from aristocratic male abdication of social and political responsibility, enabling the rise of overly powerful and toxic females. Reconfiguring the trope of the poisonous Catholic bride into an attack on Charles's poisonous Catholic mistresses, Settle condemns the continued presence of powerful Catholic women at court, along with the effeminizing effects of court libertinism. Shadwell, meanwhile, resurrects the image of the debauched Cavalier to condemn aristocratic male sexual excess. Shadwell's Don John has rejected patriarchal structures in his pursuit of pleasure, a path that ultimately leads him to death, destruction, and most damningly, Catholic ritual. Through Don John, Shadwell decries both the sexually violent immorality of libertine behavior and the fearsome specter of French Catholic influence at court. The chapter concludes with a look at Aphra Behn's *The Rover,*

Part I (1677), which, while more positive in its reading of the court than either *Love and Revenge* or *The Libertine*, is still profoundly critical of aristocratic male behavior. *The Rover*'s Cavaliers are both romantic heroes, faithful and true to their exiled king, and sexually violent exploiters of innocent women. In Behn's play, the trope of the debauched Cavalier is resurrected, if tempered, reflecting the extent of the playwright's political ambivalence on the eve of the Popish Plot.

In 1683, Algernon Sidney was executed for his role in the Rye House Plot, leaving behind his seminal work, *Discourses concerning Government*. A response to Sir Robert Filmer's recently published *Patriarcha: Or The Natural Power Of Kings*, Sidney repeatedly refers to the story of Lucrece in an effort to define the limits of monarchical authority. A king who proves a tyrant by sexually abusing his subjects, Sidney suggests, loses the right to rule. Such a view contrasts powerfully with Filmer's representations of the Lucrece myth; while Filmer acknowledges the horror of Lucrece's fate, he consistently asserts that political rebellion is a greater sin than rape. Taken together, Sidney and Filmer reveal the centrality of the Lucrece myth to contemporary debates over the nature and limits of monarchical authority. For Sidney, sexual violation reveals the limits of a subject's contractual authority, while for Filmer, it proves only the need for continued obedience.

The treatment of Lucrece as a medium for negotiating political philosophies is also apparent in the drama of the period. My third chapter therefore takes as its central focus John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester's *The Tragedy of Valentinian* (first performed in 1684, but written significantly earlier) and Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680), two contemporaneous plays that offer very different dramatic treatments of the rapist monarch and the Lucrece myth. While such representations would become much more prevalent after the Glorious Revolution, already by 1684 Rochester's *Valentinian* treats sexual violence as a justifiable reason for rebellion. Valentinian has licensed his overthrow with his attack on a virtuous subject, and Rochester regards the resulting regicide as the inevitable, albeit regrettable, conclusion to Valentinian's bad behavior. In contrast, Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* suggests that rebellion against a violent monarch will not necessarily lead to a better form of governance. Lee's Brutus is a propagandist who manipulates the memory of Lucrece, selfishly commingling the imagery of rape with the threat of cultural contagion to garner support for his rebellion. Brutus's authority as a politician is predicated on his effacement of Lucrece's memory, while the stability of his government rests upon the need for violent spectacles of suffering. The resulting parliamentary government is both stagnant and cruel, a new form of tyranny to replace the old. The contrast between Rochester's treatment of the Lucrece myth and Lee's thus demonstrates the extent to which images of sexual violation were used to mediate political

philosophies. In both cases, the plays reveal the moral impact of rape rhetoric on both the private individual and the public domain and trace the shift from private morality to public concern embedded in the myth of Lucrece.

The combination of sexually violent imagery with instances of cannibalism was, as we have seen, common in both English Civil War and Exclusion Crisis–era propaganda tracts. Images of cannibalism were particularly widespread between the Popish Plot and Glorious Revolution as authors both emphasized the horrors of civil war and depicted the ways in which parents and children turn on and destroy one another in an age of civil strife. Disruptions to parent-child relationships implicit in the concept of civil war manifest themselves as the monstrous births produced by rape and as acts of intrafamilial cannibalism, perpetrated in Tory propaganda by disobedient and ungrateful children, in Whig tracts by that absolutist monster, the cannibal father. Chapter 4 begins by examining images of rape, flesh eating, and familial conflict in a group of Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis–era plays, Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680) and *Mithridates, King of Pontus* (1678), along with Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* (1682) and John Crowne's *Thyestes* (1681). In all of these plays, parents and children have become toxic to each other, and in each case, the combination of rape and cannibalism reflects the collapse of societal boundaries and symbolizes the place of the diseased individual family in the context of the diseased body politic. Evil and parricidal Queen Tullia of Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*—both a murderous child and the play's poisonous Catholic bride—personifies the danger that children may pose to their parents in an era of civil strife. In contrast, Lee's Mithridates, Otway's Priuli, and Crowne's Atreus all emerge from their texts as deadly fathers who symbolically rape their own daughters and destroy rather than nurture their progeny. Atreus in particular becomes the monster lurking at the heart of the nation, the poisonous patriarch who, instead of nurturing his realm, will see it turn to chaos and despair. What all of these plays suggest is that the disruptions to parent-child relationships fomented by political strife and manifested in acts of rape and cannibalism undermine the nation's foundations and leave the world destabilized and ill.

Contrasted with the underlying political pessimism that characterizes the works of Lee, Otway, and Crowne is Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* (performed 1678, published 1687), which offers a very different interpretation of intrafamilial cannibalism. Although the play was initially written during the Popish Plot hysteria, it was not published until some years later, in the wake of the Rye House Plot, the death of Charles II and accession of James II, and the execution of the Duke of Monmouth. While the plays of Otway, Lee, and Crowne all end with societal disintegration, Ravenscroft's play uses the act of cannibalism to reestablish appropriate societal boundaries. The play begins with an invasion via rape; it ends with the elimination of social toxins via ingestion. The power of the Goths is finally neutralized as

Tamora and Aron literally consume their children out of existence. The cannibal father becomes, perversely, a symbol of renewed cultural stability, reflecting Ravenscroft's persistent loyalty to the Stuart line.

In my final chapter, I turn to the treatment of rape in the Williamite theater and examine the trope of the ravished monarch. In the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, Williamite propagandists continued to disseminate images of Catholics and Tories as rapists and cannibals, even as Jacobite propagandists accused their enemies of "ravishing" their king. The political use of the male rape victim of course predated the events of the Glorious Revolution. In his 1680 anti-Catholic polemic, *The Female Prelate*, for instance, Elkanah Settle used the trope of male rape to discredit the Catholic Church; the Duke of Saxony becomes a victim of Pope Joan's lust, suggesting that male bodies, too, are vulnerable to acts of popish sexual excess. In the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, Settle returned to this theme in *Distress'd Innocence* (1690); although the play purports to be apolitical, it uses the rhetoric of male rape to protest indirectly the events of the Glorious Revolution. When the play's innocent hero is stripped of his titles and honors, the other characters speak of him as they would a victim of sexual assault. Like James II, he has been unjustly ravished of his rightful position, suggesting that to take the throne by force is a violation of both the individual's bodily rights and the larger body politic.

Dramatists who supported the Glorious Revolution likewise employed the image of the male rape victim, in their case to justify the rightness of revolt. Just as the playwrights of the 1660s sought to displace accusations of rape onto the parliamentarians, Whig authors of the 1690s used images of sexual violence to rehabilitate the image of William and Mary. The chapter concludes with readings of Nicholas Brady's *The Rape* (1692), Mary Pix's *Ibrahim* (1696), and John Crowne's *Caligula* (1698). For Pix and Crowne, the rapist monarch ravishes his masculine subjects politically and economically, transforming the disenfranchised male into a victim of sexualized assault. While Sidney and Locke use images of female victims to protest absolutism, Pix and Crowne encode the consequences of tyranny in the violence done to men. Brady, meanwhile, displaces the rhetoric of male rape onto the play's villains. Like the playwrights of the 1660s, Brady defines the rapist as the enemy of the current political regime, redeeming in contrast the image of the seated monarch. To trace the treatment of the male rape victim onstage, then, is to gain a more nuanced understanding of postrevolution political and theatrical rhetoric.

There is, of course, a danger in reading acts of physical violation as acts of metaphoric or allegorical violence. To do so is potentially to engage in what Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver term the "obsessive erasure . . . of sexual violence against women."[106] When critics read rape allegorically, Higgins and Silver warn, they privilege a "masculine perspective premised

on men's fantasies about female sexuality" and contribute to a contemporary culture of "rape and rapability."[107] When rape is transformed into an artistic and allegorical symbol, it comes to "exis[t] as a context independent of its occurrence as discrete event."[108] It is, however, the very unseen presence of sexual violation in Restoration literature and culture that this book aims to explore. While some plays foreground the physicality of the act of rape in the eroticized spectacle of the actress's violated form—the titillating promise of sexual situations and naked female flesh could certainly help to attract an audience—they also transform that very real pain into social and political metaphors. Rape victims in these texts are both suffering victims and moral/political symbols, revealing the extent to which depictions of sexual violence both mirrored and shifted with the major political upheavals of the later seventeenth century.

NOTES

1. *A Bloody Tragedie, Or Romish Maske. Acted by five Iesuites, and sixteene young Germaine Maides* (London, 1607), b4r.
2. Ibid., c1r.
3. Ibid., b4v. For discussion of the anti-Catholic polemicist tendency to sexualize the confessional, see Stephen Haliczer, *Sexuality in the Confessional: A Sacrament Profaned* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
4. *A Bloody Tragedie*, c1v.
5. Ibid., c2r.
6. Ibid., d1v.
7. Ibid., d3r.
8. Ibid., b3r.
9. In the early 1620s, the future Charles I considered marrying a Spanish Catholic princess, causing widespread outrage in England.
10. Although contemporary tracts numbered as many as three hundred thousand among the dead, modern historians think two thousand deaths a more likely number. For historical treatments of the Irish Rebellion, see Raymond Gillespie, "The End of an Era: Ulster and the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising," in *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534–1641*, ed. Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (Bungay: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 191–213; Keith J. Lindley, "The Impact of the 1641 Rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641–5," *Irish Historical Studies* 18, no. 70 (1972): 143–76; Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005); and James Morgan Read, "Atrocity Propaganda and the Irish Rebellion," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1938): 229–44.
11. Trinity College Dublin MS 818, fols 055r–056v: 877. For further descriptions of the carnage, see Trinity College Dublin's online archive of the 1641 depositions: http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php.
12. Trinity College Dublin MS 839, fols 038r–039v: 1365.
13. Trinity College Dublin MS 826, fols 239r–239v: 1921.
14. John Foxe, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (Blacksburg: Wilder Publications, 2009), 271. Popularly referred to as the *Book of Martyrs*, Foxe's work was initially published under the title *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perillous dayes, touching matters of the Church.* For readings of Foxe's impact on English culture, see Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham, "Religious Publishing in England 1557–1640," in *The Cambridge History of the*

Book, Volume IV, 1557–1695, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 29–66; William Haller, *The Elect Nation: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); and Raymond D. Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).

15. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, 271.
16. *A Bloody Battell: Or the Rebels Overthrow, and Protestants Victorie* (London, 1641), a4r.
17. James Salmon, *Bloudy Newes from Ireland* (London, 1641), a3v.
18. *The Bloudy Persecution of the Protestants in Ireland* (London, 1641), av4.
19. For discussion of sodomy rhetoric in anti-Catholic discourse, see Peter Lake, "Antipopery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London and New York: Longman Group, 1989), 75.
20. *The Manner of the Burning the Pope in Effigies in London On the 5th of November, 1678* (London, 1678), 8.
21. *A Bull Sent By Pope Pius To encourage the Traytors in England, pronounced against Queen Elizabeth, of ever glorious Memory* (London, 1678), 1.
22. *A Caution To All True English Protestants, Concerning the Late Popish Plot* (London, 1681), 10.
23. *A Scheme Of Popish Cruelties Or A Prospect of what wee must Expect under a Popish Successor* (London, 1681), 1.
24. Ibid.
25. *An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland* (Scotland, 1700), 23–24.
26. *The Kings Maiesties Speech On the 2. Day of December, 1641* (London, 1641), a1r.
27. Tristram Whetcombe, *The Rebels Turkish Tyranny in their march Decem. 24, 1641* (London, 1641), a1r.
28. Salmon, *Bloudy Newes from Ireland*, a1r.
29. John Dennis, *Original Letters, Familiar, Moral, and Critical*, 2 vols. (London, 1721), 1:63.
30. Ibid.
31. Jean Marsden, "Rape, Voyeurism, and the Restoration Stage," in *Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama*, ed. Katherine M. Quinsey (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1996), 186.
32. Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 45.
33. Derek Hughes, "Rape on the Restoration Stage," *The Eighteenth Century* 46, no. 3 (2005): 227.
34. Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 175. For an expansion of this argument, see also Susan J. Owen, "'He that should guard my virtue has betrayed it': The Dramatization of Rape in the Exclusion Crisis," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 9, no. 1 (1994): 59–68.
35. Emily Detmer-Goebel, "The Need for Lavinia's Voice: *Titus Andronicus* and the Telling of Rape," *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001): 77. For more on Early Modern rape law, see John Hamilton Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History* (London: Butterworths, 1979); Nafize Bashar, "Rape in England between 1550 and 1700," in *The Sexual Dynamics of History: Men's Power, Women's Resistance*, ed. The London Feminist History Group (London: Pluto Press, 1983), 28–42; Miranda Chaytor, "Husband(ry): Narratives of Rape in the Seventeenth Century," *Gender and History* 7, no. 3 (1995): 378–407; Shani D'Cruze, "Approaching the History of Rape and Sexual Violence: Notes towards Research," *Women's History Review* 1, no. 3 (1993): 377–97; Lorraine Helms, "'The High Roman Fashion': Sacrifice, Suicide, and the Shakespearean Stage," *PMLA* 107, no. 3 (1992): 554–65; and Marion Wynne-Davies, "'The Swallowing Womb': Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*," in *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. Valerie Wayne (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 129–51.
36. *Statutes of the Realm*, Stat. Westm. Prim., *3 Edw. I*, c. 13, 1275.

37. *Statutes of the Realm*, Stat. Westm. Sec., *13 Edw. I*, c. 34, 1285.

38. J. B. Post, "Ravishment of Women and the Statutes of Westminster," in *Legal Records and the Historian: Papers Presented to the Cambridge Legal History Conference, 7–10 July 1975, and in Lincoln's Inn Old Hall on 3 July 1974*, ed. J. H. Baker (London: Swift Printers, 1978), 153.

39. Ibid., 158.

40. T. E., *The Lawes Resolutions of Womens Rights: Or, the Lawes Provision for Women* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1978), 382.

41. Ibid., 384.

42. William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997), 371–434, 1.1.408–9. Further references to *Titus Andronicus* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

43. Helms, "'The High Roman Fashion,'" 557.

44. T. E., *The Lawes Resolution*, 402.

45. Carolyn Sale, "Representing Lavinia: The (In)Significance of Women's Consent in Legal Discourse of Rape and Ravishment and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*," in *Women, Violence, and English Renaissance Literature: Essays Honoring Paul Jorgensen*, ed. Linda Woodbridge and Sharon Beehler (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003), 10.

46. J. D. Gammon attributes this shift to developing notions of individuality and individual psychology: J. D. Gammon, "Ravishment and Ruin: The Construction of Stories of Sexual Violence in England, c. 1640–1820" (PhD diss., University of Essex, 2001).

47. *A barbarous and inhumane Speech Spoken by the Lord Wentworth, Sonne to the late Earle of Straford* (London, 1642), a4r.

48. Charles Blount, *An Appeal From the Country To the City, For the Preservation of His Majesties Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion* (London, 1679), 2.

49. Anti-Catholic tracts frequently blamed the Catholics for the destruction caused by the Great Fire; see John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London: Phoenix Press, 1972), and John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660–1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

50. *An Abstract Of The Unnatural Rebellion And Barbarous Massacre Of The Protestants In the Kingdom of Ireland, In the Year 1641* (London, 1689), 3.

51. Ibid., 5.

52. Wiliam Lilly, *The Dangerous Condition of the United Provinces Prognosticated* (London, 1672), 2.

53. Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account of some of the late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English* (London, 1695), 2.

54. Charles Blount, *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors* (London, 1693), a3r.

55. James Tyrrell, *Patriarcha non Monarcha. The Patriarch Unmonarch'd* (London, 1681), 27.

56. Susan Brownmiller, *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (New York: Bantam, 1975), 14.

57. Karen Bamford, *Sexual Violence on the Jacobean Stage* (New York: St. Martin's, 2000), 9.

58. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, *Lucina's Rape Or The Tragedy of Valentinian*, in *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. Harold Love (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 133–231, 2.2.87–93. Further references to *The Tragedy of Valentinian* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

59. Bamford, *Sexual Violence*, 61.

60. John Dryden, *Albion and Albanius*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Vinton Dearing, 20 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 15:1–55, 1.1.51–60. Further references to *Albion and Albanius* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

61. According to James Winn, Dryden used such imagery throughout his career: *"When Beauty Fires the Blood": Love and the Arts in the Age of Dryden* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 256.

62. Ibid., 257.

63. William Shakespeare, *The Rape of Lucrece*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997), 635–82, ll. 1743–44. Further references to Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by line number.

64. A true Son of the Catholick Apostolick Church, *A Catholick Pill To Purge Popery* (London, 1677), 2.

65. Luke Beaulieu, *Take heed of Both Extremes Or, Plain and useful Cautions Against Popery, And Presbytery* (London, 1675), a2v.

66. Anthony Horneck, *The Honesty of the Protestant, And Dishonesty of the Popish Divinity* (London, 1681), 150.

67. John Nalson, *The Project of Peace, Or, Unity of Faith And Government* (London, 1678), 2.

68. John Oldham, *The Jesuits Justification* (London, 1679), 1.

69. *A Gratulatory Poem On The Just And Piovs Proceedings Of The King and Parliament Against The Papists* (London, 1674), 1.

70. Benjamin Keach, *Sion in Distress: Or, The Groans Of The Protestant Church* (London, 1681), 9.

71. Ibid., 1.

72. Ibid., 3, 4.

73. Ibid., 6.

74. Ibid., 7.

75. Ibid., 25.

76. *A Nest of Nunnes Egges, strangely Hatched* (London, 1680), 1.

77. Ibid.

78. Katherine Eisaman Maus argues that such conflicts also reflected the theatrical desire to cast first Rebecca Marshall and Elizabeth Boutell and later Elizabeth Barry and Anne Bracegirdle in oppositional roles: "'Playhouse Flesh and Blood': Sexual Ideology and the Restoration Actress," *ELH* 46, no. 4 (1979): 595–617.

79. Allison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 31. For further discussion of the Church's seductive power, see Carol S. Wiener, "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," *Past and Present* 51 (1971): 27–62.

80. *Battering Rams Against Rome's Gates* (London, 1641), 1, 2.

81. Frances Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999), 39.

82. *An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland*, 11.

83. *An Abstract of Some few of those Barbarous, Cruell Massacres and Murthers, of the Protestants, and English* (London, 1662), 5.

84. *News from the Sessions House* (London, 1689), 3.

85. *A Collection of Certain Horrid Murthers in Several Counties of Ireland* (London, 1679), 9.

86. See, for instance, Leah S. Marcus, "John Milton's *Comus,*" in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 232–45. For discussion of *Comus*'s political undertones, see Cedric Brown, *John Milton's Aristocratic Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), and Christopher Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977). For discussion of the masque's sexual content, see Beth Bradburn, "Bodily Metaphor and Moral Agency in *A Masque*: A Cognitive Approach," *Milton Studies* 43 (2004): 19–34; James Broaddus, "'Gums of Glutinous Heat' in Milton's Mask and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *Milton Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2003): 205–14; William Shullenberger, "Girl Interrupted: Spenserian Bondage and Release in Milton's Ludlow Mask," *Milton Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2003): 184–204; and Catherine Thomas, "Chaste Bodies and Poisonous Desire in Milton's Mask," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 46, no. 2 (2008): 435–59.

87. John Milton, *The Riverside Milton*, ed. Roy Flannagan (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998), 109–71, ll. 679–81. Further references to *Comus* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by line number.

88. Henry Bullinger, *A Confutation Of the Popes Bull which was published more than two yeres agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland* (London, 1572), *3r.

89. Samuel Harsnett, *A Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures* (London, 1603), a2v.

90. *The English Pope* (London, 1643), 21. For discussion of images of Circe in Catholic literature, see Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

91. *A Bloody Tragedie*, c1v.

92. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*, 131–35. For readings of Henrietta Maria's position in the English court, see Malcolm Smuts, "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle, 1625–41," in *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, ed. Erin Griffey (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 13–38, and Michelle Anne White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006).

93. *A Copie of the King's Message sent by the Duke of Lenox* (London, 1644), 6.

94. *Battering Rams*, 1.

95. *The Kings Maiesties Speech*, a2r.

96. *Battering Rams*, 1.

97. Ibid., 2.

98. Maggie Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism: An Anatomy of Metaphors of Incorporation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 83.

99. Horneck, *The Honesty of the Protestant*, 55.

100. Lindley, "The Impact of the 1641 Rebellion," 146.

101. *The Manner of the Burning the Pope*, 4.

102. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon*, 36.

103. John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 200.

104. G. S., *A Briefe Declaration Of The Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northerne Irish Rebels* (London, 1641), title page.

105. Ibid.

106. Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver, eds., *Rape and Representation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 2.

107. Ibid.

108. Ibid., 3.

Chapter One

Rape and the Rehabilitation of Royalist Identity, 1660–1665

The anonymously authored pamphlet, *A Blazing Starre seen in the West* (1642), tells the story of a Devonshire virgin who left her friends and relatives on the evening of Monday, November 14, 1642, to return to her father's house. Her "Friends and Kinsfolkes . . . were importunate to have her stay all night," not wanting her to travel the roads alone.[1] They remind the girl that "there were so many deboyst Covaliers [sic] abroad, so that they could not passe securely in the day time, much less in the night," but the girl decides to risk the journey anyway, not wanting to worry her father with her absence.[2] She immediately begins to regret her decision when it "grew very darke, so that she could scarce discerne her hand" before her face, and her fears are further compounded when she "heard the noyse of a Horse galloping towards her, at which she beganne to be affraid."[3] Luckily the rider, Ralph Ashley, is a family friend who suggests accompanying her for protection on the road. She accepts his offer, "partly by her knowledge of his supposed friendship to her father, and partly by her desire to get home without any further danger."[4]

Unfortunately for the girl, Ralph Ashley is insincere in his avowed desire to protect her. Instead, "the Devill strait furnished him with a device to obtaine his wicked purpose," and once she is securely installed on his horse, he rides off the road, and "went about to ravish her, taking a grievous oath that no power in heaven or earth could save her from his lust."[5] With human aid seemingly beyond reach, the young woman calls out to God for succour: "O Lord God of Hosts, tis in thy power to deliver me, help Lord or I perish."[6] God hears the virgin's prayer; although Ashley "tooke a great oath swearing God Damme-him, alive or dead he would injoy her," God sends out a "streame of fire strucke from the Comet, in the perfect shape, and exact resemblance of a flaming Sword, so that he fell downe staggering."[7] Proof of

God's wrath notwithstanding, the severely wounded Ashley refuses to repent for his crime, cursing instead "the perverseness of that Roundheaded-whore" whom he blames for his injuries.[8] Finally, "he died raving and blaspheming to the terrour and amazement of the beholders," while the girl recovers fully from her injuries, remaining ever virtuous in the face of suffering.[9] After her deliverance, "the very first words that she spake were these, Lord thou art Iust in thy Judgments and mercifull in the midest of thy justice, wherefore I beseech the [sic] let not this sinne be imputed to his Charge, in the day of Judgment."[10] She prays for Ashley's soul, offering compassion where he showed none.

God's personal intervention in the young woman's affairs both confirms her personal worth and reveals the political leanings of the Divine. While women often faced dangers when travelling the roads alone at night, the girl's friends and later her father emphasize that times are especially treacherous because there are "so many Cavaliers abroad."[11] Clearly they have good reason for concern; as the title page informs the reader, Ashley is "a deboyst Cavalier" whose politics motivate at least in part his sexually violent act.[12] He refers to the young woman as a "Roundheaded-whore," suggesting that his hatred of her (and her father's) political position outweighs his allegiance to his old friend.[13] To be a royalist is to abandon all claim to decency, empathy, or loyalty, and thus when God strikes Ashley down, He is not only aiding an innocent girl but revealing His support for the parliamentarian faction of the English Civil Wars. The tract provides a "fearefull example to al [Ashley's] fellow Cavaliers"; royalists should read of his horrible fate and repent, both of their personal sins and of their political choices.[14]

The introduction to this volume detailed the popularity of the demonic Irishman trope in English Civil War propaganda. This chapter explores the related tropes of the debauched Cavalier and his malignant consort, the poisonous Catholic bride, and traces their afterlife in the rape plays of the early Restoration theater. According to Deborah G. Burks, negative images of Cavaliers abounded during the years of the English Civil Wars: "royal and royalist men appear as rapacious, violent abusers of the innocent citizens of the English nation."[15] After the Restoration, playwrights continued to resurrect the imagery of the propaganda tracts, now using scenes of rape not to condemn but to honor the king. While only three plays of the 1660s actually staged scenes of sexual violence, each is interested in rehabilitating the monarchy from two decades of parliamentary attacks. The Earl of Orrery's *The Generall* (1662) is both the first heroic drama and the first play to use rape to redeem the memory of the Cavaliers. Orrery displaces the violence of the debauched Cavalier onto the parliamentary faction, accusing Cromwell's supporters of the worst sorts of sexually violent atrocities and improving by proxy the image of the royalist. He also constructs a discourse of rape and royalism that will be expanded upon and developed over the next forty years.

Subsequently, Thomas Porter's *The Villain* (1664) and Edward Howard's *The Usurper* (1664) adopt a similar technique to establish their own royalism, albeit *The Usurper* more explicitly, *The Villain* only in passing. Howard will also resurrect the rhetoric of the anti–Henrietta Maria tracts, engaging with the discourse of the poisonous Catholic bride to dismiss fears about the king's Catholic mistresses and new Catholic queen. In all of these plays, the discourse of sexual violence is the discourse of political controversy, while the combination of sexual atrocity and dramatic pathos reflects the depth of the theater's involvement with the world of political propaganda.[16]

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA IN THE 1640S: THE TROPE OF THE DEBAUCHED CAVALIER

The tale of rape and divine retribution that began this chapter incorporates many of the recurring tropes of English Civil War parliamentarian propaganda. *A Blazing Starre*'s Roundhead maid is an innocent woman wronged by Cavalier excess. She is obedient to her father, devout in her worship of God, and forgiving and merciful in her treatment of her assailant. Ralph Ashley, by contrast, is violent and sacrilegious. The shepherds who find the wounded Ashley are initially astounded to hear him "blaspheming, and belching forth many damnable imprecations," and he later dies entirely unrepentant, "raving and blaspheming to the terrour and amazement of the beholders."[17] The tract thus concludes with a moral that is also a political warning: "Reader heare is a president for all those that are customary blasphemers, and live after the lusts of their flesh, especially all those Cavaliers which esteem murder & rapine the chiefe Principalls of their religion, for doubtlese this is but a beginning of Gods vengeance for not onely he, but they, and we, and all of us, except we repent; we shall all likewise perish."[18] The Cavaliers as a party are, like Ashley, blasphemous, lustful, and violent. They are rapists and murderers who commit atrocities against innocent parliamentarians, reject the true faith, and worship only their own perverse desires.

Another anonymously authored tract, *A New Mercury, called Mercurius Problematicus* (1644), offers a "brief Character of a Cavalier of these times," enumerating the many destructive qualities of the royalists:

> A Cavalier of these times, appears like a burning Beacon; which makes all men expect some approaching mischief. He tells you, he fights for the King and his lawes, yet obeys none, but stands upon his own prerogative: For Rapine is his Vocation, and Murther his Recreation; imbruing his hand in the bloud of his Country with as much delight, as if *Beati-bellifaci* were the truest Motto. If Common Prayers be suppressed, his devotion is almost silenced; for he hath but one prayer for himself, and a very short one, but that I confesse is

> often in his mouth, and continually in his actions, which is *God dam him.* He loves his King as he doth his Whore, expressing to both a feigned fidelity, onely to satisfie his unlawfull appetities, which being done, he regards both alike. If he conquer any man that appears religious, it is argument enough to give no quarter, but minse him into Attomes: And he shewes his greatest contrition when at any time he lets a *Roundhead* escape unkilled, for he never repents heartily, but of that sinne. He beleeves there is no such way to know a good subject, as drinking a health to the Parliaments confusion; Nor any such Traitor as he which denies it.[19]

The tract rehearses the litany of complaints leveled against the royalists throughout the period. Cavaliers are violent beasts who rape virtuous women and murder innocent men. They are whoremongers and drunkards who speak sacrilege and lack true religion. They rejoice in their cruel treatment of the Roundheads and claim loyalty to the king but eschew true fidelity to any but themselves. In fact, by treating their king as they would a common whore, they feminize their ruler and undermine the strength of the monarchy they claim to support.

Such accusations returned again and again throughout the period as parliamentarian propagandists sought to delegitimize royalist politics. According to George Lawrence, the Cavaliers would frequently "drink a health to the confusion of the Gospell of Iesus Christ"; they would "drink, and be drunk, and whore, and be damnd, and will not be beholding to God to save us," an oath that Lawrence labels "unparalleld blasphemy, contrary to the principles of Nature, Reason, and Religion."[20] Threats of violence frequently accompanied such instances of drunken blasphemy. The royalist speaker of *The Wicked Resolution Of The Cavaliers* (1642), for instance, proposes the following toast: "My brave companion and Cavalier, let us drink courageously that we may kill the Divell and all his regiment of roundheads."[21] Another 1642 pamphlet, *A wonderfull And Strange Miracle*, describes how Andrew Stonsby, a Cavalier, demanded a "Sea of Drinke, that Leviathan-like he might swill himselfe to death in his owne Ellement."[22] Stonsby couples his desire for drink with a desire for sex—he wishes for "ten Legions of Whores"—and concludes with a Satanic toast.[23] "I beginne a health to the Devill," he avows, frightening the onlooking crowd: "the rest of his company though they were steeped in Wine, began to shrinke back."[24] Stonsby is punished for his sacrilege when the devil comes to claim him, but even while dying, he refuses to repent: "they found the miserable wretch layd groveling on the ground, raving and blaspheming, and so he continned [sic] for the space of a day and a night, and afterward died raging and blaspheming against God, and cursing the *Roundheads*."[25] As in *A Blazing Starre,* the Cavalier of *A wonderfull And Strange Miracle* is instantly punished for his blasphemy, but even proof of divine displeasure cannot dissuade him from his sacrilege.

In many of the tracts, Cavalier fondness for drink leads to alcohol-induced property damage. The author of *Strange, true, and lamentable NEWES from Exceter* [sic] (1643) describes how the royalist army "went into some Cellars where was plenty of wine, and beere, drank what their gormandising guts would hold, and let the rest run about the house . . . moreover they breake the Covenant which was made, in every respect, the very first hour that they entered the City and fell to plundering, pillaging, robbing, stealing, cutting and slashing."[26] The royalists are implacable in their hatred of the Roundheads and constantly seek to destroy both their persons and their goods. According to Lawrence, "A great Company of Cavalliers comming to plunder a Town, they swore, that they would robbe, and slay all the *Roundheads* in the Towne."[27] *The Insolency and Cruelty of the Cavaliers* (1643) similarly describes "the plundering and pillaging of Winslow, and Swanborne, and diverse other townes in the Counties of Buckingham, and Hartford," and it enumerates the goods stolen from various Roundhead country squires.[28] *Terrible Newes From York* (1642) lists "the barbarous Actions of the Cavaliers at *Yorke,* in plundering the houses, seizing the goods, and imprisoning the persons of those Citizens that refuse to contribute money to maintaine a War against the Parliament, having already plundered above twenty Citizens houses."[29] The Cavaliers are accused of "cutting . . . purses, breaking of houses, and pillaging the same, and sundry other Out-rages; as calling for things and not paying a farthing for it."[30] In some cases, they abandon all pretense of lawful behavior and become common thieves. One group of soldiers reportedly took a tailor and his servants hostage in his home, "each man drawing his sword and . . . vowing to kill him, if he told them not where his Gold was."[31]

Since for the royalists of the parliamentary pamphlets "no death was bad enough for Round-heads," no treatment too outré, the Cavaliers also attack their women, both a form of property crime and an outrage against English manhood.[32] Accounts of sexual violence pervade the propaganda tracts. *A perfect Declaration of The Barbarous and Cruell practices committed by Prince Robert, the Cavalliers, and others in his Majesties Army* (1642) details how royalist soldiers "spoyled his Majesties good subjects, and many were murthered and barbarously used, ravishing of women, and bloudily killing others, not sparing those that were great with child, nor pittying poore little infants."[33] *The Wicked Resolution Of The Cavaliers* (1642) reprints a speech supposedly "Made by a Cavalier to one of his Dammee Companions": "we desire nothing but to cut throats, take purses, ravish maids, plunder houses, murder Roundheads, defie the Parliament, and like Phaeton, set all the world on fire."[34] William Cartwright, author of the Roundhead tract, *The Game at Chesse*, directly links property crime with sexual assault. The Cavaliers, he writes, only pretend loyalty to the king while maltreating the truly loyal parliamentarian faction. They "invade the Subjects Estates and

Persons that continue firme in their Allegiance to the King and the white *Knights* [the Parliament], plundering their Houses, and inforcing their wives and daughters to their lusts."[35] The royalist army, he complains, "hath produced so many blacke and bloody effects in this Kingdome, and so many plunderings, rapines and murthers, that the beauteous face of this pleasant Land is bestained and bedewed with blood; the Inhabitants thereof beaten and terrified out of their peaceful dwellings, their goods dispoyled and taken away."[36]

Antiroyalist tracts of the 1640s also link the violence of the debauched Cavalier with that of the demonic Irishman. John Goodwin's *Anti-Cavalierisme*, for instance, demands "the suppressing of that Butcherly brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries, who are now hammering England, to make an Ireland of it."[37] George Lawrence even more explicitly connects Cavalier excess—drunkenness, whoremongering, sexual violence, and blasphemy—with Catholic sacrilege. Comparing the Cavaliers to the biblical Midianites, Lawrence writes,

> They were uncleane both by bodily and spirituall uncleannesse. . . . We put *spirituall* and *bodily uncleannesse* together, because one seldome goes without the other. As for *bodily uncleannesse,* we will not accuse them how many they abused; you may take that *ex concessio* themselves . . . that they would Whore, Drinke, and be Damned, wherefore if they doe not whore, at least they lie both which Sinnes God will judge; yet we cannot but give you the Report of the Country, of two *Cavalliers* who ravished one *Maide* while another stood by and held the Horses: of 7. [sic] more, who abused another, before shee could be released from them; besides the many Rapes and Chamber-Adulteries, which we leave to the All-seeing Eyes and Revenging Hand of Iustice, and as for *Spirituall Uncleannesse,* which is Idolatry, that cannot be free from their Campe, having so many *Papists* and prophane ones in their unhallowed and *Pseudo-Catholique* Army.[38]

Lawrence deftly shifts between the physical violence of rape and the spiritual evils of blasphemy and Catholicism. The sexual and the religious are linked as two forms of uncleanness, while uncontrollable sexual aggression functions as a natural extension of Catholic idolatry among the "Popish, and evill affected Cavaliers."[39]

In all of these tracts, the authors make an implicit appeal to the good men of England to stand up against royalist tyranny and to protect their wives, children, and goods from harm. Implicit in such warnings is the fear that English Catholics will erupt in a massacre to rival the carnage of the 1641 Irish rebellion; by recalling the tales of Irish violence, the tracts tap into popular fears of "a Catholic enemy whose aim is the total annihilation of Protestantism."[40] An increase in crime, they insist, is the direct byproduct of Catholic plotting within the realm. Left to flourish, the Catholics will "slay

our fathers, ravish our mothers, plunder our houses, spoil our goods, and utterly deprive us of all outward comforts."[41] Thus in the words of *Anti-Cavalierisme*, "You are to stand up in defence of your Lives, your Liberties, your Estates, your Houses, your Wives, your Children, your Brethren, and that not of this Nation only, but of those two other Nations likewise united under the same government with this, in the defence of those Religious and faithfull Governours, that Honourable Assembly of Parliament."[42] All good Protestants must fight against the combined forces of "the Papists and bloud-thirsty Cavaliers," must defend "the King [and] the Rights and Privilidges of Parliament, against all malignant Parties, both Papists and Cavaliers."[43] The debauched Cavalier becomes for the English the domestic ally of the demonic, blood-thirsty Irishman, and together those evil men "would subject our Roiall King under the Popes Supremacy, and so ensnare us under a Tyrant."[44]

The anti-Cavalier and anti-Irish tracts share a mutual vocabulary of violent atrocity. That Charles I and Henrietta Maria were commonly known to be soliciting Catholic (and even Irish Catholic) support for the royalist cause further reinforced the widespread fear that no Protestant man, woman, or child would be safe from the joint violence of Cavalier and Catholic. *The Dammee Cavalliers Warning Piece* complains, "how often have they appointed our men for the swords & slaughter, our wives & daughters for Rapes and Adulteries, & after to cruell murther, our children to have been dashed in pieces against the stones in the streets, as too many have Been in *Ireland,* our cities to have been fired about our eares, and all our wealth to be a prey for them."[45] *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry* decries the "plundering Cavaliers, who neither have respect to sex nor age, the gray head, nor the harmlesse babes but burn, destroy, rob, plunder, pillage all without any mercy or pity."[46] These men "plunder, pilladge, ravish, and doe what they please."[47] They maltreat women and the elderly, "throwing [a] grave minister with his aged wife downe the staires."[48] They are especially cruel to children: "such infants as we, have had their braines dashed out against the stones, or posts of houses, tost up and down upon the points of their pikes."[49] And like the Irish of the 1641 tracts, they target pregnant women. One pamphlet describes the investigation into the murder of a woman "shot under the back into the belly, being very great with child, and within a Month or five weeks of the time of her delivery."[50]

If the Cavaliers are linked with the Irish Catholics by their acts of rape and plunder, they are also connected by the shared imagery of vampirism and cannibalism. Royalist armies are alternately labelled "bloudy minded Cannibals,"[51] "malignant and bloud-sucking Cannibals,"[52] "bloud sucking Chavaliers,"[53] and "bloud-thirsty Cavaliers."[54] Such comments serve both to remind Protestant audiences of the supposed horrors of transubstantiation and to render the Catholics and Cavaliers jointly Other. "Self-fashioning is

achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile," Stephen Greenblatt writes. "This threatening Other—heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, Antichrist—must be discovered or invented in order to be attacked and destroyed," thereby determining the contours of English national identity.[55] Accordingly, the propaganda tracts transform the Cavaliers into a monstrous Other against which only the Roundheads may be judged English and worthy. One tract goes so far as to suggest that "bondage under the Turk is humanity and mercy" compared to the "slavery" and "tyranny of the Cavaliers."[56] Writing of the worst of the anti-Irish atrocity pamphlets, Raymond Tumbleson argues that their aim is to "stigmatize a people as so vile and degraded that all measures are justified against them and ruthless ones are necessary."[57] By linking the Cavaliers to an array of English cultural enemies, the anti-Cavalier tracts participate in a similar ideological project. The Cavaliers and the Catholics are worse than the cruelest of foreign enemies, justifying their final annihilation.

REDEEMING THE CAVALIERS: ORRERY'S *THE GENERALL*

In the decade following the Restoration, it fell to royalist authors to dismantle Roundhead political culture and rewrite the image of the monarchy for the new generation. As such, the theater became an important source of political activism. Nancy Klein Maguire explains,

> Since Charles II recognized the propaganda value of the theater, and relished drama personally, nearly all of the new playwrights were politicians who became playwrights either to gain or to enhance their political credibility. Whether triumphant after twenty years of fidelity to the Stuart cause or hopeful that they could blot out their Cromwellian allegiances, the playwrights, like other Royalists, defended the traditional power-structure in an attempt to rehabilitate themselves and their culture. In tragicomic rituals reenacting regicide and restoration, they promoted kingship in the new circumstances by exonerating themselves of the execution of Charles I while celebrating the restoration of his son.[58]

Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, was one such playwright who wrote to rehabilitate both the monarchy and his own reputation. Initially a friend to both Charles II and Oliver Cromwell, Orrery (then Lord Broghill) finally supported Cromwell in the civil wars, becoming a trusted advisor to the Lord Protector and urging him to accept the crown: "Rather than go to prison for supporting Charles II's cause, Orrery himself served during the Interregnum on Cromwell's cabinet, was elected to Parliament, and urged Cromwell to become king."[59] As he became disillusioned with the Interregnum government, he began to work for Charles's return. While his plan was abandoned

in favor of General George Monck's, he was instrumental in ensuring the success of the Restoration, for which Charles forgave his earlier disloyalty and awarded him the title of Orrery.

After the Restoration, Charles and Orrery remained on good terms, and it was apparently at Charles's behest that Orrery authored his first play, *The Generall*. In a letter to the Duke of Ormonde, Orrery explains, "When I had the honour and happiness the last time to kiss His Majesty's hand, he commanded me to write a play for him . . . and therefore, some months after, I presumed to lay at his majesty's feet a tragic-comedy, all in ten-feet verse and rhyme . . . because I found his majesty relished rather the French fashion of writing plays than the English."[60] Charles made his request in late 1660, and the play premiered under the title *Altemera* at the Dublin Theatre in the fall of 1662. Charles was pleased with the play and threw his support behind it, writing to Orrery, "I will now tell you, that I have read your first play, which I like very well, and doe intend to bring it upon the Stage, as soone as my Company have their new Stage in order, that the Seanes may bee worthy the words they are to sett forth."[61] The play finally premiered at Drury Lane with the King's Company on September 14, 1664. Samuel Pepys, who saw the play two weeks later on September 28, was not impressed: "so we saw, coming late, part of *The Generall,* my Lord Orrery's (Broghill) second play; but, Lord, to see how no more, either in words, sense, or design, it is to his *Harry the 5th* is not imaginable, and so poorly acted, though in finer clothes, is strange."[62] While *Altemera*, the earlier version, is no longer extant, Orrery apparently made few revisions to the text, making *The Generall* both the first newly authored play of the Restoration to feature a scene of sexual violence and the first play of the period written in rhymed heroic couplets. Throughout the play, Orrery uses rape as a central component of his political project and, as we shall see, constructs many of the tropes that will define the rape play for the remainder of the century.

On the surface, *The Generall* presents a straightforward dramatic allegory of the events of the Interregnum and Restoration. The play begins in the aftermath of the evil unnamed king's usurpation of the throne from the rightful ruler, Melizer. According to army commander Thrasolin,

> Melizer shou'd by right possesse the throne.
> Nor is't lesse true, that man who rules us now
> Is both a Tirant and usurper too,
> For when Evender I fight did fall,
> The Monster was the Armies Generall,
> And when the Royall Melizer hee shou'd
> Have Crown'd as being first Prince of the bloud,
> Hee seiz'd on him, and by his boundlesse pow'r
> Made him close prisoner in the fatall Tower,
> Where still our lawfull king hee has deteyn'd.[63]

As a result, the kingdom has fractured, with some nobles choosing to support (and purchase power within) the new regime; Olerand, another commander, admits that "Hee lately bought that Office hee possess't" (4.2.69). Meanwhile, other nobles, including the virtuous Lucidor, have been labelled rebels for their continued loyalty to the true king. The usurper excuses his crime by attempting to redefine the concept of divine right: "What ever crymes are acted for a Crowne," he explains, "The Gods forgive, when once they put it on" (4.1.27–28). Whoever holds the throne has the right to rule, he argues, or else God would not have allowed him to succeed in his pursuit of power. Merit and might, he goes on to claim, and not birth legitimize the rightful monarch.

By the end of the play, however, the correct king has been restored to his position by a coalition of army commanders. Memnor announces, "Your Subjects, Sir, from whose Campe now I came, / Have sent mee to acquaint you in their name / Their Joy, that in your Lawfull throne you sitt. / To their true sovereigne gladly they submitt" (5.1.399–402). Meanwhile, the usurper is struck down by the true king, a dramatic fantasy of punishment and reconciliation that replays the events of the Restoration with a more satisfactory outcome. According to Jonathan Scott, the early years of the Restoration "entailed a process of grieving, and of struggle between forgetting and memory."[64] As part of that struggle, royalists had to accept the fact that Cromwell was never punished for his crime, that he was only defeated by natural death. *The Muses Joy For the Recovery of that Weeping Vine Henrietta Maria* (1660), for instance, complains that Cromwell "Gasp't in his bed *too late*, and yet *too soon*" since he did not "*live* to *Hang* and suffer for his sin."[65] Likewise, in *A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell And Hugh Peters* (1660), Peters's ghost comments that Cromwell "had the luck to die in your bed, and to have a pompous Funeral with all Prince-like solemnities (never to be paid for!)."[66] After the Restoration, a rash of effigy burnings took place as people "avoided the issue of their own compliance and accommodation with the Cromwellian regime."[67] Thomas Rugge describes one such scene: "in Westminster a very great fiere was made, and on top of the fier they put old Oliver Cromwell and his wife in sables, theire pictures lifely made like them in life, which was burnt in the fire, and State armes."[68] Such displays culminated in January 1661 when Charles II ordered the exhumation of Cromwell's corpse:

> On 30 January 1661, the anniversary of the execution of Charles I, the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw were exhumed from their graves in Westminster Abbey, dragged to Tyburn on hurdles, and hanged before a crowd of thousands. At sunset, the bodies were taken down, decapitated, and buried in a pit under Tyburn, while the heads were placed on spikes atop Westminster Hall.[69]

According to Laura Lunger Knoppers, the "disinterment of Cromwell was intended as a solemn display of justice and punishment," although as she points out, by punishing Cromwell so publicly, the king returned him to the center of public discourse once more.[70] Perhaps even more problematically than Knoppers notes, the spectacle also served as a reminder that true justice—the punishment of Cromwell's living form—did not and would never occur. There is a limit to a king's authority, and he cannot command Cromwell back to life that he may sentence him to death.

It is here that the stage offers a salve to a nation's guilty conscience. While Charles II and the English people had to content themselves with exhuming and humiliating Cromwell's earthly remains, Orrery's King Melizer defeats the usurper onstage. In the play's climactic scene, Melizer prevents the usurper from committing suicide: "Thy deaths a debt my hand alone must pay. / Had I allow'd what now thou wouldst have done, / Thou hadst usurp'd my vengeance, as my crowne" (4.6.436–38). That Melizer defeats the usurper so easily proves both his potency and God's support for his cause. While Thrasolin says somewhat ironically of the usurper that "I call him King, because hee fills the throne" (1.4.333), Clorimun recognizes that Melizer joins merit with right and that both are displayed in his easy victory over the false king. Melizer's "virtues are soe great, his right soe good, / Hee should bee King by choice as well as bloud" (3.2.207–9). As Mita Choudhury explains, "The king's 'right' gives him the 'legitimacy' to rule, a right/legitimacy that the usurper does not have."[71] The end of the play thus reestablishes the primacy of divine right; the person marked by birth to rule is also the most qualified for and deserving of the position.

If the usurper is punished, his supporters are redeemed. Olerand has purchased his position within the new government but renounces it when Clorimun returns to the fight and it appears the rebellion may succeed. According to Cratoner, Olerand

> privately brought mee to Clorimun,
> Where Olerand protested before mee
> Hee wou'd this night sett him at Libertie.
> The Generall too vow'd hee'd noe more deferre
> By open force to Restore Melizer,
> Which hee noe longer cou'd esteeme unjust,
> Th'usurper having freed him of his trust. (4.2.73–79)

Clorimun, like Monck and Orrery, initially fights for the usurper but ultimately is recalled to virtue and supports his king in an act of reunion and reconciliation. All those who profited under tyranny gladly rejoin the royalist fold; even the common people renew their loyalty and recognize they have been at fault: "Since in a Tyrants cause wee prosper'd soe, / In the true Kings our Swords shou'd Wonders doe. / On the wrong side wee know how wee can fight. / Let's prove now wee can doe it on the right" (4.2.92–95). Unity

reigns as Melizer promises amnesty and mercy for all: “Past faults I’le never to Remembrance bring, / For which the word I give you of your king” (5.1.411–12). The play concludes with a reference to the 1660 Act of Indemnity and Oblivion as the country revels in the goodness of its lawful monarch.

Several critics have analyzed Orrery’s political and personal intentions in crafting *The Generall*. According to Nancy Klein Maguire, “Orrery . . . used playwriting to rehabilitate himself politically, but in modern terms, his self-indicting autobiographies were also his psychotherapy. Orrery, probably unconsciously, used playwriting to work through his own political history, particularly his obsession with the regicide.”[72] Kathleen Lynch concurs, calling the play “a kind of medicine for the soul. His conscience was eased, his monarch (he must have hoped) reassured by his successive portraits of a distinguished general reluctantly serving a usurper and joyfully thereafter bringing in the rightful king.”[73] Yet to read *The Generall* against the backdrop of the English Civil War–era antiroyalist pamphlets is to recognize the extent to which Orrery deliberately engaged with the long-standing tropes of Roundhead propaganda. The play, like the tracts, uses sexual morality to negotiate political movements, and it is in the treatment of sex and sexual violence that Orrery’s celebration of royalism becomes most clear. First and foremost, as the tyrant is a usurper, he is also a rapist, one who eagerly attempts to force Altemera into sex. The tyrant will claim Altemera’s body without consent as he unlawfully conquered the nation, and the play continually reinforces the link between imperial conquest and sexual violence. When Mora, Altemera’s stronghold, is conquered, Filadin remarks, “When townes are conquer’d by the force of Warre, / Walls first are storm’d and then the Women are” (2.2.257–58). Similarly, when defeat is assured, a Page counsels Altemera, “Fly, Madam, Fly, or else you are undone; / The Towne is now possesst by Clorimun” (2.4.371–72). Sexual violence and military conquest are treated as extensions of one another, and both prove the usurper’s baseness and corruption.

To attack Altemera is, metaphorically speaking, to attack the nation; she functions as a stand-in for the English/Sicilian state, and thus the health of her body reflects more broadly the health of the country. That the usurper has committed a horrible crime becomes terribly apparent when Altemera begins to wither away and die under his cruel control: “I perceive a palenesse in her Lipps,” the usurper complains, “And her triumphant Eyes are in an Ecclipse. / The bright Virmillion from her Cheekes is fledd, / And death beginns to reigne where beauty did” (4.6.383–86). Altemera’s decline mirrors the damage caused by the usurpation, and only with the return of the true king can she be restored to health and prosperity. Importantly, one of Melizer’s first acts as king is to bestow his consent for Altemera’s long-desired marriage to Lucidor: “And, Lucidor, since you to armes did fly / But to preserve your mistresse Chastitie, / As soone as arte and time your Mistresse cures, / By

sacred nuptiall Rites shee shall be yours" (5.1.389–92). Melizer reasserts his control over the kingdom by asserting his right to approve Altemera's matrimonial (and sexual) choices. He affirms himself as a ruler to the nation by first functioning as a ruler to Altemera.

According to Staves, Orrery's use of rape anticipates the political culture of the Exclusion Crisis and Glorious Revolution. Perhaps more urgently, it looks backward to the political culture of the English Civil Wars. In depicting the false king as a cruel rapist, Orrery transforms the trope of the debauched Cavalier into the trope of the debauched usurper. Sexual violence and sexual excess in the play are solely associated with the tyrant and his supporters. Clorimun, like the false king, is in love with Altemera, and as he initially fights on the usurper's side, he is also initially willing to commit an act of violence to slake his desire. "I renounce virtue, I am all but Love" (3.2.46), he tells Altemera. Fortunately, Clorimun proves his virtue by resigning Altemera to Lucidor, thus avoiding the usurper's fate.

> Your scorning death in mee such greifs had bred,
> I wish'd you rather Lucidors than dead.
> Why shou'd not I, since Life againe you have,
> Performe that which will keep you from the Grave,
> And save your life now at as high a Rate
> As I would lately have redeem'd it at? . . .
> You must be either death's or Lucidors,
> Be his then, Madame. (5.1.337–42, 350–51)

Clorimun's return to sexual virtue correlates with his return to political virtue. He will not follow the tyrant's lead and become a rapist, nor will he fight any longer to preserve the usurper's rule: "The tyrant then forc'd you to that sad fate; / What was his sinne, why shou'd I immitate?" (5.1.343–44). Personal morality follows political morality, reaffirming the royalist insistence that true virtue (both personal and political) lies with the monarch, not the leaders of the interregnum government.

The behavior of the other army commanders also reflects the parallel between political and sexual behavior. Thrasolin, Monasin, and Filadin are interesting figures, insofar as they accede to the new government, even as they attempt to undermine it from within. Neither fully traitor nor fully loyal to Melizer, they occupy a politically liminal space characterized by opportunism rather than principle. Monasin and Filadin in particular are willing to fight for the usurper, accepting positions in the new king's army. As their political allegiances are shifting and groundless, so, too, are their romantic impulses unfixed and disloyal. In act 2, they pause to comment on the women of their acquaintance, criticizing them for being too chaste or too loose, too old or too intelligent. Monasin calls Daphnis "a witt, reads books, / And her words are more hansome than her looks. / That woman's brought to an unhappy passe / When her tongue is the best part shee has" (2.2.163–66). He

mocks Cloris, who "vainly hopes her Lovers to persuade / By her discretion, now her beauties fade" (2.2.185–86). Cratoner calls Amanta "old enough ugly to be, I knowe; / And young enough too long to live soe too" (2.2.177–78). Filadin criticizes Calione for thinking too much of herself: "I prais'd her body, and shee prais'd her soule" (2.2.200), while Cratoner confirms that "Love enters at the Eye, not at the Eare" (2.2.210). The men celebrate their catty gossip as a way to strike a blow against female falsity: "Since they will have us tell lyes to their face, / Yet, when their backs be turn'd, let truth take place" (2.2.231–32). They also insist upon the evils of marriage. Cratoner calls marriage "needlesse, for if Love Comands / Their hearts to Joyne, they need noe nuptiall bands" (2.2.144–45), while Monasin protests the "artificiall" bands of marriage (2.2.153) and Filadin the "horrid Chaines" of matrimony (2.2.155).

This scene has, to date, received little critical attention, perhaps because it seems wholly inappropriate to the overarching tone of the play, a scene torn from a sex comedy and inserted into a heroic drama. I want to suggest, however, that Orrery includes this scene not just to provide comic relief, but to associate the usurper's opportunistic followers with the negative aspects of Cavaliering. Unlike the usurper, these men are not rapists, but their wit, flippancy, unchastity, and rejection of matrimonial mores bespeak their sexual corruption and underscore their accompanying political untrustworthiness. Their words also recall some of the more flippant Cavalier carpe diem lyrics, among them Sir John Suckling's famous pronouncement, "Out upon it, I have lov'd / Three whole days together; / And am like to love three more, / If it prove fair weather."[74] While not violent like the usurper himself, Thrasolin, Monasin, and Filadin embody one aspect of the debauched Cavalier—sexual profligacy—here displaced onto those men of questionable loyalty. According to Stephen Flores, "Heroic faithfulness—to one's king, kin, class, lover, or spouse—functions as a metaphor and a formula for solidarity, for a social and political order constituted by a public recognition of one's allegiance to the court and to the upper classes and the values necessary to their hegemony."[75] When working at least partially for the usurper's camp, the men lack fidelity, sexual or otherwise, associating the usurping faction, the parliamentary faction, with libertinism. Tellingly, the men make no more such comments after returning to the royalist fold. After the Restoration, they speak only of honor and decry the wickedness of mankind.

If the usurper's men speak the language of Suckling, Lucidor speaks the language of Richard Lovelace. Lucidor, named a rebel for his continued loyalty to the crown, evinces no interest in Cavalier sexual excess, instead remaining ever loyal to his love for Altemera. When he leaves her, he does so honorably, because he must fight for personal glory. Echoing Lovelace's famous lines from "To Lucasta, Going to the Wars," "I could not love thee, Dear, so much / Loved I not honour more,"[76] Altemera complains that

"Though you love mee, yett you love glory more" (1.2.235). "I can forgive you all thinges," Altemera tells Lucidor, "But leaving mee, and leaving mee for Warre" (1.2.206–7). In response, Lucidor both proclaims his eternal love for Altemera and defends his love of honor, the only thing he values beyond her:

> Hee, Madam, that is destin'd unto you,
> Must needes bee destin'd unto Triumphes too.
> The Justice of the Gods is sure too high
> Your care to give mee, and their owne deny.
> I have your Love, and in your Quarrell fight:
> That makes itt duty, this makes itt delight.
> In your just Cause all dangers I despise.
> My Sword shall bee resistlesse as your Eyes. (1.2.250–57)

What the play does, then, is subtly to divide the negative aspects of Cavaliering, the sexual excess characteristic of Suckling's poetry, from the positive pursuit of honor for self, king, and country represented in Lovelace's. Lucidor becomes the answer to the debauched Cavalier, the positive figure of the royalist that stands in contrast to the corruptions of the false king and his men.

PORTER, HOWARD, AND THE TROPE OF THE DEBAUCHED USURPER

On October 18, 1664, Thomas Porter's *The Villain* premiered in London. One of the first hits of the newly reopened theaters, *The Villain* pokes fun at aspects of *The Generall* (previously circulating in manuscript) while borrowing elements of *Othello* for presentation on the contemporary stage.[77] *The Villain* is not an explicitly political play; while the main characters are soldiers, their romantic travails are never linked to an overarching political plot. Yet Nancy Klein Maguire suggests that contemporary audiences might have imaginatively connected Maligni, the play's Iago/vice figure, with Oliver Cromwell: "a theatre-goer in the 1660s might also have seen a connection between Maligni and Cromwell. The typical epithet for Cromwell in Restoration plays and other publications was 'monster' . . . Porter uses the term for Maligni."[78] As Maligni is also the play's attempted rapist, Porter, like Orrery, displaces the rhetoric of sexual violence onto a stand-in for the lord protector. Maligni, like Orrery's king, attempts an act of sexual usurpation, stealing a woman who does not belong to him, perhaps an oblique glance at Restoration politics.

It is not until Edward Howard's *The Usurper* (1664), however, the third and final play of the decade to feature a scene of sexual violence, that the rhetoric of rape is employed in its most fully developed and explicitly political form. Expanding on the tropes first constructed by *The Generall*, *The Usurper* offers the clearest dramatic engagement with Roundhead propaganda. Like Orrery, Howard treats his play as a political act, a form of effigy burning and a way to witness the execution of the tyrant. Howard has "rais'd a bold Usurper up, to Fall," and if the audience will only support the play's continued success, the nation may watch the horrid criminal punished over and over on a nightly basis:

> Faith let him live, if but to dye agen.
> His Crime was horrid, and it is not fit,
> One death of the Usurper Expiate it:
> Let him dye often, He's content that way,
> Still to be punish'd, so you'l spare the Play.[79]

Certainly, as Harold Love has suggested, Howard here refers to the exhumation of Cromwell's corpse: "*The Usurper* was designed to appeal to the same unpleasant streak in the royalist mentality that was responsible for the exhumation and mutilation of the Protector's body, unctuously alluded to in its closing lines."[80] Yet Howard is also describing a *dramatic* act, transforming the play into a glorious extension of that earthly punishment. Howard celebrates his own royalism—the play represents "a Record of all such Loyalty; / That after long Contests, did safely bring, / Subjects to Rights, and to his Throne our King" (72)—and honors the theater's ability both to punish the guilty and to reform the immoral: "The Moral use of Plays, does make us know / Actions, which virtues Raise, and vice lay Low: / Teaching the Bad, though even dead, to fear / They may be Reviv'd, to be punish'd here" (72). To die is not the worst fate; even the dead must fear posthumous resurrection on the public stage, a thought that must give any evildoer pause. The usurper himself may die, but his image will live on night after night to be punished before a patriotic and royalist theater-going populace.

As is true of *The Generall*, regret over Cromwell's peaceful end permeates Howard's play. In act 3, Damocles the Usurper (Cromwell) asks his faithful henchman, Hugo (Hugh Peters), what the people are saying about him. The people, Hugo reports,

> Say, you are but an Usurper, and though you
> Have the luck to dye in your Bed; nay, and may
> Have the liberty to stinke in your Grave,
> Yet they hope before they dye to make it a
> Holiday, and see you hang'd after all this, to
> The great Comfort of the Nation. (33)

To Howard's great regret, Cromwell was lucky enough to die in his bed and did not provide solace to the nation with the spectacle of his rightful execution. Thus the play offers the royalist comfort that historical circumstances did not afford. Damocles, like Orrery's usurper, will be confronted and overthrown by the rightful government, the senators he has ordered assassinated and the king, Cleander, whom he unfairly replaced. While Orrery's tyrant dies quickly, shamed by recognition of his wrongdoing, Damocles is both unrepentant and subject to a much lengthier onstage punishment. Damocles is taunted—"who durst confine me thus, and give me / Such saucy Language," he complains (69)—and stripped of his authority, and when he finally dies by his own hand, he faces the inevitability of eternal punishment for his crimes. "My eyes grow dim o'th'sudden," he exclaims, "'Tis a trouble / Now to look upwards: Heaven's a great way off, / I shall not find the way i'th'dark" (70). He may evade earthly punishment, but God has seen and judged his actions.

Damocles is condemned to hellfire, a conclusion that mirrors the treatment of Cromwell in many of the early Restoration royalist tracts. *A Parly Between the Ghosts of the Late Protector, and the King of Sweden, At their Meeting in Hell* (1660), for instance, opens with Oliver Cromwell "taking Tobacco in the great Divills own Closet," and concludes with a graphically scatological vision of his eternal punishment.[81] One of Satan's henchmen "came presently and stopp'd his mouth with Cow-dung, as Bakers stop their Ovens, and so he was delivered to another Officer, who instantly Chained him before the General pissing place next the Court Door, with a strict charge, that nobody that made water thereabouts, should pisse any where, but against some part of his body."[82] Such a punishment is not only deserved but necessary, as even Satan must worry about the security of his throne; in *The Case is Altered. Or, Dreadful news from Hell* (1660), the ghost of Cromwell tells his wife that he hopes to "usurp a power from the Devil."[83] Thus *Hells Higher Court of Justice* (1661) offers another vision of punishment and restraint: Cromwell will

> be bound
> Within a red-hot throne and one [sic] his head
> A burning Crown about him shall be spread,
> Robes furred with brimstone that they still may be
> Marks of his late Usurped Soveraignity.[84]

He will be tormented for all time with the symbols of his undeserved office.[85]

In forcing Damocles to confront the reality of hellfire, *The Usurper* draws upon the themes of early Restoration propaganda. Like these tracts, *The Usurper* offers audiences the opportunity to deny Cromwell a peaceful death and eternal reward, royalist justice finally served. Damocles says jokingly,

"when their Breath / Is spent, their Heirs may take up their quarrel / And kill me in a Chronicle; where they shall read / That all their Fathers were my slaves" (34). While Damocles laughs, his words describe Howard's project; the play will kill the usurper in a chronicle to atone for the nation's failure to execute him in real life. And the "comfort" of such a spectacle is available to the nation on a nightly basis, if only audiences are patriotic enough to support the play with their attendance.

To rehabilitate the image of the monarchy successfully, Howard must, like Orrery, overcome twenty years' worth of parliamentary attacks. A precedent for such defenses did exist among English Civil War propaganda pamphlets, although they are few in number compared with the deluge of anti-Cavalier sheets. *The Cavaliers Catechism* (1647) presents a dialogue between a Cavalier and a suspicious questioner who recites the litany of charges: the Cavaliers are "all most infamous Livers, Atheists, Epicures, Swearers, Blasphemars [sic], Drunkards, Murderers, and Ravishers, and (at the least) papists."[86] The Cavalier proceeds to deny all such charges, proclaiming, "To these and the like scandalous aspersions, I will only say thus, (in briefe Sir) that as I cannot excuse all of our Party (no more than you can all of yours) so I cannot but in Conscience (according to my ability) be bound to defend & vindicate the Major part of us from such malitious, and fraudulent Calumniations."[87] The author of *The Noble Cavalier Caracterised, And A Rebellious Caviller Cauterised* also defends the royalist faction by separating the good and just actions of the Cavaliers from the evil acts of an unrelated faction, the Cavillers: "The *Caviller* is a Rascall, whether he swim, go, or ride; the *Cavalier* dares fight and be valiant, obey Law, and serve for his Soveraigne, his Countrey, for the true Religion established, for the Lawes, for the Subjects Liberty, for the Rights and Priviledges of Parliament, and for the peace."[88] Like Orrery, the author of the tract separates the negative aspects of the Cavalier ethos from the positive, disavowing the unsavory behavior of some. He also links the Cavalier faction with the protection of the true Protestant faith, disrupting the connection between royalism and so-called popish tyranny.

Not surprisingly, defenses of royalism became more intense in the months directly preceding the return of Charles II. One 1660 tract, *The Black Book Opened*, presents a dialogue between a "Noble Cavalier" and a "Select number of those Pure refined, Diabolical Saints called (by the most Loyal Subjects) KING-KILLERS."[89] No longer are the Cavaliers linked with brutality and bloodshed and the parliamentarians with loyal opposition. Instead the Cavaliers become "Noble," while the aging Roundheads reveal themselves to be inveterate and implacable in their disloyalty. Despite the fact that "all Nations for a King do cry," one man insists, "Id'e rather dye in a ditch, then live to see a King."[90] Still, he recognizes that he has committed a displeasing act in the eyes of God: "I should count it a good step in my way to Heaven,

could I as *Pilate* wash my hands clear from the guilt of that bloody and unparallell'd murther."[91] Horrified by the crowd of unrepentant Roundheads, the Cavalier finally exclaims in anger, "Villains have you swallowed up the precious blood of a Martyred Father, and subverted the Laws of his Kingdoms, and now do you aim at a Sons blood too, will your Hell Govern'd hearts delight in nothing but sentencing Kings, and Butchering Loyal Subjects? Is no pitty in you?"[92] The Cavalier's rhetoric here inverts the accusations of Roundhead propaganda; the Cavalier is noble, upstanding, and true, both to his king and to his faith. The Roundheads, in contrast, are violent parricides, unnatural children who have rebelled against father, king, and God. They have also metaphorically ingested the blood of their king, an act of implied vampirism (and perhaps, by extension, Catholicism).

The Black Book Opened represents an early attempt to respond to parliamentarian propaganda in the lead-up to the Restoration, and other tracts published after Charles's return follow suit. The Cromwell of *A Third Conference between O. Cromwell and Hugh Peters* tells his henchman that "the lust of ruling caused me to tumour to such a monstrosity, that nothing could gratifie my desires, but Rapines and Murders"; as is the case with Orrery's usurper and Howard's, lust for illicit rule leads to lust for illicit sex.[93] Meanwhile, John Gauden, author of *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house* (1660) calls the Roundheads "bloodthirsty and deceitfull."[94] They are "ravening Wolves" who have metaphorically cannibalized their own monarch: "can nothing satiate your cruel Appetites and Hydropick thirst, but only the flesh and blood of our King?"[95] Gauden calls the Roundheads the "impudent Ravishers both of Church and State."[96] They have been guilty of "unavoidable Tyranny, unsatiable Rapine, and cruel Oppression," and they have tricked the English people into complicity with their horrifying corruption: "You would have us all to pledge you in that horrible draught of the King's bloud, which you have greedily drank; to approve and abet your execrable villainies."[97]

The Usurper adopts similar rhetoric in its defense of royalism. Like the Cavaliers of the propaganda sheets (and like Orrery's Monasin, Filadin, and Cratoner), Damocles's men are sexually lascivious. Hugo, his chief supporter, has cuckolded much of the senate. Referring to the senators that survived Damocles's purge, Hugo tells Damocles, "Those that remain are your own Creatures, Sir, / And most of 'em my Cuckolds, their Wives, / Shall bear me witness" (14).[98] Meanwhile Damocles, like Orrery's king, is a rapist, and metaphorically speaking, a source of infection in the nation. Driven mad with lust for the virtuous Libyan Queen Timandra, mistress to the rightful king, Damocles attempts to rape her: "I wo'not leave," he insists, "Till I have made thee leprous and unfit / For any mans Embrace" (62). His sexuality will

disease Timandra, rendering her unsuitable for other company. She concurs: "I could not hope a Life here / Without Stain to my Honour" (53). The rape will be a blot and an infection, destroying her from within.

Initially, Damocles uses the image of the rape victim to describe the state of the nation at the conclusion of the late wars and to celebrate the stability of his rule. He addresses the

> Grave, honour'd Gentlemen,
> True Patriots and Preservers of your Country,
> Whose Bosome was late panting, and her Cheek
> Pale with the loss of Blood, the Punick Sword
> Had Ravish'd from her. (10)

According to Damocles, the recent uprising has sexually victimized the nation, and he uses the language of ravishment to lament war-induced property loss. Even as Damocles claims to heal the wounded nation, however, he is also the poisonous corruption at its heart. Cleanthe, the king's sister, explains, "his very Name / Carries a secret poison in the Breath," and the damage he does to female bodies encodes the damage he has done to the nation (45). The attempted rape of Timandra metaphorically represents another form of usurpation, as Damocles appropriates a second piece of property that rightfully belongs to Cleander. His lust for empire is linked with his lust for Timandra, connecting the desire for illicit and unwelcome sex with the desire for illicit and unwelcome rule. The image of Timandra's body violated and diseased thus performs the same function as the image of the dying Altemera, insofar as both symbolize the tragic consequences of the usurper's presence in England/Sicily. It is only with the return of the true king that Timandra and the nation can thrive once more. Cleander proclaims that he "hath no Ambition, but / To Repair his sad and bleeding Country, / And that the Laws, after so many Stromes, / May run in their own free and ancient Channel" (66).

While Damocles never engages in any literal acts of vampirism onstage, Howard, drawing on the rhetoric of the royalist tracts, also invokes the trope of blood drinking to taint him. The play, like the propaganda tracts, shifts between forms of atrocity, merging the image of the rapist with that of the vampire. Cleander, disguised as a Moor, confronts Damocles:

> Keep those Bugs
> Upon thy Brow to fright tame Fools, and such
> As born from Worms do Crawl about thy Court,
> And lick the dusty Pavements: Snakes that live
> And lap the blood of Innocents. (54)

Cleander likens Damocles's followers to vampiristic snakes who feed upon the blood of martyrs. Later, Timandra accuses Damocles himself of vampiristic tendencies. When she learns that Hiarbas, her Moorish servant (Clean-

der in disguise), is to be put to death, she begs her manservant "This favour, when Hiarbas with his Blood / Hath satisfied the Thrist [sic] of Damocles, / That you would bring me word" (60). Timandra and Cleander embody virtue in distress, while the parliamentarian forces are linked, however tenuously, with Catholic excess. In contrast, Howard emphasizes Cleander's virtue and mercy, linking him with Charles II. Like Orrery's Melizer, Cleander offers forgiveness and absolution to the nation: "There shall be an Indemnity for those / Whose frailty, and not malice, made 'em Act / Under the Tyrant" (70), he decrees, another reference to the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Cleander's mercy, like Charles's, proves his fitness to rule: "Mercy becomes a King," Cleomenes explains approvingly, "which as it flows / Upon your Enemies, should have a free / Stream to your Friends" (71). Damocles revels in blood while Cleander displays his forbearance.

HOWARD'S *THE USURPER* AND THE TROPE OF THE POISONOUS CATHOLIC BRIDE

As Howard glorifies Cleander/Charles II, he also works to restore the reputation of royalist women. Throughout the English Civil War propaganda sheets, the figure of the debauched Cavalier was linked not only with the demonic Irishman, his political ally, but with the corrupting influence of the poisonous Catholic bride, tainting all royalist women with the specter of popery. Catholic women, propaganda tracts imply, are naturally dangerous and bloodthirsty, all too willing to abandon feminine decorum to commit acts of horrific violence against Protestants. Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, for instance, describes how Irish Catholic women joyfully participated in the carnage of the 1641 Rebellion: "Even the weaker sex themselves, naturally tender to their own sufferings, and compassionate to those of others, have emulated their robust companions in the practice of every cruelty."[99] Aristocratic Catholic women, however, are more adept in anti-Catholic tracts at concealing their murderous impulses. Rather than acting out violently, they choose instead to insinuate themselves by way of marriage into the circles of court power. Often outsiders by birth as well as religion, such women seek to corrupt their Protestant husbands, poison their morality and honor, and ultimately instigate the rapes of English Protestant women and the massacres of English Protestant men. Attacks on royalist Catholic women centered in the 1630s and 1640s on the figure of Queen Henrietta Maria, who became a lightning rod for criticism, fear, and mistrust. Henrietta Maria was a target of hatred before she ever set foot on English soil. Her refusal to attend her own coronation, coupled with her very public mourning performances for English Catholic martyrs, only solidified her reputation as a dangerous outsider who

had been granted too much access to the inner circles of government.[100] As Charles I grew closer to his wife, the danger embodied in the queen became even more urgent, since many worried that her influence would lead Charles away from the Church of England. Widely portrayed as "uncrowned, foreign speaking, emotionally remote, offensively behaving above her gender station by performing in court plays, and ardently Catholic,"[101] the queen was also accused of "incensing the King to this dissention with . . . his Parliament."[102] Throughout the 1640s, then, Roundhead authors justified rebellion by positioning themselves as Charles's saviors. They were determined, they claimed, to save the king from the poisonous "Pests and Vipers"—his wife and chief advisors—who surrounded him and sought to lead him astray.[103] *Englands Miserie* (1642), written by a "Well-wisher to His King and Countrey," blames "these Machivillians (or rather matchlesse-villains) that professe themselves to be friends, when indeed they are fiends" for Charles's failure to heed the will of the Parliament.[104] The author insists that the king is taking bad advice from a collection of "flattering *Achitophel*-Cavaliers, proud ambitious Prelates, and blood-suck-thirsting Church Papists," chief among them, his vampiristic wife.[105]

The reaction to the release of Charles and Henrietta Maria's letters following the Battle of Naseby (1645) encapsulates the cultural anxieties centered on the queen. After capturing Charles I's letters in the battle, the parliamentary government swiftly printed and publicized their contents in a collection entitled *The King's Cabinet opened*. The Parliament insisted upon the authenticity of the letters, going so far as to establish a public exhibition open to anyone who might wish to verify the king's handwriting. The existence of such a collection is inherently voyeuristic; as the title advertises, the Parliament has opened the doors to the king's innermost sanctum and provided intimate access to the details of his private dealings with his wife. According to the collection's editors, "it were a great sin against the mercies of God, to conceale those evidences of truth, which hee so graciously (and almost miraculously) by surprizall of these Papers, hath put into our hands."[106] These monstrous truths are twofold: that Charles had been "seduced out of his proper sphere" by bad advisors and evil counselors, and even more upsettingly, that he was allowing his wife an unprecedented, highly inappropriate level of control over his political choices.[107] According to the editors,

> It is plaine, here, first, that the Kings Counsels are wholly managed by the Queen; though she be of the weaker sexe, borne an Alien, bred up in a contrary Religion, yet nothing great or small is transacted without her privity & consent. . . . The Queens Counsels are as powerfull as commands. The King professes to preferre her health before the exigence, and importance of his owne publick affaires.[108]

It is the king's uxoriousness as much as his seemingly popish leanings that angers the editors; that Charles allows himself to be subservient to his own wife, that he welcomes and even encourages her political counsel bespeaks his failings as a ruler and underscores the degree to which the Parliament must save the king from himself. Henrietta Maria embodies the dangerous triad of bad counselor, monstrous seductress, and popish infidel leading the country to inevitable destruction.

For many parliamentarian propagandists, then, the outbreak of the civil wars was the inevitable, albeit regrettable, result of Henrietta Maria's position in the kingdom. Asked "Whence did these unnaturall broyles spring and arise," the author of *The English Pope* (1643) attributes the realm's turmoil to the "poisonous tongues" of the pope and his female servants at court.[109] Henrietta Maria, the author suggests, appeared harmless as a young bride, but her presence enabled the insidious growth of Catholic political strength: "Whilst the Queene was verie young, and the plot of our Hierarchists not fully ripe, the Babylonish Mysteries were not fit to be revealed: and yet even in those times, the work went on darkly and insensibly."[110] In the privacy of the bedchamber, such pamphlets insist, Henrietta Maria works tirelessly and seductively to bend her husband to the pope's will. According to *The Great Eclipse of the Sun, Or, Charles His Waine* (1644),

> The King being in full Conjunction with this *Popish Plannet,* the Queen, hee was totally eclipsed by her Counsell, who under the Royall Curtaines, perswaded him to advance the Plots of the Catholikes, under the colour of maintaining the *Protestant Religion.* Ordinary women, can in the Night time perswade their husbands to give them new Gowns or Petticoates, and make them grant their desire; and could not Catholick Queen *Mary* . . . by her night discourses, encline the King to Popery and make him believe that he had no true obedient subjects, but Catholicks.[111]

Henrietta Maria's sexuality produces her political power; her access to Charles's innermost chambers ensures that her proposals will be heard, in the form of a curtain lecture if not in a more formal capacity.

While many authors blame Henrietta Maria for the nation's civic unrest, the author of *The English Pope* blames an older poisonous Catholic woman for Henrietta Maria's presence in England. It was at the urging of Catholic Mary Villiers, Countess of Buckingham and mother to Charles I's favorite, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, the tract claims, that Charles elected to take a Catholic bride:

> And now when three Kingdomes are under the subjection of one Prince, who is under the subjection of one lustfull, rash, young Favourite, and that Favourite solely at the devotion of his vitious, opprobrious, mischievous mother, and that mother a meere Votaresse to Rome, utterly forfeited, resigned, and sold to

> the commands of Jesuites: When our miserable Nations are in this ridiculous, preposterous posture of government, who can wonder that a Spanish or French Match for our Prince should be designed?[112]

The Countess of Buckingham is the first Catholic woman to "inebriate or debosh" the king's "understanding."[113] That Charles elected to marry Henrietta Maria is evidence of her success.

Ultimately, the relationship between Charles and Henrietta Maria leads to demonic conception and monstrous pregnancy. The author of *The English Pope* writes, "This violent sharp malady, of which we labour so distressedly at this present, began to seize the vitals of this State, long before its violence appeared."[114] Here the tract's author adopts the rhetoric of maternal monstrosity to condemn the wars; civil strife is itself a form of grotesque and unnatural progeny. Henrietta Maria, meanwhile, is an "indulgent . . . nursing mothe[r] to the Roman Church," one whose womb brings forth the horrors of civil war, both the culmination of her popish plot and a powerful example of deviant Catholic procreation.[115] Subsequently, her presence poisons the wombs of innocent Protestant mothers and gives rise to a generation of monstrous and murderous offspring. One of the speakers of *A Mappe of Mischiefe* (1641) complains that because of Henrietta Maria, "my wombe might beare a Monster of all mortalls, one whose delight is to cherish trecheries, never thinking of God or goodnesse. This is that Mortall that will not stick to shed the blood of Infants, nay to act any wickednesse whatsoever, and must it be my hard fortune to bee troubled with these things."[116]

Both a monstrous mother and an ideological source of disease, Henrietta Maria functions throughout propaganda culture as a pestilence tainting both king and country. *A Mappe of Mischiefe* explicitly adopts the language of contagion to describe the queen's effect upon the kingdom. As "E," the personification of England, celebrates Henrietta Maria's departure, "V," embodiment of the Dutch United Provinces, laments her arrival on foreign shores.[117] V begs God for deliverance from Henrietta Maria's "pestilentious filth which will else infect me and mine with sore contagions."[118] England, meanwhile, celebrates her newfound freedom from poisonous Catholic disease: "Faith my heart is so merry because that I shall be eased of a burthen under which I have a long time groaned . . . why Sister wouldst thou have me to be sad, because I am suddenly to be rid of a plague," she asks.[119] Henrietta Maria is an infection in the kingdom, and one who will finally cause the individual English subject to be "drowned in . . . blood."[120] Implicit in such constructions of the queen is the fear that she will spur the king to acts of brutality against his own people; he will be "carried on by evil councellours to shed the blood of his subjects . . . and all because they would not be slaves, or put on fetters being born unto freedom."[121] She will also propel her husband and his army to "ravish Wives and Virgins, to fire mens Barnes, and to

destroy the Graine," and at her behest, the king will permit his armies to "plunder and take away all they can finde," including the unwilling bodies of English women.[122] "[M]urther, rapine, lamentation" will spread throughout the land, finally linking acts of sexual violence with Catholic female perversity.[123] Henrietta Maria will "have her stroke againe, and then we are in a worse condition," left to the mercy of debauched Cavaliers, demonic Irishmen, and papal tyranny.[124] The anti–Henrietta Maria tracts thus reveal the extent of Roundhead anxiety over the queen's power, an anxiety conveyed through overlapping tropes of atrocity: rape, murder, vampirism, and maternal deviance.

After the Restoration, Royalist authors, of course, advanced a more sympathetic view of Henrietta Maria. The 1660s witnessed the publication of numerous pamphlets celebrating her life and goodness. The author of *The Muses Joy* names the queen a "living Martyr,"[125] while John Dauncey insists that the queen has been unjustly slandered by her enemies: "This illustrious and thrice *Noble* Princess hath not had the least *share* in this ill *humour* of the *times,* whilest the *basely* imployed *industry* and *disingenuity* of some men hath endeavoured to represent her under a black Cloud of *guilt,* who never knew how to wear other than a pure, white and Angel-like Vest of Innocency."[126] Edmund Waller celebrated her return to and repairs of Somerset House by praising her "Frugality" (undoubtedly a response to the rumors of her financial profligacy), "Bounty," and "Genius," all the while proclaiming her "Constant to *England* in [her] love."[127] She is lionized in her capacity as a mother and shown alternately rejoicing in Charles's success and mourning the loss of her other children, Henry and Mary. In a 1660 poem mourning the death of Henrietta Maria's daughter Mary, a young John Wilmot refers to the "great Queen . . . that in mighty wrongs an Age have spent," and offers consolation that in the loss of her daughter, her "sigh's have an untainted guiltlesse breath."[128] The author of *The Muses Joy* meanwhile prays that she "never *weep* again, / Unless it be for *joy* she once had *pain,* / That once her *blest Womb* with a *Charls* did teem, / Should both a Crown *Inherit* and *Redeem*."[129] Here the monstrous womb of *The English Pope* is reimagined as a blessed and holy place, while Henrietta Maria herself is treated as the best and most natural of mothers. The queen finds joy in her son's triumph—"all my joy / Is in this Gracious King," she insists in one ballad, an implicit reminder that her happiness is tied to the continued health of England and Charles II's success as king.[130]

Not all of the English population was willing to accept the newly positive image of the queen mother, however. When in 1660 rumors of Henrietta Maria's return to English soil began to circulate, one contemporary laborer supposedly exclaimed,

> That Queene Henrietta Maria was not the Queene of England, and that he (the said Edward Bilton) would never acknowledge her for a Queene, and that she was a traytour and had been the cause of all this mischief (meaning the late warres in England), and that if shee (Henrietta Maria) should come into England, she would breed nothing but sects and scisms, and if anyone would rise, hee would bee the second man to venter [sic] both life and estate to keepe her forth.[131]

Despite Samuel Pepys's offhand comment that Henrietta Maria was "a very little plain old woman, and nothing more in her presence in any respect nor garb than any ordinary woman," she was still feared by many and blamed by others for the destruction of the innocent martyr, Charles I.[132] Indeed, suspicions of the queen continued to run high throughout the decade. Henrietta Maria's repairs to Somerset House, the former seat of her Catholic court circle, induced some to post "placards calling for the 'extirpation of popery'" at her palace.[133] Meanwhile, the May 1662 arrival of another foreign Catholic queen, the Portuguese Catherine of Braganza, at least initially resurrected the concern that foreign wives could gain too much political and personal access to the body of the king.

In Howard's *The Usurper*, therefore, the play's use of rape imagery underscores the degree to which Howard is conscious of the anxieties surrounding Henrietta Maria and Catherine. To allay fears about each queen's powers and goals, Howard reworks the story of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, a play in which a poisonous foreign bride brings rape and destruction to her adopted land. *The Usurper* begins in the wake of Damocles's usurpation of the throne, as Dionysius, Damocles's son, returns triumphant from the wars in Africa. Dionysius brings with him the fair Queen Timandra, whose kingdom he has successfully conquered. Imprisoned as spoils of war, the queen serves as a symbol of Sicilian might and tangible proof of Dionysius's skill in battle. Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* also begins with a foreign queen brought in chains from periphery to center as a symbol of martial prowess; the presence of the Gothic Queen Tamora, like that of the African Queen Timandra, displays Roman imperial power. In both plays, the queen brings with her a Moorish servant with whom she has a preexisting romantic/sexual relationship, and each servant is ultimately taken into the service of the king. Timandra pleads for her servant, Hiarbas, as Tamora pleads for Aaron; Timandra begs Damocles, "I only pray, / This noble Moor, whose Fate hath suffer'd much / In mine, may have a part in your high Favour / And Freedome" (23). Enamored of the queen, Damocles grants Hiarbas both his freedom and his favor: "Sir, you have it" (23), he promises.

In both Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* and Howard's *The Usurper*, the foreign queen captures the eye of the domestic ruler. In the case of Shakespeare's Saturninus, the ruler is attracted both to Tamora's exotic beauty—Tamora "dost overshine the gallant'st dames of Rome" (1.1.314)—and to the

fact that she is not a Roman woman. Having been rejected by Lavinia, "Rome's rich ornament" and embodiment of upstanding Roman womanhood, Saturninus views Tamora as the antithesis of Romanness (1.1.52). He therefore invites the outsider into his inner sanctum and grants her access through marriage both to his body natural and to the Roman body politic. Likewise, Timandra's beauty fascinates and obsesses Damocles; though she weeps, he exclaims, she "looks fair as doth the Face of Day" (20), and he later comments on her "Angelique form" (21). He then uses the rhetoric of courtly love both to mitigate her resentment of captivity and to seduce her to his will. "Your [sic] are Queen Timandra still," he tells her, "and let me tell you / So far from being a Prisoner, that you have made / Your self a Conquest" (20). She has enslaved him with the power of her beauty—"I change the name of King to be your Servant" (23), he tells her, and suggests that her conquest avenges her country's defeat. "A Victory of me, by those fair Eyes; / So that what Spoil my Souldiers made within / Your Kingdom, you have Reveng'd this very minute / By making me the Conquerour, your Captive" (20). He then seeks to court Timandra, ostensibly with the intent to marry: "The Crown you wear, / If you but smile shall have a double Lustre, / And call to it another bright Companion; / This Island to Obey you" (21).

Ultimately, however, the plays begin to diverge, and their differences are significant to an understanding of Howard's project. Shakespeare's Tamora is only too happy to marry into the Roman imperial family, the better to effect her revenge and destroy Rome from within. In contrast, Timandra has been treated honorably by her captors, telling Damocles, "Your Son hath us'd me honourably, abating what / The Laws of War oblige him too" (20). Timandra's sadness stems from the indignity of her position, "A Queen, Your Prisoner" (20), and later, from the danger Damocles poses to her person, but she recognizes that she has been treated respectfully and in accordance with the rules of war. As such, she does not enter the kingdom with the sole intent of wreaking vengeance, and she has no desire to join herself with the hated Damocles. When Damocles proposes, she rejects him outright, telling him, "this shadow [her body] / You have in your pocession [sic], but my Soul / Can never be your Captive" (21). She remains steadfast in her fidelity to Hiarbas/Cleander, refusing Damocles and proclaiming the sanctity of her love. Timandra tells Hiarbas,

> I promis'd
> My love to you with such devotion,
> As with our last Breath gives up our Souls
> To Heaven: And those that dare lay Violence
> Upon our mutual Vows shall Reap the fruit
> Of nothing but their Sins. (24)

Tamora, by contrast, is all too willing both to marry and to cuckold the emperor, while her feelings for Aaron are predominantly sexual. Aaron comments that "Venus govern[s] your desires" (2.3.30), while Tamora herself suggests that she and Aaron "may, each wreathed in the other's arms, / Our pastimes done, possess a golden slumber" (2.3.25–27).

Additionally, while Tamora seeks to sow discord in Rome, Timandra tries to prevent the outbreak of factionalism and discord. Despite her obvious indifference, Timandra's beauty attracts both Damocles and Dionysius; father and son become romantic rivals, culminating in Dionysius's death at his father's hand. Sensing the misery that will result when son is pitted against father, Timandra intercedes on Dionysius's behalf: "Sir, I intreat, your Son may not, for his / Civilities to me, meet with your Anger" (23). Timandra is a conciliator who tries, even in captivity and defeat, to bring peace to the nation, and when she finally marries Hiarbas, now revealed to be the rightful King Cleander, the union is a cause for celebration. Unlike Tamora, whose marriage into the circles of power leads to rape, mutilation, and cannibalism, Timandra's marriage brings about the restoration of order and a nation and monarchy set to rights. Timandra emerges from the play as an anti-Tamora, her mirror image and her opposite, a foreign queen who seeks to reconcile rather than divide. In this way, Timandra represents the royalist response to and dismissal of the trope of the poisonous Catholic bride. A victim of the debauched usurper's attempted sexual assault, Timandra is virtuous, loving, and true, suggesting that England should rejoice at, and not fear, the presence of its own foreign queens. Neither Henrietta Maria nor Catherine of Braganza is a Tamora. Instead, both women are Timandras, faithful and loyal sources of peace and prosperity in their adopted land. The play invokes the tropes of the anti–Henrietta Maria tracts only to undermine and reject their lines of assault.

As we shall see in greater detail in chapter 4, the *Titus* plot as it was employed in the later seventeenth century would allegorize the dangers posed by allowing foreigners, and in the case of Restoration England, the Catholics, too much access to political and social authority. The story of the sexually enthralling foreign queen who encourages the rape of the innocent domestic martyr would represent an extremely useful allegory for authors afraid of the foreign presence in the realm. Tamora uses her sexual power over the king to achieve a dangerous and destructive degree of power, using rape as a weapon to undermine the nation she so despises. For Howard, however, the foreign queen is not a threat, but an ideal companionate mate. *The Usurper* thus unwrites the story of *Titus Andronicus*, depicting a foreign queen who brings peace, not discord, to the kingdom. As Howard displaces the image of the debauched Cavalier onto Cromwell and his men, he also denies any dangers posed by Henrietta Maria and Catherine of Braganza, those potentially poisonous Catholic brides.

CONCLUSION

While only three plays of the 1660s actually feature scenes of rape or attempted sexual assault, all three invoke critically the memory of Oliver Cromwell, and two of the three use scenes of sexual violence as an opportunity for extended political allegory. To read such scenes of sexual violence in the context of the long-standing propaganda pamphlet war, therefore, is to come to a new understanding of the ideological work such scenes performed within their own social contexts. For authors of the 1660s, rape scenes were designed to reaffirm the power of the monarchy and divorce the royalist faction from the popular tropes of the debauched Cavalier and poisonous Catholic bride. As we shall see in the next chapter, however, growing fears of the Catholic presence in England, coupled with the Duke of York's public conversion to Catholicism, led to a very different treatment of rape in the 1670s. If the Earl of Orrery and Edward Howard rejected the trope of the debauched Cavalier, playwrights of the 1670s would embrace it once more, resurrecting the rhetoric of English Civil War propaganda to express their own discomfort with royal policy. The treatment of dramatic rape mirrors the culture's developing uneasiness with the state of contemporary politics.

NOTES

1. *A Blazing Starre seen in the West at Totneis in Devonshire* (London, 1642), a2r.
2. Ibid., a2v.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., a3r.
5. Ibid., a3r, a3v.
6. Ibid., a3v.
7. Ibid., a3v, a4r.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid., a4v.
11. Ibid., a2v.
12. Ibid., a1r.
13. Ibid., a4r.
14. Ibid., a1r.
15. Deborah G. Burks, *Horrid Spectacle: Violation in the Theater of Early Modern England* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003), 282. Burks offers a trenchant analysis of violent imagery in Jacobean theater along with the works of Cavendish, Dryden, and Behn.
16. It is here that my argument differs most fundamentally from those of Jean Marsden and Elizabeth Howe. While rape scenes undoubtedly titillated, the sexual assaults staged in the 1660s are brief and not at all explicit; playwrights are more interested in exploring the political dimensions of rape imagery than in exploiting the spectacle of the actress's physical form.
17. *A Blazing Starre*, a4r.
18. Ibid., a5r.
19. *A New Mercury, Called Mercurius Problematicus* (London, 1644), a3v–a4r.
20. George Lawrence, *The Debauched Cavalleer: Or the English Midianite* (London, 1642), 4.

21. *The Wicked Resolution Of The Cavaliers* (London, 1642), 1.
22. John Hadfred, *A wonderfull And Strange Miracle or Gods Just Vengeance against the Cavaliers* (London, 1642), 3.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., 5.
25. Ibid., 5–6.
26. William Warren, *Strange, true, and lamentable Newes from Exceter, And other parts of the Western countreyes* (London, 1643), a3v.
27. Lawrence, *The Debauched Cavalleer*, 5.
28. *The Insolency and Cruelty of the Cavaliers* (London, 1643), title page.
29. *Terrible Newes From York* (London, 1642), title page.
30. *University Newes, Or, The Unfortunate proceedings of the Cavaliers in Oxford* (London, 1642), a3r.
31. *A great Robbery in the North, Neer Swanton in Yorkshire* (London, 1642), 2.
32. *A True and Perfect Relation Of A victorious Battell Obtained against the Earl of Cumberland And his Cavaliers* (London, 1642), 7.
33. R. Andrews, *A perfect Declaration of The Barbarous and Cruell practices committed by Prince Robert, the Cavalliers, and others in his Majesties Army* (London, 1642), a2r.
34. *A Wicked Resolution of the Cavaliers*, 1, 2.
35. William Cartwright, *The Game at Chesse* (London, 1643), 7.
36. Ibid., 4.
37. John Goodwin, *Anti-Cavalierisme, Or, Truth Pleading As well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this present War* (London, 1642), title page.
38. Lawrence, *The Debauched Cavalleer*, 7. For discussion of contemporary depictions of Cavalier army camps, see Robin Clifton, "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution," *Past & Present* 52 (1971): 37.
39. *The Protestation And Declaration of the Popish, and evill affected Cavaliers* (London, 1642), title page.
40. Ethan Howard Shagan, "Constructing Discord: Ideology, Propaganda, and English Responses to the Irish Rebellion of 1641," *Journal of British Studies* 36, no. 1 (1997): 9.
41. *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry, of Plentifull Children, And their Admirable, lamentable Complaint* (London, 1643), a2v.
42. Goodwin, *Anti-Cavalierisme*, 5.
43. Thomas Kittermaster, *A Wonderfull Deliverance Or Gods abundant mercy in preserving from the Cavaliers the towne of Draiton In the County of Hereford* (London, 1642), a3r.
44. *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry*, a2v.
45. *The Dammee Cavalliers Warning Piece, In a view on the Prophecy of the Prophet Obadiah* (London, 1643), 3.
46. *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry*, a3r.
47. Ibid., a3v.
48. A Gentleman of good quality, *True Intelligence From The West: Or A true Relation of the desperate Proceedings of the Rebels, and Cavaliers gathered together at Angry-Fisherten in Wilt-shire* (London, 1647), 3.
49. *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry*, a2v–a3r.
50. *An exact and true Relation of A most cruell and horrid Murther committed by one of the Cavaliers, on A Woman in Leicester* (London, 1642), 4.
51. A Gentleman of good quality, *True Intelligence from the West*, 5.
52. *Nocturnall Occurrences Or, Deeds Of Darknesse: Committed, By the Cavaleers in their Rendezvous* (London, 1642), a2r.
53. I. H., *A briefe Relation, Abstracted out of severall Letters, of A most Hellish, Cruell, and Bloudy Plot against the City of Bristoll* (London, 1642), a2v.
54. Kittermaster, *A Wonderfull Deliverance*, a3r.
55. Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 9.
56. *A True Relation Of two Merchants of London, Who were taken prisoners by the Cavaliers* (London, 1642), a3v.

57. Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, 89.

58. Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660–1670* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 3.

59. Stephen P. Flores, "Orrery's *The Generall* and *Henry The Fifth*: Sexual Politics and the Desire for Friendship," *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 37, no. 1 (1996): 56.

60. Orrery, cited in F. W. Payne, "The Question of Precedence between Dryden and the Earl of Orrery with Regard to the English Heroic Play," *Review of English Studies* 1, no. 2 (1925): 174. For discussion of the play's authorial history, see also William S. Clark, "Further Light upon the Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery," *Review of English Studies* 2, no. 6 (1926): 206–11, and W. S. Clark, "The Earl of Orrery's Play *The Generall*," *Review of English Studies* 2, no. 8 (1926): 459–60.

61. Charles II, cited in Kathleen M. Lynch, *Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965), 147.

62. Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970–83), 5:281–82.

63. Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *The Generall*, in *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle*, ed. William S. Clark II, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), 1:101–64, 1.1.33–42. Further references to *The Generall* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

64. Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 24.

65. John Crouch, *The Muses Joy For the Recovery of that Weeping Vine Henrietta Maria* (London, 1660), a3r.

66. *A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell And Hugh Peters In Saint James's Park* (London, 1660), 2.

67. Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 173.

68. Thomas Rugge, *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659–1661*, ed. William L. Sachse, Camden Third Series (London: Royal Historical Society, 1961), vol. 91, no. 90.

69. Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, 182.

70. Ibid.

71. Mita Choudhury, "Orrery and the London Stage: A Loyalist's Contribution to Restoration Allegorical Drama," *Studia Neophilologica* 62, no. 1 (1990): 45.

72. Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, 258–59. For further discussion of Orrery's dramatic motivations, see Tracey E. Tomlinson, "The Restoration English History Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 43, no. 3 (2003): 559–77.

73. Lynch, *Roger Boyle*, 159. For similar views, see Susan Staves, *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), and John Kerrigan, "Orrery's Ireland and the British Problem," in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. David J. Baker and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 197–225.

74. Sir John Suckling, "Out upon It!" in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 8th ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al., 2 vols. (New York: Norton, 2006), 1:1681, ll. 1–4.

75. Flores, "Orrery's *The Generall*," 58.

76. Richard Lovelace, "To Lucasta, Going to the Wars," in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature,* 8th ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al., 2 vols. (New York: Norton, 2006), 1:1682, ll. 12–13.

77. For analysis of *The Villain's* relationship to *The Generall*, see Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*.

78. Ibid., 68.

79. Edward Howard, *The Usurper: A Tragedy* (London, 1668), 72. Further references to *The Usurper* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

80. Harold Love, "State Affairs on the Restoration Stage, 1660–1675," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 14, no. 1 (1975): 3.

81. *A Parly Between the Ghosts of the Late Protector, and the King of Sweden, At their Meeting in Hell* (London, 1660), 5.

82. Ibid., 17.
83. *The Case is Altered. Or, Dreadful news from Hell* (London, 1660), 6.
84. *Hell's Higher Court of Justice* (London, 1661), d2r.
85. For other depictions of Cromwell in Hell, see Abraham Miles, *The last farewel of three bould Traytors* (London, 1661), and Anthony Sadler, *The Subjects Joy For The Kings Restoration, Cheerfully made known in A Sacred Masque* (London, 1660).
86. *The Cavaliers Catechisme* (London, 1647), 3.
87. Ibid., 4.
88. John Taylor, *The Noble Cavalier Caracterised, And A Rebellious Caviller Cauterised* (Oxford, 1643), 1.
89. *The Black Book Opened, Or Traytors Arraigned and Condemned by their own Confession* (London, 1660), 1.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid.
93. *A Third Conference*, 6.
94. John Gauden, *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house* (London, 1660), 1.
95. Ibid., 1–2.
96. Ibid., 7.
97. Ibid., 65, 71–72.
98. Royalist propaganda also accused both Cromwell and Peters of lechery; in *A Third Conference*, for instance, Peters acts as Cromwell's bawd.
99. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, 269.
100. Only fifteen at the time of her marriage, Henrietta Maria had been "exhorted by her mother, her confessor and Pope Urban VIII to demonstrate her commitment to her faith and proselytize on its behalf" (Smuts, "Religion, European Politics," 15), a task she undertook both with enthusiasm and a lack of political finesse.
101. Ibid., 29.
102. Cartwright, *The Game at Chesse*, 6.
103. *The Key To The Kings Cabinet-Counsell* (London, 1644), 6.
104. *Englands Miserie, If Not Prevented by the speedie remedie of a happie union between His Maiestie and this Parliament* (London, 1642), 1.
105. Ibid. For similar rhetoric, see also Robert, Earl of Warwicke, *A Most Worthy Speech, Spoken by the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Warwicke* (London, 1642).
106. Thomas May, Henry Parker, and John Sadler, *The Kings Cabinet opened* (London, 1645), a3r.
107. Ibid.
108. Ibid., g2r.
109. *The English Pope*, 2, a4r.
110. Ibid., 12.
111. *The Great Eclipse of the Sun, Or, Charles His Waine* (London, 1644), 3.
112. *The English Pope*, 7.
113. Ibid., 21.
114. Ibid., 12.
115. Ibid., 4.
116. *A Mappe of Mischiefe, Or A Dialogue Betweene V. and E. concerning the going of Qu. M. into V* (London, 1641), 2–3.
117. The initial "V" likely refers to the V in "Verenige" from "Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden," the Dutch name for the United Provinces. Henrietta Maria sailed from England to Holland in February of 1642, tasked with raising money for the royalist cause.
118. *A Mappe of Mischiefe*, 3.
119. Ibid., 6.
120. Ibid., 5.
121. Ibid., 4.
122. Warwicke, *A Most Worthy Speech*, 4, 5.
123. *The English Pope*, 12.

124. *The Reformed Malignants* (London, 1643), 1.
125. *The Muses Joy*, a2v.
126. John Dauncey, *The History Of The Thrice Illustrious Princess Henrietta Maria de Bourbon, Queen Of England* (London, 1660), a5v.
127. Edmund Waller, *Upon Her Majesties new buildings at Somerset-House* (London, 1665), 1.
128. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, "To her Sacred Majesty," in *Epicedia Academiae Oxoniensis, in Obitum Serenissimae Mariae Principis Arausionensis* (Oxford, 1660), g1r.
129. *The Muses Joy*, a3v.
130. *The Queens Lamentation* (London, 1660), 1.
131. Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *9th Report*, *Part I*, Manuscripts of the West and North Ridings (London, 1883), 326.
132. Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 1:299.
133. Caroline M. Hibbard, "Henrietta Maria (1609–1669) ," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), accessed February 10, 2011, doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/12947.

Chapter Two

Rape and the Roots of Discontent, 1666–1677

In June 1667, the Dutch fleet, led by Admiral Michiel Adriaenszoom de Ruyter, sailed up the Thames and the Medway, catching the English navy largely unawares. The attack was disastrous for the British, culminating in the loss of multiple naval vessels, including the highly symbolic *Royal Charles*. In his poem *The Last Instructions to a Painter*, Andrew Marvell describes the attack using the language of rape and accuses the Dutch of unlawfully and nonconsensually penetrating British territory:

> When aged *Thames* was bound with Fetters base,
> And *Medway* chast ravish'd before his Face,
> And their dear Off-spring murder'd in their sight;
> Thou, and thy Fellows, held'st the odious Light.
> Sad change, since first that happy pair was wed,
> When all the Rivers grac'd their Nuptial Bed;
> And Father *Neptune* promis'd to resign
> His Empire old, to their immortal line![1]

De Ruyter, "the Ravisher" (l. 758), has reduced the Thames (and by extension, England) to the status of an impotent old man unable to prevent the violation of his wife and murder of his children. Drawing on a long-standing tradition of anti-Dutch propaganda, Marvell condemns the Dutch as cruel and violent ravishers of innocent women and nations. England, the poem suggests, has been penetrated and poisoned by Dutch treachery, "a humiliation for the English, a violation of the natural order, and an index to the sickness of the court which allowed it to happen."[2]

If England is maltreated by the Dutch, it is the fault of her rulers that she could be so violated; the debauchery of Charles II and his entourage have led to the redirection of funds from military defense to the maintenance of para-

sitic courtiers and mistresses.[3] At the same time, the royal court has become too accepting of sexual violence. Even as Charles laments the maltreatment of the Medway, for instance, he orders the pardon of John, Viscount Mordaunt, a longtime royalist supporter and accused rapist impeached by the Parliament, licensing Mordaunt's actions and setting him free to rape again: "Now *Mordaunt* may, within his Castle Tow'r, / Imprison Parents, and the Child deflowre" (ll. 349–50). Charles himself is also rendered sexually predatory. At the end of the poem, a personified female England comes to Charles in the guise of a rape victim, naked, humiliated, despairing:

> There, as in the calm horrour all alone,
> [Charles] wakes and Muses of th' uneasie Throne:
> Raise up a sudden Shape with Virgins Face,
> Though ill agree her Posture, Hour, or Place:
> Naked as born, and her round Arms behind,
> With her own Tresses interwove and twin'd:
> Her mouth lockt up, a blind before her Eyes;
> Yet from beneath the Veil her blushes rise;
> And silent tears her secret anguish speak. (ll. 889–97)

Rather than feeling pity, Charles is aroused by the sight of England's naked sufferings, "unable to distinguish between matters of state and erotic fantasy."[4] Instead of offering his kingdom sympathy, comfort, and justice, he initiates more unwelcome sexual contact:

> The Object strange in him no Terrour mov'd:
> He wonder'd first, then pity'd, then he lov'd:
> And with kind hand does the coy Vision press,
> Whose Beauty greater seem'd by her distress;
> But soon shrunk back, chill'd with her touch so cold,
> And th' airy Picture vanisht from his hold. (ll. 899–904)

Charles's natural pity for his kingdom's suffering gives way to thoughtless desire, his lechery leading him to attempt another outrage upon the nation.[5] The poem thus intimates, in Margarita Stocker's words, that "vitiation from within has exposed England to her vitiation from without."[6]

The Last Instructions to a Painter ends with a warning to Charles II: he must reform his court or risk another civil war with resultant regicide. After ravished England flees, Charles comes face to face with the ghosts of his murdered ancestors, his father, Charles I, and his grandfather, Henry IV of France (Henrietta Maria's father).

> Shake then the room, and all his Curtains tear
> And with blue streaks infect the Taper clear:
> While, the pale Ghosts, his Eye does fixt admire
> Of Grandsire *Harry*, and of *Charles* his Sire.
> *Harry* sits down, and in his open side
> The grizly Wound reveals, of which he dy'd.

And ghastly *Charles*, turning his Collar low,
The purple thread about his Neck does show:
Then, whisp'ring to his Son in Words unheard,
Through the lock'd door both of them disappear'd. (ll. 915–24)

The ghosts warn Charles against placing too much faith in untrustworthy advisors—"His Fathers Ghost too whisper'd him one Note, / That who does cut his Purse will cut his Throat" (ll. 937–38)—but Charles does not heed the warning.[7] Instead, he decides on the Earl of Clarendon's fall and turns for comfort to his unfaithful mistress, the Duchess of Cleveland, and his deceitful counselors, the Earl of Arlington and Sir William Coventry. Charles recognizes the true natures of his closest courtiers:

Through their feign'd speech their secret hearts he knew;
To her own Husband, *Castlemain*, untrue.
False to his Master *Bristol*, *Arlington*,
And *Coventry*, falser than any one,
Who to the Brother, Brother would betray. (ll. 931–35)

He will not "trus[t] himself to such as they" (l. 936), yet he does not banish them from his inner circle. Instead, he allows them to feed on him like a group of vampiristic leeches. Marvell describes Charles's entourage as "His minion Imps that, in his secret part, / Lye nuzz'ling at the *Sacramental* wart; / Horse-leeches circling at the Hem'roid Vein" (ll. 495–97). The leeches feed on Charles's blood, alternately an image of vampiristic and scatological consumption, and a form of perverse breast-feeding. Charles is feminized both in his capacity as a monstrous mother giving suck to parasitic children and in his unwillingness to privilege the concerns of a suffering nation over the desires of his body. Here is Rochester's satirical comment, "His sceptre and his prick are of a length, / And she may sway the one who plays with th' other," taken to its most horrific conclusion, a world where kingly abdication of responsibility enables foreign invasion and societal collapse.[8]

Charles II's simultaneous hypersexuality and effeminate abdication of authority—what Barbara Riebling calls the "emasculation of dissolute desire"—combine to create a royal court populated with dangerously poisonous and overly powerful women.[9] The Duchess of Cleveland, for instance, already famous for her many infidelities, has become masculine both in her expansive desires and in her pursuit of her chaste male servant.

Great Love, how dost thou triumph, and how reign,
That to a Groom couldst humble her disdain!
Stript to her Skin, see how she stooping stands,
Nor scorns to rub him down with those fair Hands . . .
But envious Fame, too soon, begun to note
More gold in's Fob, more Lace upon his Coat. (ll. 81–84, 97–98)

Although Castlemaine wishes she could attract her servant using the traditionally desirable characteristics of femininity—youth and virginity—she must instead stoop to wooing him with forward advances and offers of financial advancement, "a humiliation of the King's mistress and of the King himself."[10] Meanwhile, Frances Stuart has garnered real political power by gaining the affection of the king. Marvell writes, "The *Court* in Farthing yet it self does please, / And female *Stewart* rules there, *Rules the four Seas*. / But Fate does still accumulate our Woes, / And *Richmond* here commands, as *Ruyter* those" (ll. 761–64). Marvell here puns on the fact that Frances Stuart appeared as the figure of Britannia on British coins and medals to suggest that Charles II is fatally ruled by his women.

Perhaps most striking, however, is Marvell's condemnatory description of Anne Hyde, wife of James, Duke of York. In one of the poem's most mean-spirited portraits, Marvell describes the duchess as a hypocrite who acts whorishly before marriage and pretends prudishness afterward: "She perfected that Engine, oft assay'd, / How after Childbirth to renew a Maid. / And found how Royal Heirs might be matur'd / In fewer months than Mothers once indur'd" (ll. 52–55). She is disgusting in appearance and déclassé in manner: "Paint her with Oyster Lip and breath of Fame, / Wide Mouth that Sparagus may well proclaim: / With Chanc'lor's Belly, and so large a Rump" (ll. 61–63). She is also potentially dangerous; like a hag performing alchemical experiments (or the ridiculous Margaret Cavendish), she develops a scientific knowledge that comes perilously close to a cultivation of the black arts. A "Philosopher beyond *Newcastle's* Wife," she studies "how a mortal Poyson she may draw, / Out of the cordial meal of the *Cacao*" (ll. 50, 67–68). Marvell insinuates that Hyde will use this newly learned expertise with poison to murder Lady Denham, her husband's mistress; she is "painted as a sorceress brewing poison in an attempt to murder her sexual rival."[11] And she finally represents another manifestation of perverse maternity; the duchess gives birth unnaturally quickly (less than two months after her marriage to James), she cannot keep her male children alive, and her breasts contain the cancerous growth that will kill her: "in her soft Breast Loves hid Cancer smarts" (l. 74). Her ability to give life is perverted into a source of toxicity and death.

The Last Instructions to a Painter encapsulates many of the antiroyalist tropes that would pervade the propaganda and drama of the early 1670s. As the excitement and optimism of the early Restoration faded, destroyed by plague, fire, and naval defeat, authors increasingly began to question the wisdom of a court more obsessed with libertine pleasures than with responsible governance. This discomfort is reflected in the many writings of the period in which men disavow their responsibilities to protect and defend, becoming instead sexually violent and untrustworthy.[12] Simultaneously, their women grow poisonous as they are afforded too much power within a col-

lapsing patriarchal hierarchy; male failure permits the growth of female evil. Such anxieties pervade early 1670s propaganda, as the trope of the poisonous Catholic bride is reconfigured into the trope of the poisonous Catholic mistress, while the ghosts of murdered fathers appear to offer futile warnings of oncoming destruction.

Of course, not all writers were so skeptical of Charles II's court, and the conflict between pro- and increasingly antimonarchical viewpoints plays out both in contemporaneous political tracts and in the dramatic treatment of sexual violence. This chapter therefore examines the often conflicting and contradictory treatment of rape in the early 1670s. The chapter begins with an analysis of John Dryden's 1673 play, *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*. A work of royalist propaganda designed to foment support for the increasingly unpopular third Anglo-Dutch War (1672–1674), *Amboyna* treats rape in much the same way as Orrery's *The Generall* or Howard's *The Usurper*. Throughout the play, Dryden deploys the atrocity tropes so common to English Civil War propaganda, in this case to target not the Irish, the Catholics, or even the Roundheads, but the villainous and lecherous Dutch. Dryden replaces the tropes of the demonic Irishman and debauched usurper with the trope of the demonic Dutchman, implicitly rehabilitating the court's Catholic faction and rallying the country behind Charles II's war.

Contrasting with Dryden's anti-Dutch, pro-royalist propaganda is the equally virulent anti-Catholicism that characterizes the contemporaneous plays of Elkanah Settle and Thomas Shadwell. Settle and Shadwell would later become famous as passionate supporters of Whig exclusion policy, but even in the years preceding the Popish Plot, both Settle's *Love and Revenge* (1675) and Shadwell's *The Libertine* (1675) criticize an increasingly libertine court, linking its libertinage with its tolerance for French absolutism and Catholic excess. In both plays, male obsession with debauchery precipitates societal collapse. As in Marvell's *Last Instructions*, the ghosts of murdered fathers offer warnings to reform, only to be ignored in the pursuit of more and greater pleasure. For Settle as for Marvell, male abdication of responsibility enables the violence of treacherous females who, in the absence of male control, become literal poisoners and figurative sources of social toxin. Settle thus develops the imagery of the poisonous Catholic mistress to condemn the dangerous combination of aristocratic masculine abdication of responsibility and unchecked Catholic female malice. Shadwell, in contrast, focuses on the problem of male sexual deviance, transforming the trope of the debauched Cavalier into the new trope of the debauched libertine. All of England, Shadwell suggests, is at risk from the destructive consequences of the libertine's protonihilist and self-destructive drive for pleasure, a warning to the court to reform. The chapter concludes with a reading of Aphra Behn's *The Rover, Part I* (1677), a play that fully encapsulates the extent of the era's

political uncertainty. In Behn's play, the positive aspects of the Cavalier—Lovelace's chivalry and heroism—and the negative—Suckling's inconstancy and vice—are no longer separated from one another as in Orrery's *The Generall* or displaced onto a political enemy. Instead, they are combined in the play's putative heroes, reflecting the period's profound ambivalence toward royalist behavior on the eve of the Popish Plot.

DRYDEN'S *AMBOYNA* AND THE TROPE OF THE DEMONIC DUTCHMAN

Although anti-Catholic pamphlets remained in circulation throughout the 1660s and early 1670s, they are, generally speaking, not as collectively violent or as focused on atrocity as the pamphlets of the previous or subsequent periods. Tracts accusing Catholics of rape, torture, and cannibalism, while still available, were temporarily less common than academic criticisms of Catholic doctrine and liturgical practice.[13] Such a change in tenor may be attributed in part to the harsh licensing restrictions put in place after the Restoration and perhaps in part to a general cultural optimism about the future of the English government. By the mid-1670s, however, the humiliating failure of the Second Anglo-Dutch War combined with the popular rumor that Catholics ignited the 1666 Great Fire of London and the open presence of Catholics in the highest echelons of the court led to a new explosion of anti-Catholic sentiment. According to *A Relation Of The Most Material Matters Handled In Parliament Relating To Religion, Property, And The Liberty Of The Subject* (1673), for instance, the House of Commons was extremely concerned with "the extraordinary increase of Popery and prevalency of that Faction at Court" and had begun to fear, "and not without Grounds: The Ruine of the Protestant Interest" at court.[14]

Of particular interest to anti-Catholic polemicists was the progress of Charles II's foreign policy. The loss of the Second Anglo-Dutch War, coupled with a growing sentiment that Catholic France and not the Protestant Netherlands represented the most pressing political threat, decreased popular support for the new war. Rumors regarding the contents of the secret Treaty of Dover and the passage of the unpopular Declaration of Indulgence also fanned the flames of discontent, as Charles II's public support for seemingly pro-Catholic policies convinced many members of the public that the king was playing a secret and potentially disastrous foreign policy game. According to Steven C. A. Pincus,

> The third Anglo-Dutch war proved to be a time in which two rival interpretations—the one claiming that the republican Dutch, the other that the absolutist French, were seeking universal monarchy—could be tested. . . . The political

> developments of 1672 . . . invalidated the claims that the Dutch were seeking universal dominion, while strengthening the belief that Louis XIV coveted the throne of Charlemagne. This shift in popular sentiment took on added significance when Charles II and his government attempted to evade demands for peace. Political moderates as well as their more radical brethren became convinced that court corruption was preventing England from going to war with France and allying with the United Provinces, that the government was conducting a private foreign policy.[15]

Pincus argues that anti-Catholic sentiment grew out of a fear of French military strength: "The panic about popery grew out of fears of a French universal monarchy, rather than the other way around."[16] These fears were greatly augmented in 1673, when the future James II's Catholicism became a matter of public record, leading many to believe that Charles was focusing on war with the Dutch Protestants to obfuscate the growing and insidious power of the court Catholics. "From peace with the French and war with the Dutch . . . *Libera nos, Domine*," one anonymous satirist wrote.[17]

It is in this context that John Dryden wrote *Amboyna* (1673), a deliberate act of political propaganda that demonizes the Dutch and defends the alliance with the French. Drawing on the techniques of the 1660s rape plays, Dryden, like Howard and Orrery, traffics in atrocity to glorify the British monarchy. Dryden dedicates the play to the Catholic Lord Clifford and complains in the prologue that England traditionally placed too much emphasis on ties of mutual religion: "The dotage of some Englishmen is such / To fawn on those who ruine them; the Dutch. / They shall have all rather than make a War / With those who of the same Religion are."[18] The Dutch, Dryden claims, have publicly shamed England on the world stage, yet "Cuckold like," the Englishman "loves him who does the Feat" (prologue 12). Mutual Protestantism, he suggests, has insulated the Dutch from well-deserved retribution, and to emphasize the dangers of placing too much faith in the bonds created by the Protestant religion, he invokes the memory of the English Civil Wars: "What injuries so'er upon us fall, / Yet still the same Religion answers all: / Religion wheedled you to Civil War, / Drew English Blood, and Dutchmens now wou'd spare" (prologue 15–18). Dryden blames the outbreak of the Civil Wars on the failure of religious tolerance and suggests that to continue in intolerance—that is, to privilege Dutch Protestantism over French Catholicism—is to court disaster. Such rhetoric seeks to justify both Charles II's foreign policy and the much-maligned Declaration of Indulgence.

To stir up enmity against the Dutch and foment support for Charles's unpopular war, Dryden revives the tale of the Amboyna massacre, a staple of seventeenth-century anti-Dutch propaganda. Historically, the massacre occurred in 1623, when a Japanese mercenary confessed under torture to a plot by the British East India Company to oust the Dutch Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (the Dutch East India Company) from their shared trading

post at Amboyna. According to Dutch records, the English merchants, led by Gabriel Towerson, also confessed to the scheme under torture and thus on March 9, 1623, ten Englishmen were executed for their participation in the supposed plot. Tracts condemning the Dutch for their actions began to circulate in England as early as 1624 and persisted throughout the century.[19] Roundhead propagandists in particular encouraged the spread of such material as a way to justify Oliver Cromwell's war with the Dutch (1652–1654). *A True Relation Of The Unjust, Cruel, And Barbarous Proceedings against the English at Amboyna In the East-Indies* (1651), for instance, informs its reader that the massacre was an act of utmost cruelty, a horrifying act before God:

> To take away any mans life without due course of Justice, though it be with the greatest civility and easiness of death that could be, is a crime which God hath denounced murder, and will visit accordingly; but to heighten and multiply a death with all the previous Tortures that a passionate Diabolical malice can invent, cruelty inflict, or the frame of mans body undergo, is so far from being manly or Christian, that it is beyond savageness and bestiality, and approaches that accursed frame of spirit that had plundged himself into, who sits in the seat of darkness.[20]

The author reminds the English people that the massacre finally went unpunished and that Charles I did not bother to seek justice for England or her gloriously martyred dead:

> In King Charles's time the business was not stirred in, he had too great designs at home, than to preserve our Honour, or remedy our injuries abroad; but now since that yoak of Kingship is taken off our necks, me thinks we should like men, whose shackles are taken off them while they are asleep, leap up nimbly, and make use of our Liberty. It were the most irrational thing in the World to think of forgiving of them, who, though they received assistance from us in their greatest affliction and lowest miserie, have refused not onely to assist us now, when their case is ours, but have been more than neutral against us, jealous, it should seem, that their way of Government, which they have so grown and thriven under, should have the same effects with us.[21]

It fell to Oliver Cromwell to do what the weak and careless monarch would not, to punish the Dutch finally and irrevocably for their bloodthirsty cruelty. Underlying such claims to patriotism was parliamentary anger at the United Provinces' refusal to recognize the nascent English republic, along with its continued financial support for Charles II and his exiled court.[22] To the tract's author, Dutch persistence in aiding the banished Cavaliers is a sign of continuing ingratitude toward England; as many tracts remind the reader, England helped to free the Netherlands from the shackles of Spanish rule, yet the Dutch favor those who would oppress England in turn.

Throughout the anti-Dutch pamphlets, authors employ images of atrocity identical to those found in the anti-Catholic and anti-Cavalier tracts. One 1652 pamphlet describes the tortures inflicted on the English at Amboyna in painstaking detail. To force a confession, one man is waterboarded—"they poured the water softly upon his head, until the cloth was full up to his mouth and nosti's [sic], so that he could not draw his breath, but he must suck in the water."[23] Another is tormented with fire: "they burnt him with lighted Candles in the bottom of his feet, until the fat dropt out the Candles. . . . They burnt him also under the elbows; likewise in the palm of his hands; they moreover burnt his arm-holes, till his intrails might be seen."[24] The fascination with entrails made visible by torture recalls the descriptions of the Irish Rebellion discussed in the introduction to this study, bespeaking the repetitive and overlapping nature of propaganda culture. Anti-Dutch polemicists draw on the same pool of atrocity imagery as their anti-Catholic enemies; the demonic Dutchman, like his Irish and Cavalier brethren, revels in rape, torture, and dismemberment, and poses a true threat to British national security.

After the Restoration, similar accounts of the "Cruel, Inhumane and Ingrateful" Dutch circulated during the years of the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars (1665–67 and1672–74, respectively).[25] As in the 1641 Irish massacre tracts, anti-Dutch pamphlets of the period demonize their enemies by trafficking in the language of cannibalism. Demonic Dutchmen are referred to as "Bloody Butchers"[26] and accused of having "Roasted Men alive."[27] Stories of atrocities committed on the island of Poleroon are revived, in which the Dutch are accused of hiring Japanese mercenaries to murder men, women, and children: "the Out-cry in the Streets was terrible, Men, Women, and Children being cut in pieces, and the Town a Shamble of dead persons."[28] Demonic Dutchmen are also rapists; the inhabitants of the Banda Islands are described as begging the English for protection from the Dutch "whose practice it was, daily to exact upon them, and to murther them at their pleasures, and to abuse their Wives whiles themselves were inforced to look on, and not dare in the least to resist them."[29] The Dutch are murderers and sadists, ravishers and cannibals, a distant, fearsome Other, news of whose ill deeds distracts from deficiencies in contemporary English foreign policy.

According to Robert Markley, "Dryden rushed *Amboyna* to the stage to stir up popular resentment against the Dutch as England prepared to wage yet another war against the United Provinces, this time in league with the French."[30] To that end, the anti-Dutch pamphlets offered Dryden a fertile range of preexisting images upon which to draw. Dryden's Dutch are hypocritical, mercenary, and corrupt. They appear trustworthy in public only to turn on their supposed friends in private. The Fiscal, for instance, counsels Harman Junior to pretend friendship to Towerson since, he explains, "your Father, underhand, may do a mischief, but 'tis too gross above board"

(2.1.144–45). They are ungrateful in the extreme, both personally and politically. Harman Junior quickly forgets that Towerson "reliev'd me from the Pirats, and brought my Ship in safety off" (1.1.178–79), while his father dismisses England's role in saving the Netherlands from Catholic Spain. Van Herring, a Dutch merchant, is initially loath to attack English factories as the English "have preserv'd [our throats] from being cut by the *Spaniards*" (1.1.49–50). The Fiscal concurs, insisting, "We can never forget the Patronage of your *Elizabeth*, of famous memory; when from the Yoke of *Spain*, and *Alva's* Pride, her potent Succors, and her well tim'd Bounty, freed us, and gave us credit in the World" (1.1.231–34). Unfortunately, such favors ultimately mean nothing to the Dutch characters, driven as they are by mercenary greed. They "incarnate a pure commercial interest that excludes all forms of faith, justice, and reciprocity."[31]

In comparison with the vile Dutch, Dryden's Catholics look quite good. Spanish Catholic Perez proves much more honest than his Dutch employers, and he demonstrates the innate sense of honor that they lack. Here Dryden breaks with a long-standing tradition of anti-Spanish propaganda. As far back as the 1550s, authors spread tales of the so-called Black Legend of Spain, stories of Spanish atrocities committed against the native inhabitants of the Americas, along with stories of Spanish violence against Jews and Moors in Spain and against Protestants (the Dutch in particular) elsewhere on the European continent.[32] Such tracts describe the Spanish as barbarous, merciless, and cruel, all too eager to commit acts of rape, torture, murder, and infanticide. In Philip Wayne Powell's words, "The basic premise of the Black Legend is that Spaniards have shown themselves historically to be *uniquely* cruel, bigoted, tyrannical, obscurantist, lazy, fanatical, greedy, and treacherous."[33] According to Bartolomé de las Casas, whose 1552 treatise *The Spanish Colonie* was first translated into English in 1583, the Spanish reveled in the torture of the innocent, noble "savages" under their governance. Enumerating the evil deeds of a Spanish captain in Guatemala, de las Casas exclaims, "O howe many poore children hath hee made fatherlesse Orphans, howe many men and women widowers and widowes, bereeving the [sic] also of their childre [sic]! How many adulteries, whoredoms and rapes, hath he been the cause of. . . . Howe many anguishes and calamities by him have nombers suffered."[34]

Other treatises accused the Spanish of committing atrocities against the Dutch. Willem Baudartius, for instance, accused the Spanish Duke of Alba and his soldiers of having "threatened, struck, robbed, plundered, [and] raped the women and young daughters" of the Netherlands.[35] Baudartius accuses the duke of treating Dutch women as spoils of war: "Many beautiful, rich women who were taken from their husbands . . . he gave to his Soldiers . . . to satisfy their lusts and their goods for their thievery."[36] As is true of acts of sexual violence in the English Civil War tracts, Baudartius connects "rape,

theft, and other acts of violence," suggesting "that he sees rape both as a violent act and a property crime against Netherlandish men—both of which signal Spanish depravity."[37] Similar accounts spread throughout the Netherlands during the years of the Dutch Revolt, as William of Orange encouraged the spread of anti-Spanish propaganda to foment political support for his rebellion.[38] They also circulated in English translation. George Gascoigne, for instance, condemned Spanish atrocities in his 1576 treatise, *The Spoyle of Antwerp*. A witness to Spanish violence against the Dutch, Gascoigne writes,

> I may not passe over with sylence, the wylfull burning and destroying of the stately Townehouse & all the monuments and records of the Citie: neither can I refraine to tel their shamful rapes & outragious forces presented unto sundry honest Dames & Virgins. It is a thing too horrible to rehearse, that the Father and Mother were forced to fetche their yong [sic] daughter out of a cloyster . . . & to bestow her in bed betweene two Spaniards, to worke their wicked and detestable wil with her.[39]

The Spanish have committed unspeakable acts against innocent Protestants, Gascoigne suggests, necessitating English intervention in Dutch affairs (the very intervention for which Dryden's Dutch are entirely ungrateful).

To read anti-Spanish tracts alongside anti-Irish, anti-Catholic, antiroyalist, and anti-Dutch documents of the period is to recognize the repetitive nature of early modern propaganda culture. Stories of rape, murder, and infanticide cross national and religious boundaries with ease and are swiftly refocused from one enemy to the next in successive periods of social unrest. Drawing on a communal pool of atrocity imagery, therefore, Dryden's *Amboyna* overwrites the Black Legend of Spain with tales of the demonic Dutchman. While Dryden's Dutch are inexorably cruel, the Spanish, embodied in the character of Perez, are ultimately harmless and even likable. Here, Dryden attempts to diminish and redirect popular anti-Catholic animus, reminding his audience that the Catholics—French, Spanish, and Irish alike—pose no threat in comparison to the treacherous Dutch. Unlike the Fiscal, Perez fully recognizes Towerson's obvious and innate worth: "he's a brave and worthy Gentleman, I wou'd not for the wealth of both the *Indies*, have had his Blood upon my Soul to answer" (3.2.132–34). Granted, Perez is not above mercenary motives; he refuses the commissioned killing only when he discovers that Towerson intended "as a testimony of [his] gratitude for [Perez's] honourable Service to bestow on him five hundred English pounds" (3.2.9–11). Yet there are lines of honor that Perez, a Spanish Catholic, won't cross even for money, lines that the Dutch Fiscal cannot or will not recognize. Respect for Towerson's good qualities even prompts Perez finally to fight on the side of the English, suggesting that the Catholics represent a lesser threat to English national interests. At the same time, Perez is rendered largely impotent and therefore safe, in sharp contrast to the Dutch sexual

threat. While Perez is loyal to his unfaithful wife, the Dutch revel in cuckolding and sexual violence. They "are of a Race that are born Rebels, and live every where on Rapine" (4.4.50–51), and the Fiscal reminds Harman Junior that he can commit rapes with impunity: "Is not your Father Chief? Will he condemn you for a petty Rape?" (4.4.53–54). The Dutch thus become, like the Cavaliers and Catholics of the English Civil War tracts or the Spanish of the Black Legend, a source of infection and illness. Ysabinda complains that "the foul speckled stains" left on her body by the rape are "ne'r to be washed out, but in my death" (4.5.38, 39).

Several critics read Ysabinda as the allegorical embodiment of India threatened by Dutch imperialism. Bridget Orr, for instance, calls Ysabinda "a synecdoche for the possession of Amboyna."[40] That no rapes are reported in the original Amboyna documents certainly helps to substantiate such a reading. To read these texts alongside the tropes of older atrocity narratives, however, is to reveal how Dryden adopts the rhetoric of rape both to deflect criticisms of the court onto a foreign threat and to reinforce the necessity of Charles's military campaign. Ysabinda's broken and abused body represents not only the destruction of the colonial nation, but more importantly, the damage that England has suffered (and will continue to suffer) at Dutch hands. Towerson complains that the Dutch have treated the English as imperial subjects rather than partners in the colonial enterprise: "We are not here your Subjects, but your Partners," he tells Harman Senior, "and that Supremacy of power you claim, extends but to the Natives, not to us: dare you, who in the *British* Seas strike Sayl, nay more, whose Lives and Freedome are our Alms, presume to sit and judge your Benefactors?" (5.1.266–70). The English have ceded their position of authority to the Dutch, the colonizers becoming the colonized in India. Ysabinda's death, like Altemera's decay, thus symbolizes the damage done to the English nation as the Dutch usurp English property, humiliate English men, and degrade them to the status of natives.

By the end of the play, the Dutch are revealed to be more savage than "savages," as their acts of rape and sexual excess morph into acts of torture and finally, implied cannibalism. Harman tells his servant, "Boy, take that Candle thence, and bring it hither, I am exalted, and wou'd light my Pipe just where the Wyck is fed with *English* Fat" (5.1.364–66). Van Herring concurs: "So wou'd I; oh the Tobacco tasts Divinely after it" (5.1.367). The Dutch light their pipes on fire fed by English body fat, an ingestion of English flesh. Such cannibal imagery is new to Dryden's play; it does not appear in any of the Amboyna massacre tracts, reflecting Dryden's insistence that the Dutch are worse than any Catholic enemy, Spanish, Irish, or French. Finally, after deploying the rhetoric of rape, torture, and cannibalism against the Dutch, Dryden concludes by linking them with the Roundheads. The Dutch, like the English Civil War parliamentarians, have overthrown their lawful sovereign

and for that act alone cannot be trusted. Beaumont exclaims, "Wee'l shame your Cruelty; if we deserve our Tortures, 'tis first for freeing such an infamous Nation, that ought to have been slaves, and then for trusting them as Partners, who had cast off the Yoke of their lawful Soveraign" (5.1.165–68).[41] To overthrow a seated monarch is a sin far worse than continued adherence to Rome. *Amboyna* thus participates in the same ideological project as *The Generall* and *The Usurper*: Dryden adopts the language of atrocity propaganda to discredit a hated foreign Other and then links that Other with the memory of Roundhead regicidal violence. Charles II's foreign policy is redeemed in contrast, as Dryden distances the king (and by extension, the French Catholics) from Dutch ingratitude, Dutch lasciviousness, and Dutch cruelty.

MALE LIBERTINISM AND THE POISONOUS CATHOLIC MISTRESS: 1670S PROPAGANDA

By the mid-1670s, the anti-Dutch, pro-royalist sentiment exemplified by Dryden's *Amboyna* was being drowned out by a virulent and progressively dominant cultural strain of anti-Catholicism. The performance of Dryden's *Amboyna* therefore marks a turning point in the treatment of onstage rape, the last play of the decade to use sexual violence to glorify the monarchy. Offstage, meanwhile, a growing number of anti-Catholic tracts began to circulate, once again likening the Catholics to a plague that would destroy the nation with domestic unrest. Popery is "such a Plague" that seeks "with dangerous Errours to Infect the mind."[42] William Lloyd concurs: "We say as a man that hath the Plague may live, but not by the Plague; so Popery being the bane of Christianity, and enmity to mans salvation, those that are saved among them, must be saved from Popery, not by it."[43] Catholics seek only to pour "our poison upon the earth," and undermine Protestant governments.[44] Other tracts recall the list of English kings deposed by Catholic treachery, as papists revel in the "Bloody Wars we have raised, the horrid Treasons we have Fomented, the cruel Massacres we have caused through Bohemia, England, France, and Germany of old, and in Ireland, and Vallies of Piedmont of a later date."[45] The memory of the Irish massacre is again invoked, in which "300000 were murdered, whose Blood stands still upon the score: which Cruelty, as former Ages cannot parallel, so future Ages will hardly believe."[46] George Fox enumerates Catholic atrocities committed against Protestants: "One was wrackt unto a Wheel, and beat with a Bulls Pizzle. One hanged, and her Skin fleyed off. One bound about a Globe, and her Skin fleyed off her Head and Face. One had had his Tongue cut out. One broken in

a Mortar. One bound to a Pillar, his Head downward, and roasted. One fryed in a Pan. The Mother whipt, and her Dugs pulled off."[47] He concludes with a list of specifically Irish atrocities, including acts of Irish sexual violence:

> As for the Protestant Ministers whom they surprised, their Manner was first to strip them, and after bind them to a Tree or Post, where they pleased, and then to ravish their Wives and Daughters before their Faces (in Sight of all their merciless Rabble) with the basest Villains they could pick out, after they hanged up their Husbands and Parents before their Faces, and then cut them down before they were half dead, then quartered them, after dismembred them, and stopped their Mouthes therewith.[48]

In many of the tracts, Catholics are once more likened to vampires and cannibals. Fox invites his reader to contemplate how the Catholic Church "has been drunk with the Blood of Saints and Martyrs."[49] The speaker of *A Passionate Satyr Upon a Devilish Great He-Whore That lies yonder at Rome* wonders, "Must We, Canibal like, eat up our God, / Or else must We not in Heaven have aboad?"[50] Meanwhile, the author of *The Character of a Papist* insists that the Catholics believe "the Host in an instant Metamorphosed (or if you will) transubstantiated into very Flesh and Blood, Which is no sooner made, but forthwith they devour it, which raises a Question, Whether a Cannibal or Papist, be the rankest Flesh eater, since the former eats only Mans Flesh, the later [sic] that of his God."[51] The tract ends with a song emphasizing the cannibalistic aspects of the Eucharist:

> A Wafer the Priests Charm's into a God,
> If you will believe it you may.
> And so it becomes true Flesh and Blood,
> The clean contrary way,
> Oh! the clean contrary way.
> Then into your mouth he puts it all raw,
> If you will believe it, you may,
> Which surely will bleed if that you it Chew,
> The clean contrary way,
> Oh! the clean contrary way.[52]

For many anti-Catholic polemicists, religious error is linked with sexual hypocrisy, as priests are revealed to be notorious cuckold makers: "Must all Men be blind that open their Eyes, / That Priests may do what they please with their Wives?" *A Passionate Satyr* asks.[53] *A Catholick Pill to Purge Popery* (1677) describes the sins of sexually incontinent popes:

> Pope John the thirteenth was an Adulterer, and an incestuous person, Being found Without the City with another mans wife, he was wounded of her husband, that within eight days after he died. . . . Pope Sixtus the fourth

> erected at Rome a Stews of double abominations, not only of women, but also of men. . . . Alexander the sixth committed incest with his own daughter. . . . Innocentius the eighth had divers bastards, and boasted of them.[54]

Frequently, such attacks on the Catholic faith are linked with criticisms of court libertinism, as libertine behavior is treated as a byproduct of Catholic excess. Charles has surrounded himself with Catholic priests, whores, and sycophants, people who seduce him from the path of virtue and poison him politically, religiously, and sexually. In the words of John Ayloffe's "Britannia and Raleigh" (1674–75),

> A colony of French possess the court;
> Pimps, priests, buffoons I'th' privy-chamber sport.
> Such slimy monsters ne'er approach'd a throne
> Since Pharoah's reign, nor so defil'd a crown.
> I'th'sacred ear tyrannic arts they croak,
> Pervert his mind, his good intentions choke . . .
> Thus fairy-like the King they steal away,
> And in his place a Louis changeling lay.[55]

The toxic presence of the court Catholics has led both to Charles's sexual gluttony and to his pro-French foreign policy.

As criticisms of court Catholicism became more common and pointed, the image of the poisonous Catholic bride—an image initially tied to the memory of Queen Henrietta Maria—was replaced in the late 1660s with the image of the poisonous Catholic mistress.[56] Like Henrietta Maria before her, the poisonous Catholic mistress (the Duchesses of Cleveland and Portsmouth most commonly) used her sexual access to the king to influence and control his political choices.[57] The author of "The Royal Buss" (1675) calls the Duchess of Portsmouth an "incestuous punk" who has "Made our most gracious Sovereign drunk," and accuses her of poisoning the entire nation:

> The Devil take her for a whore!
> Would he had kiss'd ten years before,
> Before our city had been burn'd,
> And all our wealth to plagues had turn'd;
> Before she'd ruin'd (pox upon her!)
> Our English name, blood, wealth, and honor.[58]

Nell Gwyn is, ironically, praised, both because she is the "Protestant whore," and because she does not aspire to a position of political authority.[59] The author of the clandestine satire "Nell Gwynne" (1669) comments,

> Hard by Pall Mall lives a wench call'd Nell.
> King Charles the Second he kept her.
> She hath got a trick to handle his p—,
> But never lays hands on his sceptre.
> All matters of state from her soul she does hate,

And leave to the politic bitches.[60]

Nell is an acceptable mistress insofar as she does not attempt to parlay sexual access into political power.

Mary of Modena, James's Catholic wife, also came in for her share of criticism, as the thought of another well-placed, influential Catholic woman caused widespread discomfort. According to Andrew Marvell,

> For his Royal Highness to marry the Princess of Modena, or any other of that Religion, had very dangerous consequences: That the minds of his Majesties Protestant subjects will be much disquieted, thereby filled with infinite discontents and Jealousies. That his Majesty would thereby be linked into such a foraine Alliance, which will be of great disadvantage and possible to the Ruine of the Protestant Religion. That they have found by sad experience how such marriages have always increased Popery, and incouraged Priests and Jesuits to pervert his Majesties subjects: That the Popish party already lift up their heads in hopes of his marriage: That they fear it may diminish the affection of the people toward his Royal Highness, who is by bloud so near related to the Crown: That it is now more than one Age, that the subjects have lived in continual apprehensions of the increase of Popery, and the decay of the Protestant Religion: Finally that she having many Kindred and Relations in the Court of Rome, by this means their enterprises here might be facilitated, they might pierce into the most secret Counsels of his Majesty, and discover the state of the Realm.[61]

Mary of Modena becomes the figurative ravisher of her husband, penetrating the domestic sphere physically and ideologically, a simultaneous invasion of the public sphere as well as the domestic.

Clandestine satires aside, direct and open criticisms of the royal mistresses and court women in the period were relatively few. Licensing restrictions prevented open condemnations of the court, and thus the majority of satirical poems circulated secretly in manuscript, only to be published years later in the collections of *Poems on Affairs of State*.[62] I want to suggest, however, that implicit criticisms of the court women can be found in the resurrected stories of treacherous and sexually violent Catholic women that pervade the published anti-Catholic tracts. Alongside stories of the Irish massacre, authors also revived the story of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of Paris (1572), focusing especially on the role of Catherine de Medici, the queen mother, in spurring on the carnage. Another manifestation of the poisonous Catholic bride (or widow in Catherine's case), Catherine de Medici encourages her son to order acts of violence against Protestant men and her subjects to commit acts of sexual violence against Protestant women. According to *Popish Policies and Practices Represented in the Histories of the Parisian Massacre* (1674), the queen is "by her own nature and proper design en-

clined" to promote "the utter ruine of the Protestants by a total slaughter."[63] When the king, her son, balks at arranging the massacre, Catherine, along with the king's evil counselors, manipulates and shames him into action:

> The Queen fearing lest the King [her son], whom she thought she did observe still wavering and staggering at the horridness of the enterprise, should change his mind, comes into his Bed chamber at midnight, whither presently Anjou, Nevers, Biragus, Tavannes, Radesianus, and after them Guise came by agreement. There they immind [sic] the King, hesitating, and after a long discourse had to and fro, upbraided by his Mother, that by his delaying he would let slip a fair occasion offered him by God, of subduing his enemies. By which speech the King finding himself accused of Cowardise, and being of himself of a fierce nature, and accustomed to bloud-shed, was inflamed, and gave command to put the thing in execution. Therefore the Queen laying hold of his present heat, lest by delaying it should slack, commands that the sign which was to have been given at the break of day should be hastened.[64]

The queen takes advantage of her son's weakness, poisoning his mind and manipulating him into condoning Catholic "slaughters and rapines."[65] The text foregrounds the image of Catherine de Medici as the poisonous instigator of sexually violent horror, and she later becomes a literal poisoner; as the margin note reminds the reader, the king "died in less than two years after of a Bloudy-flux, proceeding, as was suspected, from poison given him by the procurement of his Mother and Brother."[66] In Catherine de Medici, the figure of the poisonous Catholic bride merges with the figure of the unnatural, monstrous mother who destroys her own progeny. Similarly deviant mothers abound in the tracts of the period, with the Church itself as the ultimate exemplar of maternal monstrosity. Alternately "the Mother of Harlots, and Abomination of the Earth,"[67] the "Mother of the Fornications of the Earth,"[68] and the "Mother of . . . Idolatry,"[69] the Church gives birth to a constant stream of evil plots. In *News from Rome*, the pope asks the devil for help with the Church's "most holy design which we have so long been Midwifing into the World"; without Satan's help, the plot "is likely to prove Abortive and fatally Miscarry."[70]

Equally revealing of the contemporary political climate is the sudden burst of interest in the story of Donna Olimpia Maidalchini (1591–1657), recently deceased sister-in-law of and mistress to the late Pope Innocent X. Born in 1591 to a tax collector father and minor noblewoman mother, Olimpia evinced a strong personality and sense of personal ambition from a young age. When her father decreed that Olimpia, then fifteen, would save her family money by joining a convent, Olimpia refused to give her consent, causing a minor scandal within the world of Viterbo, Italy. Her father was finally forced to acquiesce to her demands, and she subsequently married twice, first at the age of seventeen to wealthy landowner Paolo Nini, and

after his death, to the nobleman Pamphilio Pamphili. Only twenty-one years old, Donna Olimpia was closer in age to her brother-in-law, thirty-eight-year-old Gianbattista Pamphili (the future Innocent X) than to her much older husband. Olimpia and Gianbattista quickly became inseparable, prompting gossip that the two were involved in an incestuous affair. According to Eleanor Herman, Olimpia's modern biographer, the birth of Olimpia's first surviving son and heir caused many to wonder whether Gianbattista, and not Pamphilio, "might be the father of the bouncing baby boy."[71] As Gianbattista's primary confidante and advisor, Olimpia was instrumental in overseeing his election first to the position of papal nuncio, and later, after the death of her husband, to the office of pope. Now a rich widow and presumed by all to be Innocent's lover, Olimpia became the most powerful woman in Rome, restricting access to the pope and determining the distribution of papal favors. With the exception of a three-year estrangement during which Olimpia left the city, she remained the most powerful woman in Rome until Innocent's death in 1655. The succeeding pope, Alexander VII, opened an investigation into the legalities of her dealings under Innocent, but she died of the plague in 1657 before any conclusions could be reached.

Although Donna Olimpia has been largely ignored by modern historians, the pope's "dependence on" her is, to this day, described as "the great blemish on [Innocent's] pontificate" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.[72] References to Donna Olimpia also appear regularly in the tracts of the 1670s. According to Alexander Cooke, author of *A Present for a Papist: Or The Life and Death Of Pope Joan* (1675), Donna Olimpia's influence within the Church hierarchy, along with the story of Pope Joan, proves that the Church is corrupt and unfit: "If matters then have gone thus at Rome, (the people there having been most intollerably abused, not only by this Female Pope, Donna Olympia, Sister in Law and overruling Miss to Pope Innocent the Tenth, and others of the like Masculine Gender) what hopes of Infallability?"[73] The story of Olimpia's life was first translated into English in 1666 in a tract entitled *The Life Of Donna Olimpia Maldachini, Who Governed the Church during the Time of Innocent the X*, a tract that ran through multiple editions between 1666 and 1678. Throughout the tract, Donna Olimpia is depicted as an unnatural wife, unfaithful, incestuous, and cruel. Initially married to the pope's brother, she uses her sexuality to control her brother-in-law: "She, who desired nothing more than the exercise of . . . power, freely bestowed her affections, the more to oblige [the pope] to an absolute surrender of himself. Thus the more he submitted his will to Donna Olimpia, the more love she heaped upon him."[74] Donna Olimpia, like Henrietta Maria and Charles II's mistresses, uses the power of her sexuality to gain inappropriate and unfair access to the body politic. The tract complains that the pope's power is "subjected to the frail disposal of a woman."[75] The pope is unmanned, controlled by the whims of a dangerous and unnatural woman. Finally, she

becomes so indispensible to the pope that he tells her in a letter, "Remote from you I am like a Ship without a Rudder, left to the sole mercy of Fortune."[76] The tract's publication of Pope Innocent's letter recalls the publication and contents of Charles I's letters to Henrietta Maria in *The King's Cabinet opened*, proving that the pope, like the late monarch, was uxoriously and dangerously susceptible to feminine wiles. Leti complains that former popes may have fornicated, but if a pope "admitted [a mistress] into his Bed, she entred not into his Councils."[77] In contrast, Pope Innocent "presented Donna Olimpia not only with his heart and affections, but with his hand, person, and dominion; without restraint, limit, or respect: and it is most assuredly true, that never any King gave so much power to his Wife, nor any Queen Regent commanded her Councels with so much authority as Donna Olimpia had usurped unto her self both over Pope, Councel, and People."[78]

If Donna Olimpia is a bad counselor and sexual threat, she is also another manifestation of the monstrous and sexually violent mother. When her young granddaughter is reluctant to consummate the marriage Donna Olimpia has arranged for her, Donna Olimpia insists that the new husband force his unwilling bride—by today's standards, an instance of marital rape. Only twelve years old at the time of the marriage, Olimpiucchia shamed her grandmother with her behavior on her wedding day: "Olimpiucchia raced up to her old bedroom and locked the door. The wedding guests could hear her loud sobs echoing through the walls. . . . She shrieked that she knew what her husband expected of her that night . . . and she wanted no part of it."[79] When her attempts to reconcile the girl to the marriage fail, Donna Olimpia "dragged her into a carriage and took her to the Palazzo Barberini [her husband's residence] herself. . . . The ambassador of Mantua wrote, 'The grandmother took her there almost violently one evening.'"[80] The marriage was subsequently consummated, presumably against Olimpiucchia's will and much to Donna Olimpia's relief. Donna Olimpia thus reinforces her own power by suborning, and indeed commissioning, an act of rape against her own flesh and blood. Simultaneously, driven by ambition and an extreme thirst for power, she refuses to educate her son and heir, lest he attempt to replace her as the head of the family: "She neglected the Education of her Children, especially of her Son: for fear it might waken his spirits a little, to a future disturbance of her absolute power over the house of Pansilio."[81] She also attempts to thwart her son's matrimonial ambitions. When Prince Camillo, Olimpia's son, resigns his cardinalship in favor of marrying Olimpia Aldobrandini, Princess of Rosana, Olimpia Maidalchini forces the pope to banish him and his bride from the city: The pope "held a two hours conference with Donna Olimpia, to resolve what was to be done in this case. The result of which was, that the Prince Camillo and his Lady, should be banished from Rome. Upon which the Orders were brought him to depart, to the amazement of all."[82] The common people are amazed that a mother could

treat her son so unfairly, as are the members of the papal court. "The Court wondered most at these two particulars, in the banishment of Prince Camillo. The first was to see a Pope so besotted with a Woman, as to punish his Nephew for having directed his love to a Princess of equal quality to himself. Who could but admire to see a Pope given over to the excess of an aspiring woman, who governed Church, State, Court, and Pope himself with a high hand: and at the same time become so cruel to his only Nephew, for appropriating with the love of so noble a Lady, so considerable a Patrimony to the house of Pansilio!"[83]

Leti's tract sets up the two Olimpias as inverse images of each other, a real-life analogue to such dramatic pairings as Settle's Fredigond and Aphelia, Lee's Tullia and Teraminta, and Ravenscroft's Tamora and Lavinia. As is common in the drama of the period, Leti's work juxtaposes an evil, lecherous mother against an innocent young bride victimized by the elder woman's ambitious excess, and thus, as we shall see, sheds new light on the many similar pairings appearing contemporaneously on the British stage. Such a portrayal was not, in fact, historically accurate. According to other accounts, Olimpia Aldobrandini was hardly a complete innocent. When Olimpia's son Camillo first met his future wife, she was already married to Prince Paolo Borghese. She married Camillo in 1647, less than a year after the death of her husband and despite his mother's objections. Princess Olimpia also evinced a personality as strong as her mother-in-law's; according to Herman, "It was a cruel irony that Camillo, who had married the princess to get away from the domination of his bossy mother, now found himself dominated by a bossy wife. In fact, appearances aside, the two Olimpias were remarkably similar; both were ambitious, strong, and far smarter than he, and neither would ever let him forget it."[84] Donna Olimpia was apparently jealous of Princess Olimpia's youth and beauty and particularly worried that she would usurp the pope's affections and act as a rival "in the disposal of the Pope, at least limit her in part if not in the whole."[85] The two Olimpias remained enemies and rivals their entire lives, only reconciling just before the elder Olimpia's death. The degree to which Leti renders the elder Olimpia monstrous and the younger Olimpia the embodiment of virtue in distress, however, reflects the degree to which he hopes to demonize and discredit Maidalchini. Within the context of English political culture, the tract also serves to remind readers of the evils perpetrated by poisonous Catholic mistresses, both domestically and abroad.

The frequent repetition of the Donna Olimpia story in tracts of the period suggests that the pope's mistress functioned as a stand-in for all the Catholic wives and mistresses who could not safely or directly be publicly accused. She also personifies the dangerous consequences of a world in which women are not effectively policed, a world in which men privilege the pursuit of sexual pleasure over religious devotion or effective governance. The world

that emerges from the propaganda tracts of the late 1660s and early 1670s, then, is quite similar to the view of the court proffered in Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter*. The pursuit of libertine pleasure has created a realm in which patriarchy has begun to crumble. In its place are effeminate rulers, violent debauched libertines, and poisonous and destructive women. It is in this context that we must read and understand Settle's *Love and Revenge* and Shadwell's *The Libertine*, two plays in which male abdication of responsibility leads to societal collapse. For Settle, as for Marvell and the Donna Olimpia authors, that abdication licenses the spread of female poison and eventually the disruption of lines of inheritance through rape and Catholic monstrosity. Shadwell meanwhile transforms the figure of the debauched Cavalier into the figure of the debauched libertine. The tropes of English Civil War propaganda are altered to suit the concerns of a new generation, demonstrating the link between aristocratic pursuit of pleasure, the acceptance of erroneous and harmful Catholic doctrine, and finally protonihilist destruction.

MALE ABDICATION, FEMALE POISON: SETTLE'S *LOVE AND REVENGE*

Elkanah Settle's *Love and Revenge* (1675), an adaptation of William Heminge's little-known Caroline play, *The Fatal Contract* (c. 1633), depicts a royal court very similar to that of Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter*. Drawing on material from earlier Jacobean plays—*Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *The Revenger's Tragedy* most clearly[86]—the play reveals the problems that ensue when patriarchy collapses and women are allowed too much social and sexual authority. The play begins in the wake of a series of horrifically violent acts. The fair Chlotilda has been raped by Crown Prince Clotair, and in an attempt to avenge her violation, Chlotilda's family murdered an innocent man, Clotair's uncle and brother to Queen Fredigond. Subsequently, Fredigond avenged her brother's death with the murders of Chlotilda's entire family, save two absent brothers, Dumain and Lamot, and Chlotilda herself, who is missing and presumed dead. Dumain explains,

> For in the high displeasure of that Queen
> All our Posterity was doom'd, some felt the Wheel,
> Some Wrackt, some Hang'd, others empaled on Stakes;
> And had not we been then in *Wittenburgh*
> We had added to the number of the Dead.[87]

When Dumain and Lamot return to the kingdom, they have every motivation in the world to seek vengeance, to punish both the violation of their sister and the death of their father. That the brothers were away at Wittenberg during

these tragic events constructs an imaginative parallel between Dumain and Lamot and Shakespeare's Hamlet, also away in Wittenberg during his father's murder and mother's subsequent remarriage. Dumain and Lamot, however, have no interest in assuming the role of avenger. When Queen Fredigond offers them a place at court, they disclaim the need for revenge, only too glad to accept personal advancement instead. Lamot tells his brother,

> We'l take the gracious offer of the Queen.
> She's Princely, Vow'd our Friend; besides, what ill
> Can we expect from her, who might have sent
> Her murdering Ministers, and slain us here,
> Had She intended foul play? No, She's Noble. (5)

Despite their assertions at the end of the play that there is honor in vengeance, that "This Revenge / Is an Estate to the Family; 'twill make / The *Dumane* race immortall" (72), they take no part in seeking that glorious revenge, in clearing their family's name, or in seeking redemption for their sister's reputation. Male abdication of responsibility thus becomes evident from the earliest moments of the play.

Other male characters likewise fail in their duties as avengers. Crown Prince Clotair is a rapist, but he is also son to an unfaithful mother and murdered father. Still, he repeatedly privileges his sexual conquests above his duty to his family name and personal honor. As he leaves his mother's side to rendezvous with (and potentially rape) Aphelia, he acknowledges that he should be more concerned with his duty to his parents.

> My Father dyed but now; his Fate calls down
> For thoughts of Vengeance, and my tender breast
> Should be with dreams of piety possest:
> With thoughts of Blood and Death, of Funeral Beds,
> Of Martyr'd Monarchs, and of Traytors heads;
> A Mother's Tears, and walking Fathers Ghost,
> Disturb'd i'th'other world, for what in this was lost. (15)

The play alludes to Hamlet's father's ghost—another specter doomed to walk the world and lament what he has lost—to emphasize both Clotair's responsibility to his father and his refusal to act as Hamlet does. Despite his father's death just hours before, Clotair chooses to seek out Aphelia (whose name, of course, invokes the memory of *Hamlet*'s Ophelia), insisting, "These should I think on; but to night sleep sorrow: / For Love to night, and for Revenge to morrow . . . It is not Ghosts, but Lovers walk by Night" (15, 16). Love, for Clotair, is far more important than revenge.

The memory of Hamlet's father's ghost is invoked a second time in a scene that blends elements of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* with elements of Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy*. To further her own revenge, Chlotilda

(now living disguised as the Moorish Nigrello) sends Clotair to his mother's chambers, hoping that Clotair will catch Fredigond with her lover, Clarmount. Like *The Revenger's Tragedy*'s Lussurioso, also sent to his mother's chambers by the avenger, Vindice, Clotair runs to his mother's room, and as in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, the revenger's plan goes awry. Instead of catching his mother in the sexual act, Clotair encounters what he believes is his father's ghost. When Fredigond realizes that her tryst is about to be discovered, she tells Clarmount, "in my Closet / Lyes th'Habit that my Husband wore last Night / When he was Poyson'd; put on that, and . . . / Make up the form of the dead King" (25). Later, when Clotair enters her chamber, she invents an elaborate ghost story designed to convince her son that his father's discontented spirit walks abroad:

> Oh Son,
> Such horrid Apparitions
> Have I beheld, have quite unwitted me:
> Your Fathers Ghost most terribly frightful
> Has thrice this dismal Night appear'd to me:
> In his right hand he bore a shining Cup,
> Which to his mouth he rais'd with looks so gay,
> As if he drank a health to some young Bride.
> The aiery Potion drank, strait in a fume
> He threw the seeming Goblet to the ground,
> And with an alter'd look assumed a paleness
> More death-like then the frost, his Age and Cares
> Made him in Life-time wear: To Heav'n he pointed,
> Thrice did he cry, Revenge; and at that word
> Sprang through the Roof which now stands bare to Heav'n,
> Where he did rain down Fire which here you see. (25–26)

Thus when Clotair encounters the disguised Clarmount, he believes he is confronting his father's ghost, and his reaction bespeaks both fear and guilt for having prioritized sex with Aphelia over duty to his father's memory:

> My Fathers form exactly, who could think
> The Devil were so good at Picture-drawing,
> Pray Heav'n he be not Ceremonious; for
> I find my self but ill provided for
> A Complement. If it be Injuries,
> Break open Monuments, and disturb the Dead:
> I'le see thy rights perform'd. If thou desirest
> To be appeas'd with Blood, Blood thou shalt have:
> Or if that's not enough, I'le build thee Temples.
> Thou shalt have Altars, humane Sacrifices.
> Do but depart; thy presence does not please me,
> Thou art not Company for Flesh and Blood. (26)

In Heminge's original text, Clotair encounters what he believes is his *brother's* ghost, not his father's. In a substantially less descriptive passage, Fredigond tells him, "O my Son, such horrid apparitions full of dread / Have I beheld, have quite unwitted me; / Thy brothers Ghost, young *Clovis* Ghost in armes / Has thrice appear'd to me this dismall night."[88] That Settle chooses to substitute old King Childrick's apparition for Clovis/Lewis's bespeaks the symbolic power of *Hamlet* as a backdrop to the text. As a good son, Clotair should drop everything to avenge his father; in Hamlet's words, "thy commandment all alone shall live / Within the book and volume of my brain / Unmixed with baser matter."[89] Instead, Clotair continues to value his interactions with and desire for Aphelia over his responsibility to his father. In this, Clotair's behavior is also reminiscent of Charles II's in *Last Instructions to a Painter*. Instead of heeding his (supposed) father's political warning, he chooses mistress over patriarch and goes on to plot another act of sexual violence.

Despite Lewis's eventual status as the hero of the play, he, too, privileges love over revenge. Like Clotair, Lewis chooses mistress over father, insisting that his duty to Aphelia outweighs his duty to the late king. "This process of a Fathers Death, has rowz'd / My Soul, and shew'd me Horrors in a shape / Too terrible to enter Loyal hearts" (32), he exclaims, yet finally concludes, "My Resentments / Of my wrong'd Fathers death a while must pause, / I'le Right a Kings, but first a Mistress's Cause" (33). Unfortunately, his protection proves insufficient as Aphelia is repeatedly sexually menaced and Lewis fails to best his brother in a duel. What the play dramatizes, then, is the systematic failure of men as patriarchs and avengers as they privilege sexual desire over duty. Clotair in particular emerges from the play as another manifestation of the debauched Cavalier (now libertine), sexually violent, dangerously impetuous in his appetites, and ultimately unconcerned with the effectual functioning of the government. Indeed, it is Clotair's failure to offer appropriate leadership that finally leads to the play's tragic ending, reminding the spectator that a libertine king does not pride himself on stable governance.

As is the case in Marvell's *Last Instructions*, male abdication of responsibility permits the rise of feminine evil. Queen Fredigond functions as the play's poisonous Catholic bride; like Catherine de Medici and Donna Olimpia, she is both sexually violent and a monstrous mother, yet her behavior is predicated on her husband's and son's disinclination to police her sexuality. Dumain and Lamot specifically criticize old King Childrick for failing to lock his wife away from the world and prevent her from straying: "Were I the King . . . / Before the Wanton and hot-blooded Queen / Should have the License to be suspected, / I'de lock her up, and house her like a Silk-worm" (3). Childrick's failure to prevent his wife's adultery is finally punished by his murder at the hands of the woman he has neglected to restrict. Still,

Clotair has no interest in regulating his mother's behavior after his father's death. While Hamlet and Lussurioso are tormented by the possibility of their mothers' unchastity, Clotair remains dismissive:

> I find the sin of Lust is not so Capital.
> My Father but last Night by Poyson Dyed,
> And I at the same time by Lust inflamed,
> Left the concern due to a Fathers Murder,
> To flye into a Mistresses embrace.
> I but a Father lost; and by that loss
> I gain'd a Throne: She lost a King and Husband,
> And with that loss a Crown: Yet Love had power
> To make her losses, King and Crown forget,
> And the next Night flye to a Lovers Arms.
> Why then should I be troubled; when my sin
> (If it be one) runs in my Blood. (29)

Fredigond's lack of concern for her husband's death, Clotair argues, excuses his own failures, and thus he is not bothered by evidence of her extramarital sexual desires. Too late he realizes that such sexual freedom has the potential to destroy the fabric of society; left unchecked, female infidelity leads to female violence.[90] According to Fredigond, "I once was a Kind Wife and Pious Mother. / But now my Husband, and my Sons must dye . . . / Almighty Love this wondrous Change has made, / A Love that has my hopes of Heav'n betray'd" (8). Because she desires Clarmount beyond honor and reason, she ignores the bonds of matrimony and the blood ties of maternity to ensure her lover's rise to power:

> For my *Clarmount*,
> My best-lov'd *Clarmounts* sake, Husband and Sons
> Are Clouds betwixt my Love and Me: and all
> The tyes of Blood, and Nature are too small
> To check what Love resolves. (8)

The freedom to sin sexually afforded by her son's neglect renders Fredigond cruel and merciless, and once outside the systems of masculine control, she grows ever more dangerous.

Clotair's failures to control his mother's behavior are twofold: he does not restrict her sexually, and perhaps more importantly, he forces her to avenge her brother's death on her own, as he is himself uninterested in vengeance. Fredigond's villainous acts reflect not only her unfettered lust and ambition—in an act reminiscent of Donna Olimpia's treatment of Olimpiucchia, she arranges the rape of Chlotilda to further her lover's rise to power and her own—but the fact that she must accept the role of avenger within the play's world. Just as Chlotilda must punish her own rape, Fredigond must punish her brother's murder alone: "Their Parents waded in my Brothers blood," she says of Chlotilda's relatives, "For which I'le be re-

veng'd on all their Race" (5, 6). The position of female avenger is, however, a particularly fraught one. Although prompted by necessity, the pursuit of vengeance requires a woman to abandon her femininity and become in the process a threatening monster. For Fredigond, that monstrosity results in poisonous tendencies and the abandonment of the domestic roles of wife and mother. Nigrello calls her a "Monster-Woman," the product of an "Adulterate Race" (15), while Lewis tells her,

> Adulterate Woman, shame of Royalty;
> I blush to call thee Mother, yes to think it.
> Whilst I reflect upon thy tainted blood,
> I doubt the pureness of my own. The spring head
> Defiled, who knows but the under stream may be
> Corrupted. (70)

Her actions have also infected the nation. Nigrello speaks of the "bleeding Kingdo[m]" wounded by Fredigond's actions (31), while Lamot imagines the medical cure necessary to restore the body politic to rights: "The Ulcerous State is ripe, and we must launce it" (54). Clotair calls his mother's adulterous desires "the base Canker" that "spreads through Families" (78), a species of toxin that dilutes and corrupts familial blood. Fredigond thus becomes a horrifying sexual abomination. Aphelia, being led into sexual peril by Nigrello, asks, "Into what Labyrinth do you lead me, Sir?" (17), linking Fredigond with the mythological Pasiphaë, whose sexual deviance prompted bestiality and grotesque birth. Clotair meanwhile becomes the Minotaur, the monstrous byproduct of Fredigond's deviance and the physically present danger menacing Aphelia.

Throughout *Love and Revenge*, therefore, Settle subtly reminds his viewer that a king obsessed with pleasure can be easily manipulated by evil and poisonous women. Such themes were not new to Settle's oeuvre; he began employing the trope of the poisonous Catholic bride as early as 1673 in his hit play, *The Empress of Morocco*. In that play, Settle juxtaposes the treachery of the murderous and lustful queen mother, Laula, against the virtue and bravery of her daughter and daughter-in-law, the young queens Morena and Mariamne. In *The Empress of Morocco*, Settle implicitly links the figure of the poisonous old queen with the figure of Henrietta Maria (and by extension, Charles II's Catholic mistresses), indicating that by the time of *The Empress of Morocco*, Settle was already warning against the dangers of unfettered Catholic female power. According to Anne Hermanson:

> In the highly-charged political decade which was rapidly moving toward the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, the devil of the evil woman is used . . . politically. The Empress of Morocco was probably first produced in July 1673. Certainly, Settle had a place in court when he wrote and produced the play, and he was writing from the perspective of an "insider". By this time,

> Charles's new French mistress, Louise de Kerouaille, was in a position of power at court and only a month away from becoming a duchess. James had publicly acknowledged his Catholicism and was slated to marry the Catholic Princess, Mary of Modena. For a Protestant like Settle, the 'feminine' threat—not only from within, the form of Catholic women at court, but also in the 'female' body of the Catholic Church—was already eating away at the stability of the state. Settle's evil Queen Mother reflects on former times when other conniving queen mothers were seen to be threatening stability: in particular, the Queen Mother Catherine de Médicis. Like Catherine de Médicis, Charles II's own mother Henrietta Maria tried desperately to control her son's political affairs. Her Catholic (thus nefarious) influence over her husband Charles I remained in people's minds.[91]

Like the court's controlling wives and mistresses, Laula is a source of disease festering at the heart of the nation. She literally kills with poison and metaphorically destroys the virtuous. "I begin to think your Mothers Heart / Has Poyson in't," Crimalhaz tells Mariamne insultingly, and he refers to Laula's "Poyson'd Breath"; she is the toxin in his veins that will finally destroy him.[92]

Settle's decision to adapt *The Fatal Contract* bespeaks a similar political project. Although the queen mother had been dead for several years by the time of *Love and Revenge*, Settle's decision to adapt Heminge's play revived the discourse of Henrietta Maria, still lingering in people's minds and made continually relevant through attacks on Donna Olimpia and Catherine de Medici. Heminge's play was originally acted by Henrietta Maria's acting troupe, the queen's Men, immediately linking the play with the hated queen. Fredigond, like Henrietta Maria, is described as eclipsing the king, a frequent insult, as we have seen, in the English Civil War tracts. "She is the Greater Light, the King a Star, / That only shines but through her Influence" Lamot says (4)—an image echoed by Lewis, who remarks of his mother's influence on the kingdom, "How is thy worth Ecclips'd" (69). Like Henrietta Maria, Fredigond is also an actress: "How did I act the Mother?" she asks Clarmount, and brags that she wept for her son "as an Actor in a Play would do" (23). And like Henrietta Maria, Fredigond enjoys watching plays and attends the "Masques and Revelling" (4). Most importantly, she is sexually monstrous and corrupts her husband with her deviance. Here Settle has altered the content of the original play. Settle depicts old King Childrick as a chaste and virtuous man, unlike Heminge's Childrick, who maintained a secret grotto where he coupled with his illicit conquests. Heminge's queen resolves to rendezvous with her lover in the place "where *Childrick* kept his Concubine" (3.3.225). Not so, Settle's Childrick, who keeps the same grotto as a spot for prayer and devotion. Settle's Fredigond directs Nigrello to the place where "Childrick oftentimes retired, / When fits of piety (rest his soul) / Took him ith'head" (48). Fredigond's sexual corruption is offset by Childrick's re-

strained piety, and she works to poison his virtue, even as she cuckolds and humiliates him. Lamot finally attributes the army's state of disarray to Fredigond's evil influence:

> In good old *Childricks* raign, before his Queen
> Had taught him Revels, and untaught him War,
> Before her wanton Lust had sheathed his Sword,
> To give her treacherous Poyson, pow'r of death;
> I knew that they had valour, and a cause
> To shew it in. (52)

Fredigond uses her sexuality to mislead the king and draw him from the righteous path. The play thus recalls traditional accusations against Henrietta Maria, Catherine de Medici, and Donna Olimpia, along with the new concerns inspired by Mary of Modena and Charles II's mistresses.

Underlying *Love and Revenge* is therefore a fundamental anxiety about the political threat posed by unchecked female power, an anxiety embodied in the juxtaposition of Fredigond and Aphelia, the monstrous mother and the innocent virgin she menaces. Between these two extremes falls Chlotilda/Nigrello, neither chaste nor whorish, yet who, like Fredigond, becomes monstrous as a result of masculine failure. At least initially, Chlotilda is as much Fredigond's victim as she is Clotair's, since it is Fredigond who arranges for her rape. That Clotair rapes Chlotilda only at his mother's behest further underscores his masculine inadequacies; despite his standing as crown prince, he cannot compel Chlotilda's submission and only "succeeds" with her sexually because of his mother's intervention. Yet Chlotilda does not remain a victim for long. Working against the tradition of the seventeenth-century rape play in which the rape victim's suicide is an anticipated certainty, Chlotilda does not immediately resign herself to death. As Carol A. Morley points out in relation to Heminge's Crotilda, she "imitates neither classical prototypes, such as Lucrece and Virginia, nor contemporary variant inversions, such as Shakespeare's Lavinia or Fletcher's Lucina."[93] Instead, Chlotilda must seek her own justice, a quest motivated by male failure; Chlotilda cannot play Lucrece if there is no Collatine or Brutus to avenge her sufferings. In consequence, Chlotilda becomes monstrous, arranging a rape for Clotair as Fredigond once did. The queen and her victim become equally poisonous doubles of each other, with Chlotilda's blackface disguise externalizing both the "stain" of the rape and the darkness of her now corrupted nature. Early in the play, Aphelia expresses sympathy for Philomel: "Poor Ravisht *Philomel*, thy Lot was ill / To meet that Violence from a Brother" (18). Of course Philomel, the rape victim-avenger, is an infanticidal murderess who suborns cannibalism. Like Philomel, Chlotilda is also associated with images of grotesque eating; planning the rape of Aphelia, she exclaims,

"Oh admirable Villainy! Revenge / Does feed on Ruine" (13). Revenge, here Chlotilda, will feed on ruin, Aphelia, imaginatively cannibalizing her and her sad fate.

Love and Revenge thus juxtaposes the poison of the two female avengers, Fredigond and Chlotilda, against the virtuous purity of Aphelia and creates a happy ending predicated on the restoration of patriarchal authority. Such a happy ending for Settle is made possible by the fact that he sanitizes much of Heminge's more shocking and graphic imagery.[94] In Heminge's play, Crotilda very clearly follows the trajectory of the Jacobean revenger who becomes the thing he hates. As Fredson Bowers argues in his landmark study, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy*, the revenger, "though inherently good," becomes "warped and twisted to abnormality by the intolerable stress of his almost impossible situation."[95] Charles A. and Elaine S. Hallett concur: "By the end of most revenge tragedies, there seems to be no way the revenger could go on living. He has committed atrocities that equal and in some cases even surpass those of his antagonist, and if justice requires the villain's death, it also requires the revenger's."[96] Crotilda first reveals her extraordinarily sadistic streak when she tortures Fredigond and her lover, Landrey (Heminge's version of Settle's Clarmount). First she taunts their starving bodies with the sight of food and then, in a punishment recalling Vindice's treatment of *The Revenger's Tragedy*'s Duke, poisons Fredigond, gags her, and forces her to watch the culmination of the revenge plot: "I will be bold to gag your Ladyship; / I'l leave a peeping hole through which you shall / See sights, shall kill thee faster than thy poison" (5.2.138–40), Crotilda promises, echoing Vindice's "If he but wink . . . Let our two other hands tear up his lids / And make his eyes, like comets, shine through blood."[97] Crotilda also enacts her sadistic desires on Aphelia. She plays the Iago to Clotair's Othello, and, in the play's most shocking and ethically dubious moment, mutilates Aphelia's innocent body. According to Heminge's stage directions, "they bind [Aphelia] to the Chair, the Eunuch much sears her breast" (5.2.262).

All of these acts of violence are excised from Settle's text. While Settle's Nigrello does order the death of the queen, she does not herself perform the task, nor does she revel in violence to the extent of her Heminge counterpart. This is not to suggest that Settle's Nigrello/Chlotilda is entirely free from the taint of sadism. Settle's Chlotilda is offered numerous opportunities to exact her revenge, but like Hamlet, who declines to kill Claudius at his prayers—"And am I then revenged / To take him in the purging of his soul, / When he is fit and seasoned for his passage?" Hamlet demands (3.3.84–86)—Chlotilda wants to ensure not just death, but eternal damnation for the queen. Knowing that Fredigond is planning to order several murders, Chlotilda declines to save Fredigond's future victims. Rather, she explains, these new crimes "will

add / More weight to her Damnation, and more edge / To my Revenge" (10). She reiterates this sentiment when she arranges for Fredigond's assignation with Clarmount:

> Should I prevent her Lust this second time,
> Before the third she may repent, and so
> May save her Soul which my Revenge would damn:
> Yet I'le prevent her, and contrive it so
> She shant repent, nor shall Hell lose a Subject. (49)

Still, at the end of the play, Chlotilda's desire for vengeance fails her as the glory of kingship overwhelms. She cannot punish her rapist without raising her hand against her king: "I cannot strike him," she laments. "Oh relenting heart! / What Awe hangs on the brow of Majesty. / Faint heart! A Man so long, and now turn Woman / In the last action of my Life" (81). The ending obviously reflects the ideologies of the post-Restoration era, where the glory of the king's body politic outweighs the sins of Clotair's body natural. Chlotilda begs her brothers to "Call not these Ruines Treason, but Revenge" (82); that is to say, she insists that she is taking action not against the body politic, but against Clotair's body natural alone, "A satisfaction due to an Injur'd Lady" (82). Still, it is in abandoning her final revenge and renouncing the power of her disguise that Chlotilda becomes virtuous once more: "For all my other Scenes of Cruelty," she announces, "I put on my own Sex agen to dye" (82). She resigns her final vengeance to the keeping of her male relatives, and safe in the knowledge that the men will take up her cause and use her martyred memory to shore up the new regime, she seeks death. Thus Chlotilda is reincorporated into the civic realm, her monstrousness banished and her memory put to a less threatening political use. Equilibrium is attained as poisonous and sexualized women are driven from a remasculinized realm. In this way, the play offers a subtle warning to Charles II and his courtiers, who must school their behavior or risk destruction. When the men spend too much time indulging their libertine proclivities and not enough time policing their women, they enable monstrous females to poison the political sphere. Charles II must, *Love and Revenge* urges, reclaim his position of masculine authority and rescue the nation from feminine poison. The realm can yet be saved, but the monarch first must recognize the peril.

THE DEBAUCHED LIBERTINE AND THE FAILURE OF FEMALE REVENGE: SHADWELL'S *THE LIBERTINE*

At first glance, Elkanah Settle and Thomas Shadwell may seem an odd pairing, given Shadwell's vitriolic remarks about Settle both in *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco* (1674) and in the preface to *The*

Libertine. Shadwell criticizes Settle for being a "rough hobbling rhymer" and roundly insults him as a dramatist: "some may write that in three weeks, which he cannot in three years."[98] Such vitriol stems at least in part from professional competition and Shadwell's apparent suspicion that Settle was poaching on his territory. After all, both *Love and Revenge* and *The Libertine* were written for the Duke's Company, and both are dedicated to William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle.[99] While such a dedication may have been intended to shore up Settle's royalist credentials—Settle praises Newcastle's "Sacred principles of Honour, that . . . were thought fit to be precepts for an Heir to a Crown" (sig. a4r)—Shadwell clearly viewed that dedication as a professional discourtesy and a threat.[100] In many ways, however, Shadwell's *The Libertine* represents a companion piece to Settle's *Love and Revenge*. Like Settle, Shadwell invokes the memory of *Hamlet* and creates in his play another female avenger; unlike Settle, Shadwell proceeds to deconstruct that trope. Rather than becoming a source of social poison as in *Love and Revenge*, Shadwell's female avenger is powerless in the face of male libertine excess. As we shall see, societal disintegration here stems not from masculine impotence and feminine evil, but from debauched libertine excess and Catholicism.

The ghosts of murdered fathers pervade Settle's *Love and Revenge*, as the allusions to Shakespeare's *Hamlet* underscore the play's masculine failures. In Settle's play, however, it is the *idea* of ghosts that matters; unlike in *Hamlet*, no supernatural events actually occur onstage. Not so in Shadwell's *The Libertine*, where in act 2, Don John comes face to face with his father's ghost: "Repent, repent of all thy villainies," the ghost demands (2.3.84); "My clamorous blood to heaven for vengeance cries. / Heaven will pour out his judgements on you all" (2.3.85–86). While Clotair and Lewis abandon their duties to their father's memory, they do at least acknowledge that a responsibility exists. Don John, in contrast, disclaims any allegiance to his father, not because he is obsessed with love, but because he is himself his father's murderer: "Farewell; thou art a foolish ghost," he tells his father. "Repent, quoth he. What could this mean? Our senses are all in a mist sure" (2.3.92–93). Don Lopez concurs, calling the specter a "silly Ghost" and insisting that "I'll no sooner take his word than a whore's" (2.3.100–101). Despite Don John's initial similarities to Hamlet—early in the play, he describes "the fond fantastic thing, called conscience, / Which serves for nothing but to make men cowards" (1.1.4–5), echoing Hamlet's assertion that "conscience does make cowards of us all" (3.1.85)—Don John mocks his father's ghost, symbolizing his rejection of the entire system of patriarchal culture and inheritance.[101]

Because Don John is a murderer, there is no one left to avenge his father's death, reflecting the play's overwhelming lack of effective revengers. Octavio cannot avenge his dishonored love, Maria, since he is instantly killed by

Don John and his men. Nor can her brother offer succour, as he, too, is instantly defeated. "'Sdeath! A man in my sister's chamber! Have at you, villain" (1.2.11–12), the unnamed brother exclaims as Don John runs at him. "O villain, thou hast killed my brother, and dishonoured me," Maria cries with no help of rescue (1.2.15). Likewise, both Don Francisco, father to Clara and Flavia, and their respective unnamed fiancés fail to avenge their women and their own dishonor. Don Francisco attacks his daughters rather than the truly guilty Don John—"I will revenge my self on these" (4.1.187), he says—and then is almost instantly killed, while "the two Bridegrooms are hurt" in the scuffle (4.1.191). Even Don Pedro, Duke and father to the nation, goes to his grave unpunished. "I run him through the lungs as handsomely, and killed him as decently, and as like a gentleman as could be," Don John brags (1.1.108–10); "The jealous coxcomb deserved death; he kept his sister from me. Her eyes would have killed me if I had not enjoyed her, which I could not do without killing him" (1.1.110–12). Like Don John's father, the father to the nation finds no living champion, and his epitaph memorializes the fact that his death went unavenged: "Here lies Don Pedro, governor of Seville, barbarously murdered by that impious villain, Don John, 'gainst whom his innocent blood cries still for vengeance" (4.3.5–7). Don John disrupts both the system by which men protect their female relatives and the integrity of the nation-state; the system of masculine honor in the play is fatally broken by his libertine excess.

The inability of men to seek and achieve effective revenge stems at least in part from the failure of societal controls to police male behavior adequately. If Settle's play advocates that men regulate female desires and behavior, for Shadwell it is the men who must be restrained. To that end, Shadwell offers two competing definitions of "nature," one Hobbesian in construction and the other proto-Lockean.[102] The proto-Lockean view is best epitomized by the shepherds whose masque Don John interrupts and destroys. Living in Edenic bliss, the shepherds occupy a state of nature associated with pastoral innocence, a world that can be destroyed only by fallen "art."

> Second Nymph: In humble cottages we have such contents
> As uncorrupted nature does afford,
> Which the great, that surfeit under gilded roofs,
> And wanton in down beds, can never know.
> First Shepherd: Nature is here not yet debauched by art;
> 'Tis as it was in Saturn's happy days.
> Minds are not here by luxury invaded. (4.2.13–19)

Nature in this construction must be protected from corruption by the societal forces of organized religion and a repressive state, a position echoed by Maria in her lament against Don John. According to Maria, "More savage cruelty reigns in cities than ever yet in desarts among the most venomous serpents and remorseless ravenous beasts could once be found. So much has

barbarous art debauched man's innocent nature" (2.2.36–40). Unfortunately, Maria's innocence, like that of the shepherds, cannot withstand the force of Don John's cruel and violent art. In Michael Alssid's words, "John literally silences forever the singer of traditional, romantic illusion."[103]

Contrasting with this viewpoint is the Hobbesian view advocated by Don John, in which human nature is driven by "the darkest extreme of libertinism," in essence, unrestricted id.[104] "Nature" in this construction must be restrained by the necessary mechanisms of church and state, here named "sense" and "rationality" and decried by Don John. The libertines complain,

> Don John: My business is pleasure: that end I will always compass, without scrupling the means. There is no right or wrong, but what conduces to, or hinders pleasure . . .
> Don Antonio: We live the life of sense, which no fantastic thing, called Reason, shall control.
> Don Lopez: My reason tells me I must please my sense.
> Don John: My appetites are all I'm sure I have from heaven, since they are natural; and them I always will obey. (1.1.124–26, 128–32)

Reason wars with the brutish concupiscence and violence of nature in its untouched form, revealing, as many critics have noted, the extremity and emptiness of the libertine ethos. In Aaron Jaffe's words, the play "unflinchingly excoriates both the social implications of libertine doctrines and practices and their misappropriation of Hobbesian ideas and language."[105] If the state protects the shepherds from violence, to Don John it offers nothing but unwelcome, unnatural, and unfair restraint.

In the end, it is Don John's view of nature that wins out; the shepherds' paradise is destroyed as the state fails in its duty to control and restrain the dark desires of the libertine id. Don Francisco privileges his duty to his guests over his duty as a magistrate, with fatal consequences for all concerned: "My house has been your sanctuary, and I am obliged in honour not to act as a magistrate, but your host. No violence shall here be offered to you" (4.1.157–59), he promises just before Don John destroys his household. The governor, too, is at fault, as he falls prey to his son's violent impulsivity. When Don Pedro's murder goes unavenged, it represents the unfortunate result of a society whose rulers have failed to govern and contain effectively and whose most virile members embrace the proto-Sadeian and orgiastic violence of nature rather than the social controls and safety of patriarchal governance. As Cynthia Lowenthal writes, the libertines descend into a world "composed of nothing but this kind of repetition, a numbing sameness of activity that never satisfies," and necessitates ever larger acts of violence.[106]

That the men fail in their duties as avengers necessitates, for Shadwell as for Settle, that women seek their own retribution. Shadwell's Maria parallels Settle's Chlotilda/Nigrello; both women are victims of rape, and both women

have seen their loved ones brutally murdered in their quest for justice. Subsequently Maria, like Chlotilda, dresses as a man (albeit not one in blackface) in order to pursue justice: “I am ashamed of these soft tears, till I’ve revenged thy horrid murder” (2.2.21–22), she promises her dead lover, and tells Flora, “Inspired by my just rage this arm shall teach you wonders. I’ll show you now what love with just revenge can do” (2.3.2–3). As in *Love and Revenge*, the existence of the female avenger reflects the failure of patriarchal structures. Maria must avenge Octavio, as there is no one left to avenge either her lover or her suffering. She laments, “the honour of mankind is gone with thee,” and plans that “When I have revenged my dear Octavio’s loss, I then shall die contented” (3.2.531, 533–34). For Settle, as we have seen, such a move is profoundly disconcerting, as it transforms the raped woman from innocent victim to poisonous monster. At first glance, Shadwell would seem to offer a similar view of the female avenger; after all, Maria uses vampiric imagery to describe her revenge, saying, “I will revel in his blood. O I could suck the last drop that warms the monster’s heart” (2.2.23–24). Ultimately, however, Shadwell’s play undermines dramatic expectations entirely. While Maria’s story initially seems integral to the overarching plot, she is not strong enough to make a lasting impact on Don John. While the audience might expect her, perhaps along with Leonora, Don John’s cast mistress, to engage in a final act showdown with the libertines, both women are unceremoniously killed just two acts later and long before the play’s final denouement.[107] Maria announces dramatically, “This is the villain who killed the lover of Antonio’s Sister, deflowred her, and murdered her Brother in his own house” (4.1.109–10). Receiving no support from Don Francisco, she cries out: Octavio’s “ghost, and all the rest whom he has barbarously murdered, will interrupt your quiet. They’ll haunt you in your sleep. Revenge, revenge!” (4.1.143–45). Unfortunately, her pleas go for naught, as she dies attempting to save Don Francisco and his daughters. Rather than portraying Maria as a source of toxin, it is Don John who becomes poisonous; he literally compels Leonora to drink from a poisoned cup, precipitating her death. “Y’have drunk the subtlest poison that Art e’r yet invented” (3.2.609–10), Don John tells Leonora. She responds, “Thou hast murdered the only creature living that could love thee” (3.2.614).

What *The Libertine* therefore traces is the failure of the Philomel narrative to achieve a lasting or significant revenge. Maria is not Fredigond or Chlotilda, and she does not represent a significant threat to the play’s world. At the same time, the play dismisses out of hand the efficacy of the Lucrece narrative. For Settle, order can be restored only when Nigrello/Chlotilda commits suicide, that is to say, when dangerous Philomel can be reconfigured into unthreatening Lucrece. Shadwell, in contrast, never makes such a move. When Shadwell’s women attempt to play the part of Lucrece, their efforts are either dismissed or ignored. In act 2, Don John complains that

contemporary women are no longer interested in preserving their purity through suicide. "There's ne'er a Lucrece nowadays; the sex has learnt more wit since" (2.1.323–24), he says, echoing Cavalier poet Thomas Carew's vision in his poem "A Rapture" (published 1640). Carew imagines a perfect world, wherein

> The Roman Lucrece . . . reads the divine
> Lectures of love's great master, Aretine,
> And knows as well as Laïs how to move
> Her pliant body in the act of love.
> To quench the burning ravisher, she hurls
> Her limbs into a thousand winding curls,
> And studies artful postures.[108]

In a perfect state of nature, Carew suggests, a world without a restrictive concept of honor, even the chaste Lucrece would indulge sexually without shame. Don John likewise assumes that in his ideal state of nature, women would have no interest in restricting sexual expression or in refusing any man who wishes to sample their charms. He rejects the concepts of virtue and honor, insisting, "There's nothing good or ill, but as it seems to each man's natural appetite" (2.1.336–37). Of course, Don John's claims are undermined just six lines later, when a nameless woman stabs herself rather than submit to his assault: "No, monster; I'll prevent you" (2.1.343), she says as she dies. Unfortunately, her self-sacrifice is in vain; it has no effect on the libertines' behavior, nor does it motivate the crowd to action on her behalf. The nameless woman dies in an ethical vacuum where she, like Don John's numerous other victims, will finally go unavenged.

Lucrece fails. Philomel fails. And Don John's proto-Sadeian world finally descends into nihilism, where the only end point to his behavior is self-annihilation. He becomes the victim of his own excess, while the play denies its audience the comforting proof of effective social justice. In the end, moreover, his libertinism is linked with the dangers of Catholicism. In the final moments of Don John's life, the ghosts of his victims offer the libertines "four glasses full of blood" (5.2.47). The message is clear: the act of vampirism represents the culmination of all other bad acts, the true moment of no return. The Catholic Eucharist becomes the demonic black hole at the center of the play, an act so monstrous that even Don John recoils from it: "'Sdeath, do you mean to affront us," Don John demands as the libertines "throw the glasses down" (5.2.64, 63).[109] Unchecked hedonism leads directly to Catholicism and finally eternal damnation. Thus Shadwell's *The Libertine*, like Settle's *Love and Revenge* and Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter*, offers a warning to the court to reform its excessive—and dangerously Catholic—ways before it is too late, before society is damaged beyond recognition and the courtiers can expect nothing but hellfire and destruction to result.

CONCLUSION: BEHN'S *THE ROVER, PART I* AND POLITICAL AMBIVALENCE ON THE EVE OF THE POPISH PLOT

The plays examined in this chapter all use images of rape to express their political opinions, and they become increasingly critical of the monarchy as the decade progresses. It is, however, Aphra Behn's *The Rover, Part I* (1677) that best encapsulates the political ambivalence of the period, at once idealizing and criticizing the court circle. One of the last plays to stage a rape attempt before the outbreak of the Popish Plot, *The Rover* has also received the most critical attention. While Behn was undoubtedly a Tory playwright, critics have split over her play's political message and the extent of her support for the royalist cause. Maureen Duffy, for instance, calls the play "her most outright and positive celebration of those cavalier childhood heroes," "good propaganda" for "rallying the faithful when the first romance of the king's return had worn thin and the country was again divided into factions."[110] Adam Beach likewise calls the play "Behn's most daring expression of Royalism"; the play "acknowledges concerns about the raging sexuality of the Stuart court," even as it encourages the viewer to treat libertine exploits with a "spirit of both carnival and forgiveness."[111] In Beach's reading, Hellena serves as the model "for the perfect Stuart subject, a person who is desperately attracted by the very outrageousness of Cavalier sexuality."[112] Ann Marie Stewart concurs: "Behn embraced not only Charles's politics, but also the romping sexual fun at the palace. . . . [H]er depiction of sexual licentiousness on the stage reflects her politics, particularly in a character like Willmore. Libertinism as a cultural movement was a sexual liberation for women and men."[113] Other critics, however, have read the play's scenes of sexual violence as a sustained criticism of the libertine ethos, a philosophy that fundamentally endangers the women it claims to liberate. Susan J. Owen calls the play "as profound a questioning of libertinism as is to be found in any other Restoration comedy,"[114] while for Dagny Boebel, Willmore and Blunt are ultimately indistinguishable in their acts of gendered violence: "Willmore and Blunt think and act in nearly identical ways. Behn's text . . . performs a carnivalesque displacement by exposing both Whigs and Tories, Puritans and Cavaliers, as upholders of a violent, hierarchical gender ideology."[115]

I am not interested in re-covering such well-trod ground here. Instead, I want to suggest that *The Rover*'s ambivalence toward Willmore, its simultaneous attraction to and repulsion from his behavior, combines both aspects of the political discourse examined in this chapter. Throughout the play, the Cavaliers are simultaneously lionized and demonized. Here is not, as in the case of Orrery and Howard, a full-scale defense of royalism, but rather a more measured response to the figure of the libertine courtier. On the one

hand, Belville and Willmore are extremely attractive characters, dashing, brave, and loyal to their true king. Both have sacrificed position, estate, and homeland to follow Charles II to the continent. Belville in particular is reminiscent of Orrery's Lucidor, insofar as he is honorable in battle and chivalrous in his protection of Florinda, for which he won her love. Florinda explains, "I knew him at the siege of *Pamplona*, he was then a Colonel of *French* horse, who when the Town was Ransack't, Nobly treated my Brother and my self, preserving us from all Insolences; and I must own, (besides great Obligations) I have I know not what, that pleads kindly for him about my Heart, and will suffer no other to enter."[116] In these lines, Belville seemingly embodies the Lovelacian conception of Cavalier honor so prominent in Orrery's *The Generall*. By the same token, Blunt, the character who has most clearly rejected the political ethos of royalism, is hypocritical, rapacious, and sexually violent, perhaps a throwback to the anti-Roundhead plays of the early 1660s. Belville describes Blunt's character in harshly negative terms: He is "of an *English* Elder Brother's humour, Educated in a Nursery, with a Maid to tend him till Fifteen, and lyes with his Grandmother till he's of Age: one that knowes no pleasure beyond riding to the next Fair, or going up to *London* with his right Worshipful Father in Parliament-time" (1.2.268–73, 275–76). Blunt himself celebrates his lack of political honor, praising his own foresight in refusing to join with the Cavaliers and lose his estate: "Gentleman, You may be free, you have been kept so poor with Parliaments and Protectors, that the little Stock you have is not worth preserving—but I thank my Stars, I had more Grace than to forfeit my Estate by Cavaliering" (1.2.44–47). When he attacks Florinda, therefore, Blunt functions as another manifestation of the debauched Roundhead so common a decade earlier.

Behn, unlike Orrery, however, does not cleanly divide the honorable and romanticized characteristics of the Lovelacian Cavalier from the dishonorable characteristics of the Suckling libertine. Belville is the play's romantic hero, but he is perfectly happy to commit acts of senseless and gendered aggression, commenting offhandedly about his willingness to smash the windows of Angellica Bianca's house: "Are we to break her Windows?" he asks Willmore (3.1.85–86). Meanwhile, Willmore, the titular Rover, is both loyal to his king and disloyal to his female conquests.[117] He is attractive and witty but also sexually violent and lacking in morals. As Jonas DeRitter points out, his treatment of Florinda is actually identical to Blunt's: both assume that because she is not noble (or apparently a virgin), she must be available for sex, no matter her consent or lack thereof. He asks Florinda, "why at this time of Night was your Cobweb Door set open dear Spider—but to catch Flyes?" (3.5.160–61). Later, Blunt tells Florinda, "I will kiss and beat thee all over; kiss, and see thee all over; thou shalt lye with me too" (4.5.612–13), and is then joined by Frederick in an attempted gang rape. DeRitter calls the similarity "perhaps the most powerful criticism of Behn's title character."[118]

While Willmore's behavior never rises to the level of Don John's atrocity, Shadwell's play might have resonated in the minds of *The Rover's* audience; both plays feature a pair of sisters desperate to escape the patriarchal prison surrounding them (in Shadwell's case, Clara and Flavia seek sexual adventure apart from marriage, while Hellena seeks sexual adventure apart from the nunnery).[119] Clara's picture attracts Don John as Angellica Bianca's attracts Willmore. "Have you seen my picture?" Clara asks Don John (3.2.406). He responds, "And lov'd it above all things I ever saw, but the original" (3.2.407).[120] Similarly, when Willmore steals Angellica's portrait, he tells her, "I saw your Charming Picture and was wounded; quite through my Soul each pointed Beauty ran" (2.1.225–26).

Ultimately, Willmore is a more attractive version of Don John, one whose self-serving pursuit of more and greater pleasure is tamed and reabsorbed into the matrimonial economy. In Willmore, Behn offers her audiences a modified form of the debauched libertine; even as she romanticizes Cavalier behavior, she exposes the dark and frightening underside of the libertine ethos, refusing the comfortable division of good Cavaliering from bad "Cavilling" common ten years prior. What *The Rover* offers, then, is a qualified form of the warning underlying *Love and Revenge* and *The Libertine*. The court stands on the brink of a precipice: it must either reform, reincorporating itself back into the hierarchy of normative values, or risk oncoming destruction. As we shall see in the next chapter, however, the ambivalence and unease of the 1670s soon exploded into the intense fear and anger of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. Just a few months after the first performance of *The Rover, Part I*, depictions of sexually violent atrocity returned with a vengeance in both the propaganda and the drama, and this time without the comfort of a happy ending.

NOTES

1. Andrew Marvell, *The Last Instructions to a Painter*, in *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 2:147–72, ll. 743–50. Further references to *The Last Instructions to a Painter* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by line number.

2. Warren L. Chernaik, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 203.

3. Annabel M. Patterson points out that the "funds already granted" for naval upkeep "had not . . . been spent on the war, but on maintaining the court's luxury and debauchery": *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 159. For further historical background, see also Michael Seidel, *Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 140.

4. Steven N. Zwicker, "Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration," in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 245.

5. Zwicker, by contrast, does not read this figure as a rape victim, commenting instead on her "coldness": "Virgins and Whores: The Politics of Sexual Misconduct in the 1660s," in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins (Brookfield, VT: Scolar Press, 1990), 104. See also James Turner, who describes the "palpable frigidity of this Britannia-figure": "The Libertine Abject: The 'Postures' of *Last Instructions to a Painter*," in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (New York: St. Martin's, 1999), 242.

6. Margarita Stocker, *Apocalyptic Marvell: The Second Coming in Seventeenth Century Poetry* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1986), 172.

7. Barbara Riebling calls this encounter "a *de causibus* warning: change your ways or risk being killed by your people": "England Deflowered and Unmanned: The Sexual Image of Politics in Marvell's 'Last Instructions,'" *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 35 (1995): 152. For a similar reading, see A. D. Cousins, "The Idea of a 'Restoration' and the Verse Satires of Butler and Marvell," *Southern Review* 14, no. 2 (1981): 131–42.

8. John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, "A Satyr on Charles II," in *Restoration Literature: An Anthology*, ed. Paul Hammond (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 38–39, ll.11–12.

9. Riebling, "England Deflowered," 142.

10. Zwicker, "Virgins," 97.

11. Riebling, "England Deflowered," 140.

12. Here I agree with Harold Weber that sexual desire represents a "potentially subversive force" that "generates the collapse of conventional hierarchies": *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), 93–94.

13. See, for instance, William Fenner, *Four Select Sermons Upon Several Texts of Scripture* (London, 1668), and William Penn, *A Seasonable Caveat Against Popery* (London, 1670).

14. *A Relation Of The Most Material Matters handled In Parliament Relating To Religion, Property, And The Liberty Of The Subject* (Netherlands, 1673), 9. This pamphlet describes at length the parliamentary proceedings leading up to Charles II's abandonment of the Declaration of Indulgence in exchange for financial support for the war.

15. Steven C. A. Pincus, "From Butterboxes to Wooden Shoes: The Shift in English Popular Sentiment from Anti-Dutch to Anti-French in the 1670s," *Historical Journal* 38, no. 2 (1995): 335. For further analysis of the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars, see also Alvin D. Coox, "The Dutch Invasion of England: 1667," *Military Affairs* 13, no. 4 (1949): 223–33; Susan Iwanisziw, "Tortured Bodies, Factionalism, and Unsettled Loyalties in Settle's Morocco Plays," in *Staging Pain, 1580–1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater*, ed. James Robert Allard and Matthew R. Martin (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 111–36; Paul Seaward, "The House of Commons Committee of Trade and the Origins of the Second Anglo-Dutch War, 1664," *Historical Journal* 30, no. 2 (1987): 437–52; and Steven C. A. Pincus, "Popery, Trade and Universal Monarchy: The Ideological Context of the Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Dutch War," *English Historical Review* 107, no. 422 (1992): 1–29.

16. Pincus, "Butterboxes," 351.

17. "A Litany," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:190, ll. 1, 3.

18. John Dryden, *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Vinton A. Dearing, 20 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 12:1–79, prologue 5–8. Further references to *Amboyna* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

19. For the earliest examples of Amboyna massacre tracts, see *Newes out of East India: Of the cruell and bloody usage of our English Merchants and others at Amboyna* (London, 1624); John Skinner, *A True Relation Of The Unjust, Cruell, And Barbarous Proceedings against the English at Amboyna In the East-Indies* (Saint-Omer, 1624); and Robert Wilkinson, *The Stripping of Ioseph, Or The crueltie of Bretheren to a Brother* (London, 1625).

20. *A True Relation of the Unjust, Cruel, and Barbarous Proceedings against the English at Amboyna In the East-Indies* (London, 1651), *4v.

21. Ibid., *5v–*6r.

22. For discussion of the English Commonwealth's relationship with the Dutch government, see Simon Groenveld, "The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640–1652," *Historical Journal* 30, no. 3 (1987): 541–66. For discussion of the circumstances surrounding the First Dutch War, see Jonathan Israel, "Competing Cousins: Anglo-Dutch Trade Rivalry," *History Today* 38 (1988): 17–22, and J. E. Farnell, "The Navigation Act of 1651, the First Dutch War, and the London Merchant Community," *Economic History Review* 16, no. 3 (1964): 439–54. For discussion of military tactics during the Dutch Wars, see M. A. J. Palmer, "The 'Military Revolution' Afloat: The Era of the Anglo-Dutch Wars and the Transition to Modern Warfare at Sea," *War in History* 4, no. 2 (1997): 123–49.

23. *A Memento for Holland: Or A True and Exact History of the most Villainous and Barbarous Cruelties used on the English Merchants residing At Amboyna in the East-Indies* (London, 1652), 18.

24. Ibid., 19.

25. *A True and Compendious Narration; or (Second Part of Amboyney)* (London, 1665), a2r.

26. Ibid., 4.

27. *The Grand Abuses Stript and Whipt* (London, 1672), 1.

28. Robert Codrington, *His Majesties Propriety, And Dominion on the British Seas Asserted* (London, 1672), 138.

29. Ibid., 142.

30. Robert Markley, *The Far East and the English Imagination, 1600–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 159.

31. Shankar Raman, *Framing "India": The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 203.

32. For discussion of the genesis of the Black Legend, see Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, eds., introduction to *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 2.

33. Philip Wayne Powell, *Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971), 11. As Powell points out, the accuracy of the accounts that shape the Black Legend has been hotly debated. For further historical analysis, see Benjamin Keen, "The Black Legend Revisited: Assumptions and Realities," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 49, no. 4 (1969): 703–19.

34. Bartolomé de las Casas, *The Spanish Colonie, Or Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies, called the newe World* (London, 1583), f1r.

35. Willem Baudartius, *Morghen-wecker der vrye Nederlantsche Provintien*, translated in Amanda Pipkin, "'They were not humans, but devils in human bodies': Depictions of Sexual Violence and Spanish Tyranny as a Means of Fostering Identity in the Dutch Republic," *Journal of Early Modern History* 13 (2009): 243.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. For discussion of William's propaganda techniques, see René Van Stipriaan, "Words at War: The Early Years of William of Orange's Propaganda," *Journal of Early Modern History* 11, no. 4/5 (2007): 331. For historical analysis of the Dutch Revolt, see Peter J. Arnade, *Beggars, Iconoclasts, and Civic Patriots: The Political Culture of the Dutch Revolt* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Graham Darby, ed., *The Origins and Development of the Dutch Revolt* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Geoffrey Parker, "The Origins of the Dutch Revolt," *History Today* 34, no. 7 (1984): 17–21; and Herbert Rowan, "The Dutch Revolt: What Kind of Revolution?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (1990): 570–90.

39. George Gascoigne, *The Spoyle of Antwerp. Faithfully reported, by a true Englishman, who was present at the same* (London, 1576), c1v. For further analysis of Gascoigne's treatise, see Linda Bradley Salamon, "Gascoigne's Globe: *The Spoyle of Antwerp* and the Black Legend of Spain," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no. 1, special issue 18 (2008): 7.1–38.

40. Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage, 1660–1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 158. For discussion of comparable tropes in plays of the New World, see also Markley, *The Far East*, and Heidi Hutner, *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

41. By the time of Dryden's *Amboyna*, the Dutch had already restored William to power following the 1672 lynching deaths of Johan and Cornelis de Witt. Given that the English, too, had overthrown and restored a king, Dryden is condemning the Dutch for crimes the English perpetrated in their own country.

42. *A Gratulatory Poem*, 1.

43. William Lloyd, *Papists No Catholicks: And Popery No Christianity* (London, 1677), 5.

44. *A Letter From The Devil To The Pope And His Prelates* (London, 1670), 2.

45. *News from Rome* (London, 1680), 3. See also William Denton, *The Burnt Child dreads the Fire* (London, 1675); Henry Foulis, *The history Of Romish Treasons and Usurpation: Together With A Particular Account Of many gross Corruptions and Impostures In the Church of Rome* (London, 1671); and G. C., *Popish Plots And Treasons From the beginning of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1676).

46. *Speculum Papismi: Or, A Looking-Glass for Papists Wherein They may see their own sweet Faces* (Cambridge, 1669), i1r. For further references to the Irish massacre, see *Popery Absolutely Destructive to Monarchy* (London, 1673), and *A Short Memorial Of The Most Grievous Sufferings Of The Ministers Of The Protestant Churches In Hungary* (London, 1676), 2.

47. George Fox, *The Arraignment And Condemnation of Popery* (London, 1675), 167. Fox continues in this vein for five pages.

48. Ibid., 192.

49. Ibid., 6.

50. *A Passionate Satyr Upon a Devilish Great He-Whore That lives yonder at Rome* (London, 1675), 2.

51. *The Character of a Papist* (London, 1673), 4.

52. Ibid., 7–8.

53. *A Passionate Satyr*, 2.

54. A true Son, *A Catholick Pill*, 75.

55. John Ayloffe, "Britannia and Raleigh." in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:228–36, ll. 25–30, 33–34. The poem provides a warning of future revolt should Charles's behavior continue unchecked. For further criticisms of Charles's mistresses, see "The King's Vows" in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:159–62; "On the Prorogation," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:179–84; John Lacy, "Satire," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:425–28; and Andrew Marvell, "Upon his Majesty's being made Free of the City" in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:237–42.

56. This is not to suggest that Henrietta Maria's exploits were entirely forgotten. *Popery Absolutely Destructive to Monarchy* reminds the reader that Henrietta Maria flouted English laws by praying for Catholic martyrs in England (*Popery Absolutely Destructive*, 112–13). Several years later, Andrew Marvell would blame Henrietta Maria for Charles II's initial alliance with the French and for the debacle of the Second Anglo-Dutch War: *An Account of the Growth Of Popery And Arbitrary Government in England* (Amsterdam, 1677).

57. For discussion of the royal mistresses' power at court, see James G. Turner, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics, and Literary Culture, 1630–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), and Sonya Wynne, "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics," in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2000), 171–90.

58. “The Royal Buss,” in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:263–5, ll. 65, 66, 23–28.

59. Derek Parker describes this famous anecdote as follows: “Driving through London streets crowded with merrymakers celebrating the anniversary of the accession of Queen Elizabeth I, [Gwyn] was booed under the impression that she was [the Duchess of Portsmouth], leaned out the window of her carriage, and shouted, ‘Be still friends—I am the *Protestant* whore!’” *Nell Gwyn* (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2000), 157.

60. “Nell Gwynne,” in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 1:420, ll. 1–6.

61. Marvell, *Account*, 43–44.

62. For discussion of licensing restrictions and the circulation of clandestine satire, see George deF. Lord, introduction to *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963).

63. Edward Stephens, *Popish Policies and Practices Represented in the Histories of the Parisian Massacre; Gun-powder Treason; Conspiracies Against Queen Elizabeth And Persecutions Of The Protestants in France* (London, 1674), 21.

64. Ibid., 27.

65. Ibid., 49.

66. Ibid., 27.

67. *A Protestant Catechisme for Little Children, or Plain Scripture against Popery* (London, 1673), 14.

68. Gilbert Burnet, *The Mystery of Iniquity Unvailed* (London, 1673), 2.

69. Ibid., 24.

70. *News from Rome*, 5.

71. Eleanor Herman, *Mistress of the Vatican: The True Story of Olimpia Maidalchini: The Secret Female Pope* (New York: William Morrow, 2008), 71.

72. Michael Ott, “Pope Innocent X,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton, 1910), accessed April 20, 2011, http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08020b.htm.

73. Alexander Cooke, *A Present for a Papist: Or The Life and Death Of Pope Joan* (London, 1675), a3v. For other mentions of Donna Olimpia, see *The Burning of the Whore of Babylon, As it was Acted, with great Applause* (London, 1673), 3.

74. Gregorio Leti, *The Life Of Donna Olimpia Maldachini, Who Governed the Church during the Time of Innocent the X* (London, 1666), 8.

75. Ibid., 25.

76. Ibid., 9.

77. Ibid., 69.

78. Ibid., 70.

79. Herman, *Mistress of the Vatican*, 325.

80. Ibid., 332.

81. Leti, *The Life Of Donna Olimpia Maldachini*, 13.

82. Ibid., 39–40.

83. Ibid., 45–46.

84. Herman, *Mistress of the Vatican*, 309.

85. Leti, *The Life Of Donna Olimpia Maldachini*, 43.

86. Heminge’s frequent allusions to earlier plays have since earned him the reputation of a plagiarist. For criticisms of his work, see Joseph Quincy Adams Jr., “William Heminge and Shakespeare,” *Modern Philology* 12, no. 1 (1914): 51–64; Fredson Thayer Bowers, “The Stabbing of a Portrait in Elizabethan Tragedy,” *Modern Language Notes* 47, no. 6 (1932): 378–85; and Anne Hargrove, introduction to *The Fatal Contract*, by William Heminge (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1978).

87. Elkanah Settle, *Love and Revenge: A Tragedy* (London, 1675), 5. Further references to *Love and Revenge* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

88. William Heminge, *The Fatal Contract*, in *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge*, ed. Carol A. Morley (Madison: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006), 303–89, 3.1.38–41. Further references to *The Fatal Contract* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number. Settle changes the name of Clotair's brother from Clovis to Lewis.

89. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 1997), 1659–2090, 1.5.102–4. Further references to *Hamlet* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

90. In Anne Hermanson's words, "a sexually aggressive woman is an evil aberration of normal womankind and becomes infinitely more dangerous the more privileged her position": Anne Hermanson, "Monstrous Women in Aphra Behn's *Abdelazer* and Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*," in *Aphra Behn (1640–1689): Le Modèle Européen*, ed. Mary Ann O'Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq (Entrevaux, France: Bilingua GA Editions, 2005), 31. Hermanson is writing of Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*, but her words are equally applicable to *Love and Revenge*.

91. Ibid., 30–31.

92. Elkanah Settle, *The Empress of Morocco. A Tragedy* (London, 1687), 47.

93. Carol A. Morley, introduction to *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge*, by William Heminge (Madison: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006), 291.

94. Settle frequently excises Heminge's risqué jokes and acts of overt violence, changes that Morley attributes to his need to conform to the morality of the Restoration era (Ibid., 247).

95. Fredson Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940), 278.

96. Charles A. and Elaine S. Hallet, *The Revenger's Madness: A Study of Revenge Tragedy Motifs* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 11. Many critics have written on the treatment of revenge in Jacobean tragedy and on the revenger's tendency to become the thing he hates. See, for instance, Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama* (London: Methuen, 1985), and Anne Pippin Burnett, *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). For discussion of historical understandings of revenge and vengeance, see Ronald Broude, "Revenge and Revenge Tragedy in Renaissance England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (1975): 38–58, and Lily B. Campbell, "Theories of Revenge in Renaissance England," *Modern Philology* 28, no. 3 (1931): 281–96. For the relationship between revenge, politics, and theatricality, see Annalisa Castaldo, "'These were spectacles to please my soul': Inventive Violence in the Renaissance Revenge Tragedy," in *Staging Pain, 1580–1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater*, ed. James Robert Allard and Matthew R. Martin (Burlington: Ashgate, 2009), 49–56, and Darryl Grantley, "Masques and Murderers: Dramatic Method and Ideology in Revenge Tragedy and the Court Masque," in *Jacobean Poetry and Prose: Rhetoric, Representation and the Popular Imagination*, ed. Clive Bloom (New York: St. Martin's, 1988), 194–212. For revenge tragedy as a response to Reformation changes in religious and funereal customs, see Thomas P. Anderson, *Performing Early Modern Trauma from Shakespeare to Milton* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006); Huston Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Thomas Rist, "Religion, Politics, Revenge: The Dead in Renaissance Drama," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 9, no. 1 (2003): 1–20; and Thomas Rist, *Revenge Tragedy and the Drama of Commemoration in Reforming England* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008). For revenge tragedy as a response to Elizabethan and Jacobean politics, see Eileen Allman, *Jacobean Revenge Tragedy and the Politics of Virtue* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), and Stephen Mullaney, "Mourning and Misogyny: *Hamlet*, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, and the Final Progress of Elizabeth I," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (1994): 139–62.

97. Thomas Middleton, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, in *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, ed. David Bevington et al. (New York: Norton, 2002), 1297–1370, 3.5.203–5.

98. Thomas Shadwell, *The Libertine*, in *Four Restoration Libertine Plays*, ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1–85, preface, ll. 30, 34–35. Further references to *The Libertine* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

99. F. C. Brown attributes Shadwell's attack to professional jealousy over the success of Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*: *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), 12–13. Given that Settle was "one of the most commercially successful dramatists of the 1670s," professional jealousy is certainly not implausible: Don-John Dugas, "Elkanah Settle, John Crowne and Nahum Tate," in *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, ed. Susan J. Owen (Malden: Blackwell, 2001), 378. For a discussion of Dryden's role in creating the *Notes and Observations*, see also Roswell G. Ham, "Dryden versus Settle," *Modern Philology* 25, no. 4 (1928): 409–16, and Anne Doyle, "Dryden's Authorship of *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco* (1674)," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 6, no. 3 (1966): 421–45. For discussion of Settle's response to such attacks, see Maximillian E. Novak, introduction to *The Empress of Morocco and Its Critics*, by Elkanah Settle (Berkeley: Augustan Reprint Society, 1968).

100. For discussion of the relationship between Shadwell and his patrons, see Harold Love, "Shadwell, Flecknoe and the Duke of Newcastle: An Impetus for *MacFlecknoe*," *Papers on Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1985): 19–27, and Harold Love, "Shadwell, Rochester, and the Crisis of Amateurism," *Restoration* 20, no. 2 (1996): 119–34.

101. Don John's pleasures are forbidden by all aspects of the patriarchal authority system. In Oscar Mandel's words, "Don Juan the sensualist does find himself opposed, not only by injured fathers, husbands, and fiancés, but by the Law and God": *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630–1963* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), 18. As such, he works to destroy the system that would restrict him.

102. For further discussion of the Hobbesian elements of Shadwell's *The Libertine*, see Helen Pellegrin, introduction to *Thomas Shadwell's The Libertine: A Critical Edition* (New York and London: Garland, 1987); Raman Selden, "Rochester and Shadwell," in *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*, ed. Jeremy Treglown (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982); Thomas B. Stroub, "Shadwell's Use of Hobbes," *Studies in Philology* 35, no. 3 (1938): 405–32; Dale Underwood, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957); and Christopher J. Wheatley, *Without God or Reason: The Plays of Thomas Shadwell and Secular Ethics in the Restoration* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1993).

103. Michael Alssid, *Thomas Shadwell* (New York: Twayne, 1967), 126. See also H. Gaston Hall, who suggests that in destroying the shepherds' paradise, Don John undermines conceptions of both the pastoral ideal and chivalric masculinity: "Dom Juan: Personnage Europeen Du XVIIe Siecle," in *Horizons européens de la literature française au XVIIe siècle*, ed. Wolfgang Leiner (Tübingen: Narr, 1988), 139–47.

104. Alssid, *Thomas Shadwell*, 108.

105. Aaron Jaffe, "Seditious Appetites and Creeds: Shadwell's Libertines and Hobbes's Foole," *Restoration* 24, no. 2 (2002): 56. For a similar reading, see Robert D. Hume, who suggests that Don John's bad acts depict libertine philosophy in its most outrageous and exaggerated form: *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama, 1660–1800* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983), 174. In such a world, "Chaos, the ultimate seventeenth-century horror, would reign": Arthur Gerwirtz, *Restoration Adaptations of Early 17th Century Comedies* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982), 88.

106. Cynthia Lowenthal, *Performing Identities on the Restoration Stage* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003), 160.

107. The extreme and senseless violence of *The Libertine* has led multiple critics to treat the play as a comedy rather than a serious tragedy. See, for instance, Laura Brown, *English Dramatic Form, 1660–1760: An Essay in Generic History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); and Don R. Kunz, *The Drama of Thomas Shadwell* (Salzburg: Institut Für Englische Sprache Und Literatur, 1972). Ian Spink calls the play a "burlesque": "Purcell's Music for 'The Libertine,'" *Music and Letters* 81, no. 4 (2000): 522. Meanwhile, Rose Zimbardo comments on the bleakness of "the total vision of the play": *A Mirror to Nature: Transformations in Drama and Aesthetics, 1660–1732* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 125.

108. Thomas Carew, "A Rapture," in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 8th ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al., 2 vols. (New York: Norton, 2006), 1:1672–75, ll. 115–18.

109. Writing of Jacobean revenge tragedies, Huston Diehl explains, "By confronting their readers with the violent, grotesque, and absurd implications of transubstantiation, [authors] aggressively seek to denaturalize Roman Catholic beliefs in the nature and efficacy of the Mass" (Diehl, *Staging Reform*, 114). Shadwell, too, renders such beliefs ridiculous and, with Don John's demise, moves beyond ludicrousness to monstrosity.

110. Maureen Duffy, *The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn, 1640–89* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1977), 153.

111. Adam R. Beach, "Carnival Politics, Generous Satire, and Nationalist Spectacle in Behn's *The Rover*," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28, no. 3 (2004): 2, 3.

112. Ibid., 7.

113. Ann Marie Stewart, "Rape, Patriarchy, and the Libertine Ethos: The Function of Sexual Violence in Aphra Behn's 'The Golden Age' and *The Rover, Part I*," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 12, no. 2 (1997): 26–27. For similarly positive readings of Behn's politics, see Nancy Copeland, *Staging Gender in Behn and Centlivre* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004); Janet Todd, *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660–1800* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); and Melinda Zook, "Contextualizing Aphra Behn: Plays, Politics, and Party, 1679–1689," in *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, ed. Hilda Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 73–93.

114. Susan J. Owen, "'Suspect my loyalty when I lose my virtue': Sexual Politics and Party in Aphra Behn's Plays of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678–83," in *Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd (New York: St. Martin's, 1999), 62. Owen also discusses Behn's ambivalence to Willmore and libertinism in two later works: "Drink, Sex and Power in Restoration Comedy," in *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Adam Smyth (Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2004), 127–39, and *Perspectives on Restoration Drama* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). For other critical views of Willmore, see Turner, *Libertines and Radicals*, and Anita Pacheco, "Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn's 'The Rover,'" *ELH* 65, no. 2 (1998): 323–45.

115. Dagny Boebel, "In the Carnival World of Adam's Garden: Roving and Rape in Behn's *Rover*," in *Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama*, ed. Katherine Quinsey (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), 59.

116. Aphra Behn, *The Rover, Part I*, in *The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd, 7 vols. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 5:445–521, 1.1.45–49. Further references to *The Rover, Part I* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number. The threat of rape underlies this passage. Although Florinda's town was ransacked, Belville kept her person safe, likely protecting her from the sorts of sexual violence that accompany political defeat in plays like *The Generall*. That Florinda says she will "suffer no other to enter" also has sexual resonance; she will not let men other than Belville invade her body as they did her town.

117. As Jacqueline Pearson points out, to behave as a libertine is a political act, demonstrating allegiance to the court faction. See Jacqueline Pearson, *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women & Women Dramatists, 1642–1737* (New York: St. Martin's, 1988), 152.

118. Jonas DeRitter, "The Gypsy, *The Rover*, and the Wanderer: Aphra Behn's Revision of Thomas Killigrew," *Restoration* 10, no. 2 (1986): 84, 86.

119. See also Kaufman, who uses Don John to offset Willmore: Anthony Kaufman, "'The Perils of Florinda': Aphra Behn, Rape, and the Subversion of Libertinism in *The Rover*, Part I," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 2 (1996): 13–14.

120. Don John would doubtless have been attracted to Clara and Flavia without the added enticement of either beauty or a painted advertisement, given that they are (a) female and (b) engaged to be married. The use of the painting as advertisement, however, is explored in much greater detail in both *The Rover* and its source play, Thomas Killigrew's *Thomaso*. For discussion of Aphra Behn's revisions of Killigrew's *Thomaso*, see DeRitter, "The Gypsy," and Todd, *The Sign of Angellica*. For discussion of the relationship between portraiture, commodification, and female sexuality, see Ashley Brookner Bender, "Moving Miniatures and Circulating Bodies in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*," *Restoration* 31, no. 1 (2007): 27–46; Nancy Copeland, "'Once

a Whore and Ever'? Whore and Virgin in *The Rover* and Its Antecedents," in *Early Women Writers: 1660–1720*, ed. Anita Pacheco (London: Longman, 1998), 149–59; and Elin Diamond, "*Gestus* and Signature in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*," in *Early Women Writers: 1660–1720*, ed. Anita Pacheco (London: Longman, 1998), 160–82.

Chapter Three

Lucrece Narratives: Rochester, Lee, and the Ethics of Regicide

On December 7, 1683, Algernon Sidney was beheaded for treason. During his arrest for participation in the Rye House Plot, authorities discovered a copy of his unfinished manuscript, *Discourses concerning Government*. An answer to Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha: Or The Natural Power Of Kings* (1680), the *Discourses* argues on behalf of contractual monarchy and insists that the people have the right to overthrow a tyrannical king.[1] Throughout the text, Sidney makes repeated reference to the story of Lucrece, using Tarquin as a classical example of a king who earned his overthrow. Tarquin, Sidney writes, "by his insolence, avarice and cruelty, brought ruin upon himself and his family."[2] Tyrannical monarchs corrupt their people; through "the violence of tyranny all good order was overthrown, good discipline extinguished, and the people corrupted," leaving the Romans no choice but to "recove[r] their liberty by expelling Tarquin."[3] Indeed, in the case of such a ruler, the people have a responsibility to rebel:

> When Hannibal was at the gates, or any other imminent danger threatened them with destruction; if that magistrate had been drunk, mad, or gained by the enemy, no wise man can think that formalities were to have been observed. In such cases every man is a magistrate; and he who best knows the danger, and the means of preventing it, has a right of calling the senate or people to an assembly. The people would, and certainly ought to follow him, as they did Brutus and Valerius against Tarquin.[4]

For Sidney, the rape of Lucrece offers a powerful example of the negative effects of monarchical tyranny, while the tale of Tarquin's overthrow functions as a medium for negotiating conflicting political and social philosophies.

Other writings of the period also use the rape of Lucrece to justify monarchical deposition. The author of *Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's Ghost* (1679), for instance, suggests that a monarch led astray by Catholic priests and mistresses would ultimately earn the same fate as Tarquin. The ghostly speaker accuses the court of being "with luxury o'ergrown," and condemns Charles II for his fondness for the Duchess of Portsmouth: "Each night you lodge in that French siren's arms, / She straight betrays you with her wanton charms . . . / Imperial lust does o'er your scepter sway, / And, though a sov'reign, makes you obey."[5] Recalling the ending of Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter,* the poem suggests that the presence of Catholic mistresses, courtiers, and priests has poisoned the royal court and turned the king into a lecherous and sexually violent tyrant. The author then compares Charles II to Tarquin, reminding the Stuart monarch of his precursor's demise.

Rome ne'er to such a glorious state had grown
Had not luxurious Tarquin there been known;
A single rape was deem'd such a disgrace
They extirpate his odious name and race
Though he from Tuscan Kings did succour crave,
Yet they with arms pursu'd him to his grave.[6]

The poem concludes with a warning to Charles, instructing him to banish his priests and change his sexual behavior or risk becoming a hated English Tarquin:

Trust not in prelates' false divinity,
Who wrong their princes, shame their deity . . .
Repent in time and banish from your sight
The pimp, the whore, buffoon, Church parasite;
Let innocence deck your remaining days
That after ages may unfold your praise.[7]

If Charles II continues in his current ways, he will license his overthrow, as did Tarquin before him.

Depictions of rape as a justification for political revolt would become, as we shall see in chapter 5, much more common in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution. Speaking of theater of the 1690s, Derek Hughes writes, "Rape was now a justification of extreme political action: a means of focusing attention on the supremacy of private rights over tyrannical power, even when wielded by a legitimate, hereditary monarch."[8] In the early 1680s, however, such sentiments were both rare and dangerous; Sidney was exe-

cuted at least in part for the ideas expressed in his *Discourses*. Instead, allusions to Lucrece were more often employed by proponents of divine right ideology to protest the idea of contractual monarchy and to discredit the concept of democratic government. Sir Robert Filmer, for instance, does not deny in his *Patriarcha* that what happened to Lucrece was horrible, but he argues that her death did not create a right to rebel. In the case of uprisings against "the insolencies of tyrants," Filmer argues that republicans "propound a remedy far worse than the disease."[9] The people cannot be trusted with self-governance, and Filmer is quick to point out that the rape of Lucrece did not actually lead to democracy. Contrasting the experience of the Athenians, who, "for the love of their Codrus changed their government" with that of the Romans, who rebelled "out of Hatred to their Tarquin," Filmer points out that "neither of them thought it fit to change their state into a democracy."[10] Civil wars, he claims, are not "occasioned by the tyranny of any prince," but by "the wantonness of the people."[11] Monarchical overreach in the private sphere does not license political rebellion.

The conflict between Sidney's treatment of the Lucrece myth and Filmer's reflects both the central political conflict of the day and the continued contemporary resonance of that story. The pathos-laden tale of Lucrece's painful violation and subsequent tragic death offered a powerful corrective to the concept of unchecked sovereign authority, privileging personal autonomy and the rights of the individual over the fulfillment of libertine monarchical desires. Tory authors thus attempted to counter the overwhelming emotional power of the Lucrece narrative in several ways. One pseudonymous author, H. P., attempted to discredit Lucrece sexually, insinuating that she invited the "rape" and only committed suicide when her plan to gain political power fell through:

> *Lucrece* the Chast, the Fair, of Noble blood
> Would not be buss'd for all that's good,
> She would not truckle to her Loves decree,
> She would not kiss, poor heart, not she.
> Bravely the Noble *Doxy* strove,
> Though at last forc'd to pay her Tax of Love.
> When the lascivious Scene was Done,
> And the Slut saw she was not made a Queen,
> She tore her Hair and dainty Quoif,
> With a sharp Ponyard ended all the strife,
> And quickly did the little job of life.[12]

Collatine, meanwhile, is not a wronged husband seeking justice for his wife, but a jealous dupe:

> A Snivelling Peer that lov'd his Spouse too well,
> Rather than be a Cuckold would rebell;
> For's Country's sake he thought it was no sin:

For well knew he
That Petticoat and Property
With the same Letters did begin.[13]

While such sordid actions do not inherently warrant rebellion, the common people, those "*Roman* Bullies," seize any opportunity to rise up, an experiment with democracy that fails:

For this the *Roman* Bullies seiz'd his Crown,
For this they threw the mighty Lecher down,
And in his stead two Consuls fill'd the Chair,
Almanack Kings that lasted by a Year:
They and their Senate all reform'd anew
From Cit and Bumkin to the Nobler Crew.
The Alphabet it self was crost,
The Letters that made *Rex* were lost
And *S. P. Q.* did Rule the Roast;
At last their Civil Wars made such a stir,
They were forc'd to accept the Kingly Power
A Monarch of three Syllables an Emperour.[14]

H. P. rewrites the story of Lucrece to undermine the heroism of all involved. Tarquin is still a violent lecher, but his violence is encouraged by a power-hungry Lucrece who is all too willing to cuckold her husband in exchange for power. Collatine is an uxorious fool who would rather cry rape than acknowledge his own social humiliation. And the political revolution fostered by the rape is itself a failure, as the incapable republican government is quickly replaced by the more stable empire.

Other Tory tracts discredit the story of Lucrece by linking the rebellion against Tarquin with the Roundhead rebellion against Charles I. According to the Nonconformist speaker of "A Summons from a True Protestant Conjurer to Cethegus' Ghost, To Appear September 19, 1682" (1682),

Brutus was brave, and his impulse divine,
When first from Rome he chas'd the royal line;
And something like't we did, ere forty-nine.
But those blest reformation days soon pass'd,
And Charles' return our blooming hopes did blast.[15]

To praise the rebellion under Brutus is intellectually to ally with the Roundheads who martyred their innocent king. Conversely, underlying the Tory dismissal of the Lucrece narrative is the suggestion that to depose a seated monarch is a uniquely Catholic practice. As we have already seen, numerous anti-Catholic tracts of the early 1670s offered a roster of monarchs unseated by Catholic treachery. Tracts of the late 1670s and early 1680s frequently followed suit, depicting the Jesuits as proponents of contractual monarchy. The Jesuit speaker of *A Popish Political Catechism* (c. 1685), for instance, argues that a "Magistrate by his Miscarriages abdicates himself from being a

Magistrate, and proves a Robber instead of a Defender."[16] He goes on to define a tyrant as one who "rules tyrannically, converting all things to his own use, while he contemns and neglects the publick good, afflicts his Subjects contrary to Law, spoiling them of their Goods, robbing them of their Lives, or perverting them in their Religion."[17] In the case of a tyrant, the Jesuit speaker argues, the people are absolved of their oaths and have the right (and indeed the responsibility) to overthrow their king. The rape of Lucrece, he goes on to claim, provides a sufficient and just reason to depose Tarquin: "By what Authority did Rome abrogate the Authority of Tarquin, and drove him, his Wife and Children into Banishment? Tarquin's Invasion of the Bed of Collatinus gave a sufficiently just Cause."[18] The pamphlet thus aligns the rhetoric of contractual monarchy, the rhetoric of Sidney's *Discourses*, with Catholic treachery.

The battle between those who would affirm the divine power of hereditary monarchy and those who would establish limits to monarchical power unfolded through contemporary treatments of the Lucrece myth. A similar set of conflicts also appears in the drama of the period, as authors use Lucrece narratives to negotiate reactions to the events of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. This chapter takes as its focus John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester's *The Tragedy of Valentinian* (performed in 1684 but written much earlier) and Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1680), two plays that recreate the story of Lucrece in markedly different ways and mirror the conflict between Sidney's treatment of the myth and Filmer's. Rochester's *Valentinian* strongly implies that the rape of Lucina provides sufficient justification for regime change; acts of sexual violence offer, to return to Hughes's phrase, "a justification of extreme political action."[19] In contrast, *Lucius Junius Brutus* is highly suspicious of Brutus's rise to power; Brutus's political success is predicated on the effacement of Lucrece's memory, while the actions of his republican conspirators are as violent as those of the royalists. Monarchical overthrow does not heal the realm and may indeed lead to even worse forms of societal oppression, suggesting that acts of sexual violence do not necessarily excuse acts of political violence.

At the same time, Rochester and Lee are both interested in the process of propaganda making on a metatheatrical level and, in particular, in the place of the Lucrece story in the broader realm of political rhetoric. The late 1670s and 1680s saw a resurgence of sexually violent pamphlets, as authors demonized Catholics, defended their king, or warned against the miseries of renewed civil war. Female bodies are sacrificed in these tracts to broader political and social ends, natural bodies becoming victims of the need for change in the body politic. Authored in such an atmosphere, *Valentinian* and *Lucius Junius Brutus* both trace the development of the propagandist who traffics in atrocity to effect political change. While vastly different characters on the surface—one a ravished innocent, the other a feigned madman—both

Rochester's Lucina and Lee's Brutus recognize the political power of sexually violent imagery, and each harnesses that force to foster rebellion. Disempowered sexually by Valentinian's superior physical strength, Lucina reasserts herself as a political martyr in the aftermath of her rape. Lucina becomes Lucrece through her suicide, killing herself into spectacle because she knows that her death will destroy Valentinian's perceived authority. Meanwhile Brutus rises to power through his canny exploitation of rape imagery, manipulating the memory of Lucrece to gather support for his rebellion. The propagandist's treatment of the Lucrece story thereby reveals the author's political intentions. As Lucina is a sympathetic victim-propagandist, *Valentinian* supports the overthrow of the corrupt king. Lee's Brutus, in contrast, like his new government, is devious, opportunistic, and corrupt. Taken together, then, what *Valentinian* and *Lucius Junius Brutus* offer is a meditation on the nature and ethics of sexually violent propaganda, along with an extended exploration of the limits of monarchical authority.

ROCHESTER'S *VALENTINIAN* AND THE LIMITS OF MONARCHICAL AUTHORITY

Scholars have been unable to establish conclusively the authorial history of Rochester's *Valentinian*. Probably written in the late 1670s before illness restricted Rochester's activities—James William Johnson, Rochester's modern biographer, dates Rochester's initial decision to revise Fletcher's *Valentinian* to 1676—the play was later edited for publication by unknown hands and finally performed in 1684, four years after Rochester's death.[20] Like many plays of the period, Rochester's tragedy comments on contemporary politics. Critics have, for instance, frequently linked the Emperor Valentinian's sexual excess with Charles II's. According to J. Harold Wilson, "the poet intended Valentinian as a portrait of Charles II" while "his own personality was reflected in the character of Maximus, the philosophical-minded favorite of the Roman emperor."[21] Larry Carver concurs, writing that the emperor was "evidently meant to be a satirical portrait of Charles II."[22] Harold Love, in contrast, takes a more measured approach to the parallel, suggesting that Valentinian is not a direct "portrait of Charles II or of James, though there might be a kind of veiled hint of what things would be like if James ever became king. What Valentinian and Charles had in common was an insatiable appetite for sex; but Charles was not, as far as is known, a sadist or a rapist, nor was he bisexual."[23]

Whatever Rochester's actual intent, the play was authored in an era of great political contention, begun after the Duke of York's public conversion, revised amid the turmoil of the Popish Plot, and performed after the resolu-

tion of the Exclusion Crisis. Throughout the play, Rochester analyzes the rhetorical structure of political conflict and negotiates the relationship between private language and individual morality, private language and political action. As we have seen, seditious speech could represent a real and present threat to a sitting monarch; rumors and innuendo about a king's personal failings, coupled with criticisms of governmental policy, could undermine a regime in dangerously pressing ways. Charles II himself was clearly aware of the dangers of unfettered speech, first passing the Licensing of the Press Act in 1662 and, ten years later, ordering the suppression of seditious talk. According to a 1672 proclamation, "great and heavy Penalties are Inflicted upon all such as shall be found to be spreaders of false News, or promoters of any Malicious Slanders and Calumnies in their ordinary and common Discourses."[24] Seditious words, Charles complains, "Incite and Stir up the People to hatred or dislike of the Person of his Majesty, or the Establisht Government," and therefore must be banished from the realm.[25] Underlying such a proclamation is the belief that negative political speech may poison the individual subject against his monarch, a view proffered in Rochester's *Valentinian* by the Roman general Aecius. Acutely aware of the political danger posed by seditious language, Aecius uses the rhetoric of contagion to describe the social impact of antimonarchical propaganda. The "exponent of divine right in the play," Aecius abhors even the suggestion of punishing the emperor's bad acts.[26] To Aecius, disloyal words are equivalent to treasonous deeds; hence he arrests Pontius for speaking seditiously. Maximus initially defends Pontius to his friend, asking Aecius to "Pray consider what certaine ground you have" (4.1.23–24). Aecius responds,

> What Grounds?
> Did I not take him preaching to the Souldiers
> How lazyly they liv'd, and what dishonour
> It was, to serve a Prince so full of Softness!
> These were his very words Sir. (4.1.24–28)

Pontius's words, not his deeds, are his crime, and Aecius has caught him in the act of (speaking) treason. The danger, of course, is that Pontius's discontent will spread among the troops and thereby grow into full-scale rebellion. Pontius, he claims, is one "whose infection / Has spread it self like poyson through the Army / And cast a killing Fogg on fair allegeance!" (4.1.43–45). Political dissension in this construction is an infection and a poison, a contagious miasma that destroys the listener's civic virtue.

Pontius's words condemn him—"All your language / Makes but against you Pontius" (4.1.97–98), Aecius insists. Such is his preoccupation with dangerous language that Aecius forces Maximus, too, to proclaim his linguistic innocence—"I soe [sic] no danger in my words" (1.1.79), Maximus promises, despite his disdain for Valentinian's policies and actions. Later, when

Maximus does attempt to rebel, Aecius refers to his former friend as "that lost Wretch / Whose breast is poyson'd with soe vile a purpose" (5.1.9–10); the desire for rebellion is reimagined as a species of toxin. Simultaneously, however, Aecius believes that foul and infectious words have corrupted the emperor, turning him away from his duty to the kingdom. When Proculus succeeds in turning Valentinian against Aecius, his most faithful friend and ally, Aecius threatens Proculus:

> Look to't, when ere I draw this sword to punish
> You and your grinning Crew will tremble, Slaves,
> Nor shall the Ruin'd World afford a corner
> To shelter you, nor that poor Princes Bosome,
> You have invennom'd and polluted soe. (5.1.44–48)

Aecius imaginatively transforms Proculus's words, like Pontius's, into an insidious infection. To hear bad language is to invite corruption, the same fear underlying the treatment of Catholic mistresses and advisors in contemporary anti-Catholic discourse. Just as the Catholic religion may "disperse / Into weak Souls [its] poisonous influence," antimonarchical ideologies may disease both the army and the populace.[27]

The language of contagion, applied by Aecius to the political sphere, is also applied to what at first appears to be a very private battle of wills between Lucina and Valentinian. From the beginning of the text, the pair is locked in a battle for sexual supremacy that is also, by extension, linguistic. Just as Aecius believes that ill speech can corrupt politically, Valentinian hopes that he can use seductive and pernicious language to destroy Lucina's virtue and convince her to succumb. Thus Lucina is constantly importuned, not only by Valentinian, but also by his bawds and their wives, whose express purpose is to tempt Lucina into sexual transgression. Grown sick of their promises and threats, Lucina exclaims against their poisonous speech. "Tempt me no more," she insists to Phorba:

> If any of your Ancesters
> Dyed worth a Noble deed—that would bee cherished—
> Soul-frighted with this black infection,
> You would run from one another to Repentance
> And from your guilty eyes drop out those Sins
> That made ye blinde and Beasts. (2.1.52–57)

Like Aecius, Lucina perceives of language as an infection—in her case, a very personal form of plague—and she resolves to avoid the occasion for vice.

Because the other characters also believe in the power of language as poison, they doubt the strength of Lucina's continued resistance. Despite Lucina's harsh dismissals, Phorba will not leave Lucina alone with her virtuous thoughts. "In Conversation," she says instead, "Doubts are resolv'd, and

what sticks near the conscience / Made easy and allowable" (2.1.36–37). For Phorba, conversation functions as a moral panacea, a salve to a guilty conscience. The bawds need only talk enough and Lucina will feel justified to succumb. Phorba therefore insinuates that Lucina's resistance will wane: "how shee blushes," she points out to Ardelia. "And what flowing Modesty runnes through her / When wee but name the Emperour" (2.1.80–82). The insinuation that Lucina's blush signifies her secret willingness underscores an inherent faith in the power of sexual propaganda. One word, the name of the emperor, is enough to arouse Lucina's blushes, creating a transgressive thrill that prefigures her eventual and inevitable sexual lapse.

Maximus, too, displays an inherent faith in the power of seduction and a concomitant distrust of his wife's fidelity. Outwardly, Maximus denies that self-interest drives his hatred of Valentinian:

> Mistake mee not dearest Aecius:
> Doe not believe that through meane jealousy
> How far the Emperour's Passion may prevaile
> On my Lucina's thoughts to our dishonour,
> That I abhorre the person of my Prince . . .
> I am concern'd for Rome, and for the World. (1.1.134–38, 145)

Implicit in Maximus's protestation of civic-mindedness, however, is the fear that Lucina may succumb, that Valentinian may invade his wife's body along with her thoughts and that he himself will be dishonored. Despite Lucina's obvious virtue, Maximus does not fully trust her strength.

The play thus questions the extent to which Lucina is tempted by Valentinian's ardent pursuit, and in passages new to Rochester's adaptation, Lucina actually appears to acknowledge her illicit interest in the emperor: "Ah, cease to tempt those Gods and Vertue too!" she begs Valentinian (1.1.187), and puts him off by insinuating that in future, he will not be so rebuffed. When Valentinian tries to grab her, she promises to reconsider his suit: "Hold Sir, for mercys sake: / Love will abhor whatever force can take. / I may perhaps perswade my selfe in time / That this is duty which now seemes a Crime" (1.1.285–88). Given the circumstances in which Lucina speaks, this promise appears at first glance to be a feint: Lucina would say anything to avoid Valentinian's physical assault. In act 3, however, Rochester's additions suggest that Lucina's conscience may in fact be at odds with her desire. When Lucina wanders away from the court into a grove, Marcellina and Claudia, her women, perceive her wanderlust as evidence of temptation: "But Claudia," Marcellina says, "why this sitting up all night / In groves by purling streames? this argues heat, / Great heat and vapours, which are maine corrupters!" (3.3.7–9). Throughout the play, Lucina has been marked by her coldness; Chylax calls her a "Cake of Ice" (2.2.114), while Balbus describes

her as “Cold as Christall, / Never to bee thaw’d” (2.2.43–44). That she now experiences heat suggests that, at least in the eyes of her women, she has not been immune to the emperor’s charms.

In the same act, Lucina privately acknowledges her susceptibility to Valentinian’s illicit attractions:

> The Emperour!
> Unwonted horrour seizes mee all o’re
> When I but heare him nam’d: sure tis not hate
> For though his impious Love with scorne I heard
> And fled with Terrour from his threatning Force
> Duty commands mee humbly to forgive
> And blesse the Lord to whom my Lord does bow;
> Nay more methinks hee is the gracefull’st man,
> His words so fram’d to tempt, himself to please,
> That tis my wonder how the Powers above,
> Those wise and carefull Guardians of the good,
> Have trusted such a force of tempting charmes
> To Enemys declar’d, of Innocence. (3.1.30–42)

Marcellina’s diagnosis of Lucina’s heat is not, in fact, altogether unfounded. Lucina is torn between fear of physical assault, understanding of her civic duty to the emperor, and a much more fearsome recognition of her own weakness. Lucina may have, as she claims, a “conscience” (2.1.157), but her admission in the grove presents the possibility that she may actually be susceptible to the sexual and polluting force of his language and that her desire may one day overpower her will. Lucina’s fear of Valentinian is motivated at least in part by a fear of her own reaction to his beauty and his words, along with a fear that she may indeed one day justify “That this is duty which now seems a Crime” (1.1.228).

If seductive language may poison Lucina’s virtue, the play initially suggests that Lucina’s virtuous language may instead redeem Valentinian. When the emperor proclaims his love for Lucina, he cites her virtue as one of her primary attractions: “Your beauty had subdu’d my heart before— / Such Vertue could alone enslave mee more” (1.1.270–71). Later, he suggests that her chastity is so alluring that it threatens to render him chaste as well. Using the language of infection, Valentinian insists,

> Before my dazl’d Eyes coud you now place
> A thousand willing Beautyes to allure
> And give mee lust for every loose embrace,
> Lucina’s Love my vertue would secure;
> From the contagious charme in vain I fly,
> That seiz’d upon my heart, and may defye
> That great preservative Variety. (1.1.311–17)

Itself a form of contagion, Lucina's virtue is also possibly the antidote to the filth of Valentinian's daily routine. Like Settle's Clotair, who is temporarily redeemed by Aphelia, Valentinian will, he avers, take Lucina's example of virtue to heart and reform. Ardelia exclaims, "If any thing redeeme the Emperour / from his wild flying Courses, this is shee! / Shee can instruct him if yee mark; shee is wise too" (2.1.62–64). Language, when properly employed, has the capacity to reform as well as destroy.[28]

Valentinian and Lucina thus represent two opposing sources of infectious language, and the play treats them both as authors, one telling a tale of corruption, the other one of redemption. What emerges from their conflict is a battle for linguistic and dramatic control that represents a wider battle for personal and public order. As part of his faith in the power of his imperial speech, Valentinian describes himself as an author; in Marina Hila's words, "language and spectacle" are the "twin pillars of the emperor's political power."[29] Valentinian cites his linguistic power when, early in the play, he complains of Lucina's rejection: "Gods! Why was I markt out of all your Brood / To suffer tamely under mortall Hate? / Is it not I that do protect your shrines? / Am author of your Sacrifice and prayers?" (1.1.167–70). As emperor, Valentinian names himself the author of the nation, a sentiment Maximus echoes angrily: "Why is this Author of us?" he demands (1.1.74). While Maximus's description of the emperor as author is original to Fletcher's play, Valentinian's similar self-description is Rochester's addition, emphasizing the link between author*ship* and author*ity*. Valentinian encodes power in linguistic terms; his right to author his nation's prayers to the gods (and implicitly, to put words in Lucina's mouth) is the sign of his imperial prerogative.

Finally, however, Valentinian's narrative of seduction fails, as Lucina is not truly susceptible to linguistic corruption. As a result, Valentinian employs a different form of narrative, one in which he succeeds with her by force. Sexual violence becomes Valentinian's art, a script he pens to express his power over Lucina and by extension, his kingdom. In Peter Byrne's words, "She assumes the role of an audience, he of playwright and producer."[30] Valentinian orchestrates the rape scene in minute detail:

> You see the Appartment made very fine
> That lies upon the Garden, Masques and Musick
> With the best speed you can, and all your Arts
> Serve to the highest for my Masterpiece
> Is now on foot. (3.2.52–56)

The rape is Valentinian's "Masterpiece," his greatest work of art; it is "intended to engage her aesthetically on the same emotionally transformative level as if she were responding to a theatrical performance."[31] That he arranges the music, the scenery, and even the blocking of the rape emphasizes the artificiality and theatricality of the sexual assault.

In the climactic scene of the play, a scene entirely original to Rochester, Valentinian rapes Lucina offstage while a troupe of dancers rehearses an upcoming masque onstage. Valentinian has specifically ordered the masque to detract attention from the rape:

> 'Twill serve to draw away
> Those listning fooles who trace it in the Gallery;
> And if (by chance) odd noises should bee heard,
> As womens Shricks [sic], or soe, say tis a Play
> Is practicing within. (4.2.191–95)

Valentinian has facilitated a sadistically witty moment of dramatic irony: as Lycinias comments, it's a "merry pranck" to stage the rape of Lucrece during the rape of Lucina (4.2.196). As the dancing-masters rehearse, some of the true Lucina's suffering breaks through the performance: "Blesse mee," Lycinias exclaims, "the Lowd shricks and horrid out cryes / Of the poor Lady! Ravishing d'yee call it? / She roares as if she were upon the racke" (4.2.9–11). Lucina's screams merge with the rehearsal for the masque, emphasizing the link between Valentinian's sexual violence and theatricality. The rehearsal onstage substitutes for the "real" performance within the bedchamber, a work of the emperor's conscious authorship, though a work that cannot publicly be staged. Valentinian's script, his masterpiece, becomes his ultimate expression of imperial power and authorial privilege; he has achieved his goal of having Lucina while she is yet chaste.

If the rape functions as an expression of authorship, the rape's immediate aftermath would initially seem to confirm Valentinian's vision of his narrative. When Lucina calls for vengeance, vowing, "As long as there is life in this Body / And breath to give me words, I'le cry for Justice" (4.4.3–4), Valentinian insists on her powerlessness—"Justice will never hear you," he boasts, "I am Justice" (4.3.5)—and he insists that his voice carries the ultimate authority: "Know I am farre above the faults I doe / And those I doe I'me able to forgive" (4.4.87–88).[32] Moreover, he taunts Lucina for her linguistic impotence: she lacks sufficient "credit in the telling it" to overcome his version of events (4.4.90). Lucina, Valentinian brags, is utterly helpless: "Your Husband cannot help you, nor the Soldiers: / Your Husband is my Creature, they my weapons" (4.4.94–95). In keeping with Valentinian's script, Lucina acknowledges that he has effectively rewritten her identity. "Gods," she mourns:

> what a wretched thing has this man made mee

> For I am now noe Wife for Maximus,
> Noe company for women that are virtuous,
> No Family I now can claime or Country,
> Nor name but Caesars Whore. (4.4.42–46)

Valentinian has effaced Lucina's reputation, her family, and even her name. His actions have renamed her; she is no longer Lucina, but "Caesar's whore," her identity now existent only insofar as she bears relation to the emperor.

Valentinian rapes Lucina to satisfy the demands of his physical body, but it is here in the aftermath of sexual violence that the distinction between private and public, body natural and body politic, breaks down and the play's political leanings emerge. The private battle of wills between Lucina and Valentinian and their conflicting stories of chastity and cuckoldry are never only of individual consequence. Within a royal court, sexuality is always imbued with political significance. For Lucina, her encounters with and rejections of Valentinian are initially private. Not so for Valentinian, who, as emperor, recognizes her refusals as both a private rebuff and a political danger. As a divinely appointed ruler, Valentinian should, he insists, see a direct, one-to-one correspondence between his words and his subjects' actions. He brags of his powers to Lucina:

> Have I not Pretors through the spacious Earth
> Who in my name doe mighty Nations sway,
> Injoying rich Dominions in my right?
> Their temporary Governments I change,
> Divide or take away, as I see good,
> And this they think noe Injury nor shame. (1.1.212–17)

Valentinian commands and the world reacts accordingly. By refusing Valentinian, however, Lucina transforms him, the ruler and author of Rome, from emperor to slave: "Alas," he complains,

> All Power is in Lucina's Eyes.
> How soone could I shake off this heavy Earth
> Which makes mee little lower than your selves
> And sitt in Heav'n an Equall with the first,
> But Love bids mee pursue a Nobler Aime,
> Continue Mortall, and Lucina's Slave. (1.1.177–82)

Valentinian imagines himself (briefly and disingenuously) as Lucina's slave, a frightening, albeit temporary, rhetorical disempowerment. As is true for Settle's Clotair, Valentinian's inability finally to command Lucina's willing submission becomes a sign of political weakness, tangible proof of the limits to his divine authority. If he cannot force one woman's submission, he cannot hope to command the armies of imperial Rome. Lucina's personal narrative of fidelity conflicts with and threatens to overpower Valentinian's own linguistic and political mandate.

Finally Valentinian assaults Lucina rather than look weak before his kingdom, a powerful expression of his absolutist philosophy. Paradoxically, however, the rape becomes the source of his disempowerment, the moment when the private acts of private bodies become irrevocably public and political, and when personal suffering is transformed into a justification for regicide. In 1675, Settle's Chlotilda could not punish the king for his private act of violence lest she instead harm the body politic. In 1684, Rochester's Lucina dramatizes the new strain of political thought encapsulated in Sidney's *Discourses*, one that not only licenses but obligates the people to oppose a tyrannical king. The clash between Valentinian and Lucina therefore underscores a broader clash in political ideologies. Valentinian approaches his authority from a Filmerian perspective, perfectly confident in his absolute and unquestioned authority over his subjects. In fact, however, his power is revealed to be untenable, tyrannical, and false, as the play finally propounds a contractual conception of rulership more reminiscent of Sidney's work than Filmer's. Lucina functions both as the symbol of suffering created by monarchical overreaching and as the agent of the emperor's overthrow; in the aftermath of her rape, she becomes a very different sort of author, one who uses her rape as a form of political propaganda. Before the assault, Lucina attempts to enhance the emperor's individual morality, an essentially private affair. After the rape, she tells a story of monarchical tyranny and becomes the infection Aecius fears. Early in the play, Balbus threatens Lucina with physical violence. He reports:

> I askt her
> After my many offers, walking with her,
> And her many downe denyalls, How
> If the Emperour growne mad with love should force her:
> She pointed to a Lucrece that hung by,
> And with an angry looke that from her Eyes
> Shot Vestall Fire against mee, she departed. (2.2.87–93)

By gesturing, albeit silently, to the painting of Lucrece, Lucina promises her allegiance to that older narrative, a script powerful enough to unseat kings. If Valentinian will play the rapist, Lucina will play Lucrece, in the context of imperial politics a true political threat.

In attempting to dissuade Valentinian from rape, Lucina warns him that sexual assault will forever taint her, body and soul: "I will become so leprous / That yee shall Curse mee from yee" (4.2.150–51), she promises. She will become "A Plague to Roome, and Blott to Cesars fame!" (1.1.203). In most plays, the victim of sexual assault bears the "stain" of that attack alone. Lucina, however, insists that Valentinian will also be infected by the contagion he transmits. She will be ruined, but her blood will be forevermore on Valentinian's hands. That Lucina chooses to use the word "Blot" underscores the conflict between narratives. She is his victim, but she rhetorically trans-

forms herself into an error of his penmanship. After the rape, Valentinian himself becomes the toxin, a blot not only on her fame, but on the reputation of the empire:

> the Empire,
> In which thou livest a strong continu'd surfeit
> Like poyson will disgorge thee, good men raze thee
> From ever being read again—
> Chast wives, and fearfull maids make vows against thee. (4.4.14–18)

She labels Valentinian a poison, a contaminant that good people will avoid, and thus like the Romans of Sidney's *Discourses*, who, as we have seen, "recove[r] their liberty by expelling Tarquin," demands a public, political punishment for his private act of violence.[33] If Valentinian rewrites Lucina's identity by renaming her "Caesar's whore" (4.4.46), he also enables Lucina to rename him in turn. Deferring to the narrative of Lucrece for the second time in the play, Lucina curses the emperor: "The sins of Tarquin be remembered in thee" (4.4.60), she cries. She may be no better than a "glorious whore" (4.4.66), but she likens Valentinian to a notorious and executed tyrant. This label will prove more powerful than Valentinian's bragging pronouncements about his own power. His author(ity) is not powerful enough to avoid the denouement of Lucrece's story and Tarquin's fate.

Lucina initially expresses her virtue silently with her gesture toward Lucrece's painting. She finally expresses her fidelity both to her husband and to Lucrece's narrative with her suicide, the ultimate expression of chastity. Rochester's version of the play emphasizes the pathos of Lucina's death, extending the description of her final moments by twelve lines. Fletcher's description of Lucina's suicide is somewhat abrupt. According to Claudia,

> When first she enter'd
> Into her house, after a world of weeping,
> And blushing like the Sun-set, as we saw her;
> Dare I, said she, defile this house with whore,
> In which his noble family has flourish'd?
> At which she fel, and stird no more. (3.1.364–69)

Rochester's Claudia continues:

> At this she fell—Choakt with a thousand sighs;
> And now the pleas'd expiring Saint
> (Her dying Lookes, where new borne Beauty shines
> One opprest with Blushes), modestly declines,
> While death approacht with a Majestick grace,
> Proud to looke Lovely once in such a face.
> Her Armes spread to receive, her wellcome guest,
> With a glad sigh, she drew into her Breast.
> Her Eyes then languishing tow'rds Heav'n she cast
> To thanke the powers that death was come at last;

> And at th' approach of the Cold silent God
> Ten thousand hidden Glories rusht abroad. (4.4.345–56)

This highly descriptive account of Lucina's death contrasts with the terse announcement of Fletcher's original text. As when she points to the painting of Lucrece, Lucina does not speak. Instead, she gestures, she looks, she blushes, and she sighs, emphasizing the thematic importance of her suicide; she receives death as she would a welcome lover, with open arms and glad sighs, a sharp contrast to her fervent rejection of the emperor. By welcoming death into herself, she effaces the trace of Valentinian's lust and reasserts control over her own body. Appropriately enough, the moment of Lucina's death, the moment when she wrests final and permanent control of the narrative away from Valentinian, is itself reduced to narrative (in this case, Claudia's). The rape and Lucina's response to the rape emerge as two opposing, if equally unstageable, masterpieces.

The Tragedy of Valentinian indicates that Lucina finds power in Lucrece's script, and thus Rochester edits Lucina's final meeting with Maximus to suggest that the suicide is the product of her will alone. In both versions of the play, Maximus and Aecius immediately read the fate of the now ravished Lucina on her body: "Already in thy tears I've read thy wrongs" (4.4.127), Maximus laments, treating her body as a text to be read and interpreted. Only in Fletcher's original script, however, does Maximus view Lucina's suicide as a foregone conclusion. When Fletcher's Lucina first expresses an intent to kill herself, Maximus praises her virtue: "Farewell thou excellent example of us," he tells her, "Thou starry vertue, fare-thee-well, seeke heaven, / And there by Cassiopeia shine in glory, / We are too base and dirty to preserve thee" (3.1.157–58). Rochester, by contrast, excises these lines, focusing instead on Maximus's love and concern for his wife. "[T]hese lipps / Tast not of ravisher," he promises (4.4.142–43), while Aecius urges Lucina to live and "draw from that wilde man [Valentinian] a sweet repentance" (4.4.172). The sight of Lucina's ravaged body will, he insists, offer a corrective to and a penance for the corrupt ruler.

Subsequently, Rochester excises Maximus's lengthy speech requiring Lucina's death: "she must not live" (3.1.156), he concludes in Fletcher's script. For Fletcher, Lucina commits suicide at her husband's urging as well as her own behest. Certainly, Rochester's Maximus is hardly a perfect husband by modern standards; despite his initial affirmation that the rape was not Lucina's fault, he later becomes anxious, doubting her fidelity if she does not kill herself: "The Emperour / is young and handsome, and the woman flesh, / And may not these two couple without scratching" (4.4.272–74), he asks bitterly. Such comments momentarily recall the depiction of Lucrece from H. P.'s *A Satyr Against Commonwealths*, and the fear that Lucina may, like H. P.'s Lucrece, have cried rape to conceal adultery. Yet Maximus expresses his

doubts only after Lucina has left the stage and is out of earshot. The decision to die is Lucina's own, one that establishes her merit both as a wife and as a catalyst for political change; she claims suicide as both her duty and her desire: "The Tongues of Angells cannot alter mee" (4.4.187), she avers. No words can change Lucina's fate nor alter the course of her narrative. Her death is her final act of will and authorship, and one that finally strips Valentinian of his authority.

In choosing death, Lucina recognizes her own presence and power as spectacle. It was, of course, Lucina's physical beauty that initially inspired Valentinian's sexual interest, but if her visual appeal leads to her destruction in life, she offers a very different sort of spectacle in death. By martyring herself, Lucina accepts her role as a public theatrical spectacle; in essence, she kills herself into art to deconstruct the text that Valentinian has scripted and transforms herself into the ultimate form of antimonarchical propaganda. The sight of Lucina's body, borne throughout the town, will, as Sidney suggests, inspire widespread outrage and provide the impetus for political change in Rome. In this, Rochester implies that the spectacle of rape, when dramatically performed and effectively harnessed, will spread treasonous contagion throughout the kingdom and poison men's minds against their government. The rhetoric of rape and contagion is therefore never only of individual concern, and *The Tragedy of Valentinian* exposes the process by which a private, sexual crime becomes a public, political act.

In the end, Valentinian is overthrown by his people as the rape of Lucina provides sufficient justification for his deposition, leaving Maximus to mourn his own loss: "Lead me to Death or Empire which you please / For both are equall to a Ruin'd man . . . / Sorrows soe just as mine must never end / For my Love ravish'd and my murder'd Friend" (5.5.253–54, 266–67). Significantly, Rochester has chosen to end his play a full act before the original source text. In Fletcher's earlier version, Maximus gladly marries Valentinian's widow and becomes equally tyrannical before his own eventual overthrow. According to Hila, "Maximus duplicates his predecessor's faults as soon as he has succeeded to the throne, which suggests that there is something fundamentally wrong with the ideological underpinnings of political power, including the doctrine of divine right."[34] Fletcher's text also suggests that regicide cannot be tolerated.[35] Any man who kills a king will be punished by God with his own harsh demise. In contrast, not only does Rochester's Maximus go unpunished, but his takeover of the throne is a cause for celebration.[36] Meanwhile, liberty from tyranny is made possible by Lucina's decision to transform her own body into an effective form of antimonarchical propaganda. Rochester once again emphasizes the move toward a contractual understanding of monarchy and produces a treatment of the Lucrece narrative dangerously reminiscent of Algernon Sidney's.

LEE'S *LUCIUS JUNIUS BRUTUS* AND THE DANGERS OF REVOLT

Although Rochester's *Valentinian* justifies the overthrow of a violent monarch, it was Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* that proved the more immediately controversial; the play was suppressed after only three nights for "very Scandalous Expressions & Reflections vpon ye Government."[37] Critics have speculated that the censors may not have actually read the play, that the language of royalism and republicanism alone may have made them sufficiently nervous to inspire a preemptive suppression. Antony Hammond writes, "It is clear from the wording that the Chamberlain was acting upon a complaint, not first-hand knowledge, and that he had not troubled to verify the objections to the play."[38] That said, the play's depiction of the royalists is far from complimentary and certainly could have raised concerns. At the center of *Lucius Junius Brutus* lies a royalist black mass in which human sacrifice and blood drinking are performed onstage: as a "busie Commonwealths' Man," symbol of parliamentary government, is displayed crucified upstage, priests distribute goblets "fill'd with Blood & Wine" that the royalists may drink the blood of human sacrifice and grow strong.[39] Brutus will later condemn the conspirators, his own sons among them, calling them "Sons of Murder, that get drunk with blood" (4.1.241). In the context of the Exclusion Crisis, this scene is central to any pro-Whig reading of the play, as royalism is here linked with Catholic vampirism and perversity. As in the English Civil War tracts, acts of rape escalate into instances of blood drinking, dark parodies of the Catholic Eucharist that align the royalists with the most pernicious and terrifying aspects of libertine and Catholic excess.

The scene of blood drinking notwithstanding, however, *Lucius Junius Brutus* defies a straightforwardly antiroyalist, anti-Catholic reading. For all that Brutus condemns the royalists for their perversity, he has himself participated in a vampiristic act; at Brutus's insistence, Lucrece's avengers seal their pact by kissing her knife, tasting the blood of Lucrece's self-sacrifice to cement their oath. Brutus says,

> Behold, you dazled Romans, from the wound
> Of this dead Beauty, thus I draw the Dagger,
> All stain'd and reeking with her Sacred blood,
> Thus to my lips I put the Hallow'd blade,
> To yours Lucretius, Collatinus yours, . . .
> kiss the Ponnyard round. (1.1.434–39)

Brutus's use of Lucrece's knife is a less obvious but no less definite act of blood drinking than that of the royalists. It is also an addition of Lee's imagining. According to Livy, the Lucrece story's source text, Brutus "put the knife into Collatinus's hands, then passed it to Lucretius, then to Valer-

ius"; at no point in Livy's narrative do they kiss the bloodied weapon.[40] That Brutus, like his hated son, participates in an act of vampirism suggests that the republicans may be no better than the royalists they replace.

For both Lee's royalists and republicans, the spectacle of human suffering plays a fundamental role in the transfer and affirmation of political authority. Brutus in particular recognizes that female sacrifice leads to political consequences, and he argues for the necessity of human sacrifice to ensure stability in the wake of a rebellion. Brutus tells the Senate,

> It has been found a famous truth in Story,
> Left by the ancient Sages to their Sons,
> That on the change of Empires or of Kingdoms,
> Some sudden Execution, fierce and great,
> Such as may draw the World to admiration,
> Is necessary to be put in Act
> Against the Enemies of the present State. (5.2.6–12)

For a nation to stand, a display of violence is essential; the spectacle of suffering is needed to channel the power of the multitude. He continues,

> Had Hector, when the Greeks and Trojans met
> Upon the Truce, and mingled with each other,
> Brought to the Banquet of those Demy-Gods
> The Fatal head of that illustrious Whore;
> Troy might have stood till now. (5.2.13–17)

The death of Helen would have united the Greeks and the Trojans and averted an unnecessary war. Commonly depicted as a rape victim,[41] Helen is useful to Brutus only in death, worthy only insofar as she can cement political bonds between men. Similarly, Brutus is eager to exploit the sins of Tarquin's body natural to reshape the contours of the Roman body politic, and he will use Lucrece as he encourages Hector to use Helen: as a necessary sacrifice. In this, Brutus's use of Helen and Lucrece mirrors the use of rape in propaganda as described throughout this study. Here is female physical suffering stripped of its personal impact and transformed into a public symbol to be fought over and debated by men. The individual woman's trauma is a cause for celebration if it leads to masculine advancement or political change.

Fully aware of the political ramifications of Lucrece's death, Brutus quickly and callously harnesses the political power of her narrative to effect his rise to power: "Leave me to my work, my Titus," he tells his son, "For from this Spark a Lightning shall arise / That must e're Night purge all the Roman Air" (1.1.278–80). Brutus does not admit to personal ambition but rather constructs himself as a "social and moral surgeon," come to "cure the ailing body politic."[42] Titus, too, conceives of his father as a doctor, aiding the nation in its recovery: "My Father, like an Æsculapius / Sent by the Gods,

comes boldly to the Cure; / But how, my Love? by violent Remedies" (2.1.445–47). Certainly, Brutus's Rome is in need of healing; throughout the play, Lee foregrounds imagery of contagion and illness, with the sexually corrupt acts of the Tarquin family serving as the primary agents of infection. Lee's Lucrece laments her "dishonored blood" in the aftermath of her rape (1.1.392), while Teraminta, the bastard daughter of the king, carries the "natural Contagion" of the Tarquin line (1.1.220). As such, her marriage to Titus can only be a "detested Epithalamium" and "polluted Rit[e]" (1.1.212, 214). In the "slimy joys" of consummation (1.1.216), Teraminta will pollute her lover via contact with her poisonous blood (as her half-brother, Tarquin, does to Lucrece).[43] Later, upon the exposure of the royalist counterplot, Brutus describes his sons' complicity using the imagery of disease: his sons are "two Villains lurking in my blood" (4.1.226). The realm of Rome itself has grown ill, and thus Titus encourages Teraminta to forsake "this Contagious Air" for his embrace (3.3.67). The filth of Tarquin's evil and years of misrule have poisoned the land and given rise to a series of monsters. The members of the Tarquin family are described as the "Monster[s] of Mankind" (1.1.355), while Fabritius claims that the mob has become a "strange blunder-headed Monster" (2.1.32). Brutus admits that he has "act[ed] deformity in thousand shapes" (1.1.118), while infection threatens to spill over the bounds of the fictional world—the play's prologue describes the proliferation of infectious wit, a form of "malice" that "poyson[s] half the house" (prologue, 10). The blood of the theater, like the blood of the nation, has grown corrupt.

In creating a Rome poisoned by sexual corruption, Lee follows two earlier versions of *The Rape of Lucrece*, Shakespeare's poem of 1594 and Thomas Heywood's drama of 1608, both of which depict rape as a form of disease, a poison that infects, distorts, and destroys both the victim's blood and the marrow of her society. According to Shakespeare's Lucrece, her body has become "spotted, soiled, corrupted" and "blemished" (ll. 1172, 1175), her blood "stained" and "tainted" by Tarquin's assault (ll. 1181, 1182). Heywood's Lucrece concurs: she has been "stain'd, polluted, and defil'd," her body "soil'd with lust-burn'd sinne."[44] In both adaptations, the rape has engendered a wider atmosphere of societal illness. Shakespeare's Lucrece curses the "rotten damps" (l. 778), "poisonous clouds" (l. 777), and "unwholesome breaths" of "hateful, vaporous and foggy night" (ll. 778, 771); nature itself spreads contagion and disease. Likewise, Heywood's Brutus says that Tarquin's ill deeds have infected the larger realm of Rome: "The state," he claims, "is full of dropsie and swollen big / with windie vapors" (b1r).

According to Lee's Brutus, the sexual excesses of the Tarquin family—the rape of Lucrece and illegitimacy of Teraminta—both reflect and create the contagion that pervades the realm. Here again we see the shift from

private sexuality to public concern illuminated in Rochester's *Valentinian*, with bloodletting in acts of political violence a potential means of purgation. While Lucrece's body becomes, as Brutus terms it, a "Public Wound" (2.1.152), Titus's abused body will "heal" that "wounded freedom" with his execution (4.1.524). Throughout the play, characters insist that suffering will serve as a means to redemption. Lucrece's "dishonor'd blood" becomes "chast blood" in the wake of her suicide (1.1.392, 442), at least according to Brutus. Similarly, Titus must, Brutus claims, "bleed before People" to reaffirm the strength of the republic (4.1.528). Titus accepts the necessity and benefit of the blood purge as a requirement for social and personal redemption. He tells his father, "I hope the glorious Liberty of Rome, / Thus water'd by the blood of both your Sons, / Will get Imperial growth and flourish long" (5.2.168–70), and he resigns himself to the status of sacrificial victim. He will "make [Brutus] reparation" for his disloyalty with death (4.1.456). Even at the expense of his own existence, Titus masochistically insists on redeeming himself through flagellation and the public shedding of blood. "My constant sufferings are my only Glory" (4.1.528), he boasts, and he dreams of a Rome run red with redemptive blood: "Ere yet she can be well," Titus avers, Rome "must purge and cast, purge all th'infected humors / Through the whole mass, and vastly, vastly bleed" (2.1.448–50).

Shakespeare and Heywood also offer the possibility of violent bloodletting as a means to purge the nation and restore social order. Heywood's Brutus promises to "pierce" the "windie vapors" of the state, "to purge th'infected blood, bred by the pride / of these infested bloods" (b1r), while in Catherine Belling's words, Shakespeare's poem "culminates . . . in Lucrece's purificatory suicide: with a knife, she makes herself bleed."[45] Lucrece's "chaste blood," rendered free from taint by the ritual of bloodletting, provides the impetus for the successful overthrow of the Tarquins, thereby righting the political realm. Heywood, too, concludes with an image of restoration in the wake of a blood purge: "After so much effusion and large washe / Of Roman blood, the name of peace is welcome" (k2v), he writes. The state has been redeemed from tyranny, and according to Belling, "The body politic can now begin to heal."[46]

In Lee's play, however, despite his protestations of civic altruism, Brutus's interest in redemptive bloodletting exposes the depths of his personal ambition and his canny understanding of the political power of Lucrece's self-sacrifice. Brutus gladly exploits the emotional impact of Lucrece's suffering, transforming her private experience into a public spectacle that reveals the effectiveness of sexual violence as a form of political propaganda. In the process, Brutus effaces the memory of Lucrece in a thoroughly unsettling manner. Rochester's *Valentinian* foregrounds both the tension leading up to the rape and its psychological aftermath; Valentinian does not assault Lucina until the end of act 4, unlike his counterpart in Fletcher's play, who

accomplishes his design at the end of act 2. In contrast, Lee's play does not focus on the rape. As his title implies, Lee's interest lies in the political ramifications of the assault and in Brutus's rise to power; Lucrece's story ends as Brutus's begins. Like Rochester's Lucina, Brutus takes control of the political narrative and parlays an act of private sexual violence into public political power. But while Rochester's Lucina controls her own narrative, Lee's Brutus takes control of Lucrece's story. He gains power through her suffering, and his success hinges on his ability to manipulate and redirect to his own benefit the public's emotional response to her death.

Lee's Lucrece, like Rochester's Lucina, demands vengeance for her suffering in a pathos-laden scene: "All that I ask you now," she begs,

> is to Revenge me;
> Revenge me Father, Husband, Oh revenge me:
> Revenge me, Brutus; you his Sons revenge me;
> Herminius, Mutius, thou Horatius too,
> And thou Valerius; all; revenge me all:
> Revenge the Honor of the Ravish'd Lucrece. (1.1.407–12)

Lucrece's appeal is potent, leading some critics to assume that Brutus must himself be moved. Sue Owen, for instance, argues that Brutus is motivated to rebellion not by ambition, but by a desire to avenge the wronged Lucrece: "Brutus is capable of political opportunism, but it would be wrong to see him as 'exploiting' the rape of Lucrece. Lucrece's own dramatic rendering of her wrongs, demands for revenge, and noble suicide make such an interpretation unworkable. Brutus is not motivated by self-interest."[47] I would argue, however, that Brutus's interest in Lucrece's sufferings is negligible. Before Lucrece's suicide, before he has even received confirmation of her attack, Brutus has already begun to anticipate his assault on the Tarquin family. Brutus had long despised the Tarquins; according to Livy, King Tarquin confiscated Brutus's property and ordered the execution of his brother:

> Now Brutus had deliberately assumed a mask to hide his true character. When he had learned of the murder by Tarquin of the Roman aristocrats, one of the victims being his own brother, he had come to the conclusion that the only way to save himself was to appear in the king's eyes as a person of no account. . . . Accordingly he pretended to be a half-wit and made no protest at the seizure by Tarquin of everything he possessed.[48]

Although Lee's characters never discuss Brutus's past onstage, his hatred for the Tarquins forms an openly acknowledged backdrop to the play's events. Brutus has forsaken personal reputation and social standing to await the optimal opportunity for revenge, and he praises his own powers of patience and endurance:

> O, what but infinite Spirit, propt by Fate,

> For Empire's weight to turn on, could endure
> As thou hast done, the labours of an Age,
> All follies, scoffs, reproaches, pities, scorns,
> Indignities almost to blows sustain'd,
> For twenty pressing years, and by a Roman? (1.1.112–17)

Brutus has concealed his true nature from the world and for twenty years has been unable to "Disclose the weighty Secret of my Soul . . . to my dearest Friend, / To my own Children, nor my bosome Wife" (1.1.129, 127–28). He insists that his masquerade proves his civic virtue; his "infinite Spirit" has sustained him that he might eventually preserve Rome from destruction. Still, underlying Brutus's claim to righteousness is a drive for power and the "self-interest" that Owen denies. For years, Brutus has been feigning madness while awaiting his opportunity to strike, and when he hears about the rape, he knows that his moment has come. Thus he callously rejoices over Lucrece's downfall. In public, Brutus will lament; in private, his celebration of Lucrece's sufferings belies his apparent grief: "[F]rom the blackness of young Tarquin's Crime / And Fornace of his Lust," he tells his son,

> the virtuous Soul
> Of Junius Brutus catches bright occasion,
> I see the Pillars of his Kingdom totter:
> The Rape of Lucrece is the midnight Lantorn
> That lights my Genius down to the Foundation. (1.1.272–77)

The rape of Lucrece represents a grand opportunity. Tarquin's crime of lust has unsettled the kingdom and allowed Brutus to avenge his own sufferings.

To achieve his revenge most effectively, Brutus co-opts the power of Lucrece's image, gradually replacing her sufferings in the public imagination with his own. In his first soliloquy, Brutus displays a rhetorical tendency to marginalize Lucrece. He begins by relaying the news of her assault:

> Occasion seems in view; something there is
> In Tarquin's last abode at Collatine's:
> Late entertain'd, and early gone this morning?
> The Matron ruffled, wet, and dropping tears,
> As if she had lost her wealth in some black Storm! (1.1.94–98)

Brutus's description of Lucrece continues for fifteen lines; from there, he abruptly transitions to a litany of his own sufferings. Lucrece is a "pattern," he claims, "For all succeeding Wives. O Brutus! Brutus! / When will the tedious Gods permit thy Soul / To walk abroad in her own Majesty, / And throw this Vizor of thy madness from thee?" (1.1.107, 108–11). Brutus moves from a lamentation of Lucrece to a self-lamentation literally in the middle of a line. For the remaining twenty-six lines of the soliloquy—nearly twice as many lines as he devoted to Lucrece—Brutus does not mention her again, further undermining his claim to selflessness. His real passion comes

through in his self-pitying display, while his interest in Lucrece is, from the earliest moments of the play, linked with his desire for personal advancement.

In the grief and confusion following Lucrece's death, Brutus emerges as a leader, and he calls for violent political action:

> Swear, and let all the Gods be witnesses,
> That you with me will drive proud Tarquin out,
> His Wife, th'Imperial Fury, and her Sons,
> With all the Race; drive'em with Sword and Fire
> To the World's limits, Profligate accurst:
> Swear from this time never to suffer them,
> Nor any other King to Reign in Rome. (1.1.444–50)

Tellingly, Brutus never explicitly demands the punishment of Sextus Tarquin, the rapist. Instead he demands the banishment of Tarquinius Superbus, the king, and Tullia, his much-despised wife.[49] Tarquin himself appears merely as an afterthought, an undifferentiated member of the royal family. That Brutus does not seek to punish the guilty party suggests that vengeance is not Brutus's true goal. Rather, he obfuscates the real problem, manipulating the crowd into confusing political rebellion with private vengeance.[50] By the end of Brutus's speech, Lucrece has been forgotten, now irrelevant to the tide of political upheaval. Brutus has perpetrated what Joyce MacDonald calls "the reduction of the body of Lucrece to the status of that public wound."[51]

If Brutus marginalizes Lucrece, the members of her family are all too eager to follow suit; unlike the suicide of Rochester's Lucina, which gives her momentary control, the suicide of Lee's Lucrece is brushed aside, even by her closest relatives. In act 2, Collatine becomes disenchanted with his inability to advance in Brutus's new regime, and, like Settle's Dumain and Lamot, he pledges his allegiance to the royalist faction. Despite his promise to avenge Lucrece not one act prior, he begins to fight alongside and even socialize with the friends of his wife's rapist. Brutus tells Valerius:

> I have intelligence of [Collatine's] Transactions,
> He mingles with the young hot blood of Rome,
> Gnaws himself inward, grudges my applause,
> Promotes Cabals with highest Quality,
> Such headlong youth as, spurning Laws and manners,
> Shar'd in the late Debaucheries of Sextus,
> And therefore wish the Tyrant here again. (3.1.106–12)

Collatine's lack of fidelity to his wife's cause is, on one level, shocking—how could the bereaved husband of act 1 transform so rapidly into the cynical, libertine courtier of act 3 with nary a thought for his wife's memory?[52] On another level, however, the shift is indicative of the play's overall trajec-

tory: having served her political function, Lucrece herself is no longer important to the play's characters. When her memory no longer advances Collatine, he is more than prepared to switch his allegiance to the opposing side.

The experience of the rape victim is thus effaced, redirected by men who would transmute suffering into power, while her death is avenged merely as a demonstration of Brutus's power as orator. What emerges from the play is not, as in Rochester's *Valentinian*, the triumph of Lucina/Lucrece over her attacker, but the triumph of Brutus as a master rhetorician. From the earliest parts of the play, Brutus demonstrates a talent for harnessing the emotional and propagandistic power of language and spectacle. He uses his oratorical skills to his advantage in his dialogue with the Roman mob, threatening the crowd with an imaginary omen. "What, art thou blind?" he asks the crowd; "[W]hy, yonder, all o'fire; / It vomits Lightning; 'tis a monstrous Dragon" (1.1.318–19). No such dragon exists—one peasant complains, "For my part, I saw nothing" (1.1.333). Yet he is soon cowed into submission by the force of the mob: "Down with him, knock him down," Vinditius threatens, and the peasant capitulates: "Mercy: I did, I did" see the dragon, he insists, "a huge monstrous Dragon" (1.1.336).[53] To Victoria Hayne, Brutus's rhetorical skill points to a larger discomfort with the nature and role of language in Restoration society: "the play participates in a cultural suspicion of language widespread in the late seventeenth century. That conflict is directed toward building distrust of Brutus's eloquent oratory."[54] It also reflects a specific discomfort with the political power of language and with the propagandist's ability to create action from words. The play's world will ultimately be controlled by Brutus's rhetoric. At the beginning of the play, Brutus has been posing as a fool, a man whose words disturb and amuse but, generally speaking, whose language is not valued. Fabritius and his courtier friends, for instance, seek out Brutus to "divert ourselves" with "the impertinence of a Fool" (1.1.143, 145). As he gains in political authority, however, Brutus simultaneously gains in linguistic force, with multiple characters commenting on the power of his speech. According to Vinditius, only Brutus has ever succeeded in moving him to tears: "O, Neighbours, oh! I bury'd seven Wives without crying" (2.1.167), he exclaims (however disingenuously), and until Brutus's eulogy for Lucrece, "I never wept before in all my life" (2.1.168). Subsequently, characters begin to praise Brutus's godlike power. In the wake of Brutus's speech, Valerius insists, "O Brutus, as a God, we all survey thee" (2.1.236), while Tiberius, Brutus's second son, complains that the Roman people treat Brutus "Like Jove when follow'd by a Train of Gods" (3.1.5). Later, Valerius, speaking for the Roman Senate, deifies Brutus still living: "[W]hy, he's no more a man; / He is not cast in the same Common mould . . . / He looks and talks, as if that Jove had sent him" (5.1.8–9, 11).

Brutus finally emerges as a god among the Roman people because he succeeds in manipulating them where others have consistently failed, and Brutus both accepts and encourages the belief in his own divinity.[55] As the play concludes, Brutus requests peace and prosperity for the new republic:

> Let Heav'n and Earth for ever keep their bound,
> The Stars unshaken go their constant Round;
> In harmless labour be our steel employ'd,
> And endless peace thro all the World enjoy'd,
> Let every Bark the Waves in safety Plough,
> No angry Tempest curl the Ocean's brow;
> No darted flames from Heav'n make Mortals fear,
> Nor Thunder fright the weeping Passenger. (5.2.197–84)

It is worth contrasting Brutus's speech here with Valentinian's. In the wake of Lucina's suicide, Valentinian proclaims his power over nature:

> The world is my creature;
> The Trees bring forth their Fruit, when I say Summer;
> The wind that knows no limits but its wildness,
> At my command moves not a Leaf: The Sea,
> With his proud mountain-waters envying Heav'n,
> Where I say still, runs into chrystal mirrors. (5.2.21–26)

Valentinian insists that he can control the weather, that he can stop the winds and halt storms; unfortunately, his power is undermined by his inability to speak Lucina back to life and by his political impotence in the aftermath of the rape. Brutus expresses similar desires to Valentinian's—prosperity and an end to discord and storms—but unlike Valentinian, he achieves those goals; the play theoretically concludes with the restoration of order in the new republic.[56] Thus while Brutus does not directly proclaim his power over nature—he displaces the power onto the gods to whom he prays—the impact of his speech is to emphasize his control and accomplishment, even at the expense of his own blood.

Valentinian is a linguistic failure: as Hila writes of Fletcher's emperor, "his rhetoric is subjective and limited rather than absolute."[57] Valentinian cannot reanimate the dead, nor can he retain control of his personal narrative. In contrast, while Brutus cannot speak Lucrece back to life, he does speak her back to purity. While Lucrece initially bemoans her "dishonored blood" after the suicide (1.1.392), Brutus renames it "chast Blood" and "Sacred blood" (1.1.442, 436). Seemingly, Lucrece's death has restored her purity and removed Tarquin's infection from her veins. Both Lucrece's impurity and her subsequent redemption are, however, imaginative constructs. Lee's Tarquin attacks and injures Lucrece, but he does not leave behind a physical spot or literally contaminate her blood. As we have already seen, Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* literalizes the taint, Lucrece's blood flowing from her wounds in two distinct streams. The "black" blood "that false

Tarquin stained" separates from "some of her blood still pure and red" (1743–44).[58] The evil of the rape has a tangible and visible effect upon the body of the victim. In contrast, only one type of blood issues from the veins of Lee's Lucrece. She may feel herself tainted, but unlike Shakespeare, Lee provides no evidence that the feeling is anything more than a psychological belief. His Lucrece is spotted because she claims herself to be so, and when Brutus pronounces her chaste once more, she is redeemed not because she has killed herself, but simply because Brutus has announced her redemption. Brutus thus claims control of Lucrece's body along with her narrative; that Lucrece's family accepts his pronouncement confirms the power of his oratory.

Subsequently, the image of Lucrece becomes one of Brutus's most pointed propagandistic weapons, and he will summon her "ghost" three times during the course of the play. First, in order to cement the loyalty of the republican faction, Brutus paints a vivid picture of her ghost, who (he claims) warmly approves of his plan for vengeance: "Oh, methinks I see / The hovering Spirit of the Ravish'd Matron / Look down; She bows her Airy head to bless you, / And Crown th'auspicious Sacrament with smiles" (1.1.452–55). Lucrece supports and encourages their actions, Brutus insists; therefore, those actions must be right and good. Given Lucrece's dying plea for revenge—"Revenge me; Oh Revenge, Revenge, Revenge," she begs (1.1.421)—it is likely that Lucrece would indeed have approved of Brutus's plan. Yet her "appearance" onstage is entirely imaginative. In Victoria Hayne's words, "No phantom appears on stage; it exists entirely in Brutus's language."[59] Lucrece has become a fictional construct, a character in Brutus's rhetorical arsenal to be summoned at his will.

In act 1, Brutus describes the ghost of Lucrece to foment political discontent among the aristocracy; he again summons her spirit to sway the common people: "Behold she comes, and calls you to revenge her," he tells the public, brandishing Lucrece's knife.

> Her Spirit hovers in the Air, and cries
> To Arms, to Arms; drive, drive the Tarquins out.
> Behold this Dagger, taken from her wound,
> She bids you fix this Trophee on your Standard,
> This Ponnyard which she stab'd into her heart,
> And bear her Body in your Battels front. (2.1.212–17)

The image of Lucrece, coupled with the threat of aristocratic violence—Brutus promises the city will be filled with "Rapes, Adulteries, / The Tiber choak'd with Bodies" should Tarquin reclaim his throne (2.1.221–22)—is enough to sway the people to his side and create widespread support for the new republic. Finally, Brutus summons the image of Lucrece to manipulate his son's behavior. To prevent Titus from consummating his illicit marriage to Teraminta, Brutus once more brandishes Lucrece's knife and demands his

son's obedience. "[O]n this, / This spotted blade, bath'd in the blood of Lucrece," he says, "I'll make thee swear on this thy Wedding night / Thou wilt not touch thy Wife (2.1.345–47). If Brutus himself is not truly moved by Lucrece's suffering, he is profoundly aware of her power as a symbol. Thus he forces his son to swear obedience not merely on Lucrece's knife, but on her soul: "Swear too, and by the Soul of Ravish'd Lucrece, / Tho on thy Bridal night, thou wilt not touch" Teraminta (2.1.399–400). Brutus's tactic is effective. Just as he is able to manipulate Lucrece's family and the Roman mob, he is able to compel his son's submission: "I swear," Titus capitulates, "ev'n by the Soul of her you nam'd, / The Ravish'd Lucrece, Oh th' Immortal Gods! / I will not touch her" (2.1.401–2). Lucrece's greatest power lies in her weight as a symbol, while Brutus's power lies in his ability to harness that significance to his own ends.

Eventually, Brutus moves to channel popular love for Lucrece into love for (and obedience to) himself. Initially, when Brutus demands vengeance, he pledges to fight "For Chastity, for Rome, and [Lucrece's] violated Honor" (1.1.429). Brutus will again speak of violation and demand vengeance late in the text, but this time, the nation of Rome, not Lucrece, plays the role of victim: "I swear the Gods have Doom'd thee to the grave" (4.1.496), he tells Titus after discovering and foiling the royalist counterplot. "The violated Genius of thy Country / Rears his sad head, and passes Sentence on thee" (4.1.497–98). The country as a whole has been assaulted, and Brutus mourns the "assaulted Majesty of Rome" (5.2.35). Then the rhetoric shifts once more; it is not Lucrece, not Rome, but Brutus himself, who has been violated: "O rise, thou violated Majesty" (4.1.561), Titus begs his father, "Rise from the Earth; . . . I now submit to all your threatn'd vengeance" (4.1.562, 564). Now Brutus has been assaulted, has suffered as Lucrece once suffered. Rome has been ravished by the royalist plot and Brutus, as a metonymic stand-in for Rome, has replaced Lucrece as the primary victim of the crime. Brutus encourages such an identification, co-opting the country's sympathy for the ravished Lucrece; he (and by extension Rome, with which he is inextricably linked) has become the victim of royalist excess, while the virtuous Roman matron, once a catalyst for change, lies forgotten.

To examine Lee's Brutus is to disclose the growth of the propagandist and the process by which the image of rape becomes a political weapon. Such a process is not necessarily positive for Lee. Unlike Rochester, for whom Lucina's victory in death over Valentinian is a cause for celebration, Lee evinces a profound suspicion of Brutus's verbal skills. And unlike Rochester, Lee does not celebrate the tyrant's overthrow, expressing instead a much more Filmerian suspicion of political change. Filmer, as we have seen, argues that to oust a legitimate monarch is to invite new forms of political corruption, "a remedy far worse than the disease."[60] Lee's play likewise concludes with the unsettling notion that Brutus's new government is as

tyrannical as the one it replaced. Brutus, of course, insists that he has set the world back to rights. In this new world, he claims, "endless peace" will be "thro all the World enjoy'd" (5.2.200), and "No dreadful Comets threaten from the Skies, / No venom fall, nor poys'nous Vapors rise" (5.2.207–8). Owen concurs, "Lee leaves us, ultimately, not with a nightmare, but with the transcendence of nightmare through human effort."[61] Yet does he really? If Brutus's tactics are suspiciously unsavory, so, too, is the government of his nascent republic. On the one hand, Brutus offers freedom through republicanism from the arbitrary law and personal favoritism of monarchy.[62] However, Tiberius praises these same things as the benefits of aristocratic rule:

> Remember this in short. A King is one
> To whom you may complain when you are wrong'd;
> The Throne lies open in your way for Justice:
> You may be angry, and may be forgiven.
> There's room for favor, and for benefit,
> Where Friends and Enemies may come together,
> Have present hearing, present composition,
> Without recourse to the Litigious Laws;
> Laws that are cruel, deaf, inexorable,
> That cast the Vile and Noble altogether;
> Where, if you should exceed the bounds of Order,
> There is no pardon: O, 'tis dangerous,
> To have all Actions judg'd by rigorous Law. (2.1.8–20)

Staves calls this speech "a monarchist argument contrasting the mercy prerogative affords with the harshness of impersonal law."[63] What Brutus condemns as arbitrariness, the royalists celebrate as the opportunity for social mobility through patronage—Fabritius, for instance, has risen from the position of a servant to the position of a favored courtier—and compassion before the law.

No less ethically dubious, of course, is Brutus's treatment of his favorite son. In the case of Lucrece's suicide, bloodletting does purge contagion, Lucrece's "dishonored" blood becoming "chaste" blood and "sacred" blood after her death (1.1.392, 442, 436). When Brutus condemns his son to execution, however, the efficacy of the purge is not as clear. Titus believes himself tainted by his association with the royalist plot—he describes himself as "Black . . . with all my guilt upon me" (4.1.403)—but his self-sacrifice does not necessarily redeem. According to Valerius, Titus is tainted not by his involvement with the treasonous plot, but rather by the act intended to reclaim him:

> But see, O Gods, behold the Gallant Titus,
> The Mirror of all Sons, the white of Virtue;
> Fill'd up with *blots*, and writ all o're with blood,
> Bowing with *shame* his body to the ground;
> Whipt out of breath by these Inhuman Slaves! (5.1.33–37, emphasis mine)

The ostensibly purifying whipping has done as much damage to Titus as the initial act of disloyalty. Titus's body, once white with innocence, has been blotted not by his crimes, but by the mark of the lictor's lash. The punishment yields degradation, not catharsis, while Brutus himself emerges a "God of Blood" and "more Tyrannical than any Tarquin" (5.1.103, 116). In transforming Titus into a second Lucrece, he also becomes, perversely and incestuously, the play's second violator. Critics who argue on behalf of *Lucius Junius Brutus*'s Whiggish leanings frequently praise Brutus's stoic nobility in sacrificing his children for the greater societal good. Laura Brown, for instance, writes, "Brutus can be consistently heroic because his merit is everywhere and always tied to his republican virtue."[64] Yet Brutus uses his son as he uses Lucrece—to cement the new regime—creating a structural parallel between the two characters and replaying Lucrece's violation in Titus's form. Multiple moments in the text reinforce the parallelism between Lucrece and Titus. Brutus describes Lucrece, mourning the rape "as if she had lost her wealth in some black Storm!" (1.1.98); Valerius uses similar language to describe Titus's whipping: "How fares this noble Vessel, that is rob'd / Of all its Wealth" (5.2.188–89), he wonders. Both the sexual assault and the whipping are described in terms of lost property. Similarly, just as Lucrece laments her lost honor, "blot[ted]" "with the Blood of Tarquin" (1.1.358), Titus speaks of "my blotted honor" (4.1.469). Titus becomes the play's second Lucrece, Brutus's contemporary Helen, and the sacrifice necessary to realize Brutus's political design.

For some critics, the parallel between Teraminta and Lucrece is more obvious than that of Titus and Lucrece, since both female characters are brutally attacked, Lucrece by an unscrupulous noble, Teraminta by an unscrupulous republican mob. Titus describes Teraminta's appearance after her assault:

> Ha! my Teraminta!
> Is't possible? the very top of Beauty,
> This perfect face drawn by the Gods at Council,
> Which they were long a making, as they had reason,
> For they shall never hit the like again,
> Defil'd and mangled thus! What barbarous wretch
> Has thus blasphem'd this bright Original? (5.1.53–59)

Like Lucrece, she has been defiled, her beauty attacked and soiled. Thus Julie Ellison sees Teraminta as a second victim of a sexualized attack: "In the last act, as in the first, the broken body of a violated woman is the somatic sign of republican rigor. The suicide of Lucrece catalyzed the republican victory over Tarquin at the beginning of the play. At the end, Teraminta enters disheveled and wounded after being tormented (in effect, raped) by 'the mob,' to which she is twice vulnerable, as a member of the tyrant's family and as an illegitimate member of that family."[65] The parallelism be-

tween Teraminta and Lucrece certainly emphasizes the parallels between the two political parties. The mob replaces Sextus Tarquin as a defiler of women, perpetrating the very act that initially aroused its rebellious ire. Yet the play also makes quite clear that Teraminta has *not*, like Lucrece, been sexually assaulted; she has emerged from her encounter with the mob with virginity intact. She will subsequently plead for Brutus's mercy "By all these wounds upon my *Virgin* breast" (5.2.130, emphasis mine). The preservation of Teraminta's chastity emphasizes Brutus's deliberate complicity in the construction of a sacrificial victim for the greater political good. He has "avenged" one victim by creating another.[66]

Throughout the text, Brutus feminizes his son in anger, calling him "fond, young, soft, and gentle" (2.1.381) and demanding that he "shake this soft, effeminate, lazy Soul / Forth from thy bosom" (1.1.229–30). Later, when Teraminta laments her husband's sufferings, she imagines breast-feeding from his abused and broken body. Gazing at Titus's flayed and bloodied form, Teraminta says that she has come

> to pant my last,
> To wash thy gashes with my Farewel tears,
> To murmur, sob, and lean my aking head
> Upon thy breast, thus like a Cradle Babe
> To suck thy wounds and bubble out my Soul. (5.1.83–87)

Citing these lines, Joyce MacDonald calls Titus "hermaphroditic" and writes, "That Titus offers to nourish his lover with his heart's blood also points to the inherent disorder of the masculine body that Brutus would reorganize and rededicate to manhood."[67] What has gone entirely unnoticed by critics, however, is the striking religious subtext of the moment. Titus's act of breast-feeding directly recalls the image of Christ lactating blood familiar from medieval Catholic iconography. Drawing on 1 Peter's assertion that people, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word,"[68] medieval writers frequently "called the wound in Christ's side a breast. . . . Over and over again in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries we find representations of Christ as the one who feeds and bleeds. Squirting blood from wounds often placed high in the side, Christ fills cups for his followers just as Mary feeds her baby."[69] A tradition of such imagery also existed in seventeenth-century English literature. Richard Crashaw's epigram to Luke 11, *Blessed be the paps which Thou hast sucked*, for instance, explicitly employs the image of a maternal and lactating Christ: "Suppose he had been Tabled at thy Teates, / Thy hunger feels not what he eates: / Hee'l have his Teat e're long (a bloody one) / The Mother then must suck the Son."[70] Lee draws on this iconographic tradition and on the image of Christ's bloody teat when Titus imaginatively nourishes his wife with his sacrificial blood. When Teraminta imagines "suck[ing]" on Titus's wounds, she imagines an act of vampirism trans-

formed by Christian iconography into Eucharistic ritual. Given the play's overwhelming anti-Catholicism—when confronted with literal blood drinking in the royalist conspirator's black mass, Vinditius says, "if a man can't go to Heaven, unless your Priests eat him, and drink him, and roast him alive; I'll be for the broad way, and the Devil shall have me at a venture" (4.1.126–29)—it may seem strange that the play's "most virtuous and attractive characters—the Romeo and Juliet of the piece" would themselves engage in a Catholic-style ritual.[71] Here nonetheless is Eucharistic imagery and blood drinking associated not with black mass and sadism, but with Titus's self-sacrificial heroism, certainly complicating the anti-Catholicism of the play. It also challenges again the ethics of Brutus's justice; as a second Lucrece, Titus provides another broken and effeminized body through which power can be affirmed. As a Jesus figure, he dies for the sins of a diseased society and a power-crazed father.

Teraminta's speech marks the third in a series of blood-drinking rituals that merge the image of the monarchy with the image of the commonwealth and recall the chaos and upheaval of civil war. Teraminta, perhaps the most innocent victim in the second half of the play, criticizes Brutus for his cruelty and coldness toward his progeny; she calls her husband the "God-like Son / Of an inhuman barbarous bloody Father" (5.1.51–52). Teraminta comes to despise Brutus, and thus she rewrites the story of Titus's birth: "A wretch so barbarous never could produce thee" (5.1.70), she tells him; "Some God, some God, my Titus, watch'd his absence, / Slipt to thy mothers bed and gave thee to the World" (5.1.71–72). In act 1, Titus tries to free Teraminta from the stain of her parentage by reimagining the circumstances of her conception: "A God thy Father was, a Goddess was his Wife" (1.1.45), he insists, denying her father's paternity. In act 4 the play comes full circle, and Teraminta does the same for her husband, thereby constructing a parallel between the two fathers and suggesting that Brutus is just another Tarquin, another tyrant to take the place of the first. While Brutus initially calls Tarquin a "monster," Teraminta finally accuses Brutus of possessing a "monstrous nature" (5.2.155).[72] Tiberius, too, castigates his father, telling him to "Enjoy the bloody conquest of thy Pride, / Thou more Tyrannical than any Tarquin" (5.1.115–16). Tiberius speaks from his own thwarted ambition, of course, but he speaks truth in this. Brutus, like his royalist counterparts, harnesses the power of human, sexualized suffering and turns his son into an unjustly executed martyr, becoming in the process a "God of Blood" (5.1.103). Thus a true catharsis is impossible for the Roman republic. Brutus may have purged the realm of aristocratic misrule, but he has established a new tyranny in its place.[73] The murder of Titus, while strong enough to cement the empire, cannot heal a public wound first created by Sextus Tarquin and then exacerbated by Brutus's merciless justice.

CONCLUSION

In the end, Lee presents a very different treatment of the Lucrece myth from Rochester's, one more reminiscent of Filmer's *Patriarcha* than Sidney's *Discourses*. Unlike Rochester's *Valentinian*, which finally celebrates the emperor's removal from office, Lee leaves his audience with the specter of a new tyranny to replace the old. Political rebellion does not bring an end to suffering, but instead invites new forms of corruption, violence, and decay. Meanwhile, the sympathetic propaganda of Rochester's Lucina is replaced by the opportunistic propaganda of Lee's Brutus, a form of rhetoric associated not with liberation from tyranny but with an illegitimate and repressive regime. Despite the contemporary censoring of the play, then, Lee offers a critical view of both republican governance and the unethical motivations of those who would transform acts of private violence into public action. As we shall see in the next chapter, however, the political cannot be cleanly separated from the personal. As the Exclusion Crisis itself represented a conflict within a single family, the language of paternalism transformed all civil unrest into acts of intrafamilial violence. Underlying many of the plays in the period is a fear of familial collapse engendering broader societal destruction. Authors combine the rhetoric of rape with cannibalism to question the nature of familial and parental responsibilities in an age of extreme civic unrest.

NOTES

1. According to Jonathan Scott, "the polemical intention of the *Discourses* was to refute Sir Robert Filmer's *Patriarcha*": *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 203–4. Scott has provided the fullest modern discussion of Sidney's life, works, and intellectual legacy. See also Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623–1677* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
2. Algernon Sidney, *Discourses concerning Government,* ed. Thomas G. West (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1990), 543.
3. Ibid., 342.
4. Ibid., 528–29.
5. "Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's Ghost," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. Elias F. Mengel, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 2:7–11, ll. 30–31, 34–35.
6. Ibid., ll. 84–89.
7. Ibid., ll. 92–93, 100–103.
8. Hughes, "Rape," 232–33.
9. Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 33.
10. Ibid., 26, 27.
11. Ibid., 34.
12. H. P., *A Satyr Against Common-wealths* (London, 1684), 5.
13. Ibid., 4–5.
14. Ibid., 5.

15. "A Summons from a True Protestant Conjurer to Cethegus' Ghost, To Appear September 19, 1682," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. Howard H. Schless, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 3:263–66, ll. 11–16.

16. *A Popish Political Catechism: Or, A View of the Principles of the Synagogue of Antichrist, concerning the Power of Kings* (London, 1685), 2.

17. Ibid., 2–3.

18. Ibid., 4.

19. Hughes, "Rape," 232.

20. James William Johnson, *A Profane Wit: The Life of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2004), 206. Harold Love, in contrast, dates the play to early 1675: "The Rapes of Lucina," in *Print, Manuscript & Performance*, eds. Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol (Athens: Ohio State University Press, 2000), 208. For discussion of the play's publication history, see Lucyle Hook, "The Publication Date of Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19, no. 4 (1956): 401–7.

21. J. Harold Wilson, "Satiric Elements in Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Philological Quarterly* 16 (1937): 41. Wilson likens Valentinian's pursuit of Lucina to Charles II's pursuit of Frances Stuart. Likewise, Wilson calls Charles II an "actual prototype" for Rochester's Valentinian": "Rochester's *Valentinian* and Heroic Sentiment," *ELH* 4, no. 4 (1937): 266.

22. Larry Carver, "Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre Research* 3, no. 1 (1989): 25.

23. Harold Love, "Was Lucina Betrayed at Whitehall?" in *That Second Bottle: Essays on John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. Nicholas Fisher (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 188. For a contrasting view of Rochester as Valentinian, see Peter Byrne, "'Where Appetite Directs': Tragic Heroism's Recovery in Rochester's *Valentinian*," *Pacific Coast Philology* 40, no. 1 (2005): 158–77.

24. Charles II, *A Proclamation To Restrain the Spreading of False News, and Licentious Talking of Matters of State and Government* (London, 1672), 1.

25. Ibid.

26. Marina Hila, "'Justice shall never heare ye, I am justice': Absolutist Rape and Cyclical History in John Fletcher's *The Tragedy of Valentinian*," *Neophilologus* 91, no. 4 (2007): 746.

27. *A Gratulatory Poem*, 1.

28. For more negative readings of Lucina, see Byrne, "'Where Appetite Directs,'" along with Arthur Colby Sprague, *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

29. Hila, "'Justice shall never heare ye,'" 753.

30. Byrne, "'Where Appetite Directs,'" 160.

31. Ibid.

32. See also Kirk Combe, who reads this exchange as a condemnation of the falsity of divine right ideology: *A Martyr for Sin: Rochester's Critique of Polity, Sexuality, and Society* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 137.

33. Sidney, *Discourses*, 342.

34. Hila, "'Justice shall never heare ye,'" 749.

35. Some critics have read more ambivalence into Fletcher's attitude toward tyrannicide; see, for instance, Philip J. Finkelpearl, *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). For other readings of the politics of Fletcher's *Valentinian*, see Rebecca W. Bushnell, *Tragedies of Tyrants: Political Thought and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990); Sandra Clark, *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Sexual Themes and Dramatic Representation* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994); and Robert Y. Turner, "Responses to Tyranny in John Fletcher's Plays," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 4 (1989): 123–41.

36. In this, my argument differs fundamentally from Jeremy Webster's; Webster argues that Rochester sympathizes with a monarch "torn between national duty and personal desire": *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 140.

37. William Van Lennep, ed., *The London Stage, 1660–1800*, 5 vols. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960), 1:293.

38. Antony Hammond, "The 'Greatest Action': Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*," in *Poetry and Drama, 1570–1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*, eds. Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond (London: Methuen, 1981), 175.

39. Nathaniel Lee, *Lucius Junius Brutus*, in *Works*, ed. Thomas B. Stroup and Arthur L. Cooke, 2 vols. (New Brunswick: Scarecrow Press, 1954), 4.1.28, 4.1.104. Further references to *Lucius Junius Brutus* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

40. Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, trans. B. O. Foster, 14 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970), 1:83.

41. Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece*, for instance, explicitly refers to Helen as a rape victim.

42. J. M. Armistead, "The Tragicomic Design of *Lucius Junius Brutus*: Madness as Providential Therapy," *Papers on Language and Literature* 15 (1979): 48.

43. Victoria Hayne points out the difference between Brutus's and Titus's descriptions of the impending consummation: "'the pangs of bliss' or 'slimy joys'": "'All Language Then Is Vile': The Theatrical Critique of Political Rhetoric in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*," *ELH* 63, no. 2 (1996): 344.

44. Thomas Heywood, *The Rape of Lucrece. A True Roman Tragedie. With the severall Songs in their apt places, by Valerius, the merrie Lord amongst the Roman Peers* (London, 1608), h3v. Further references to *The Rape of Lucrece* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

45. Catherine Belling, "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge: Bloodletting and the Health of Rome's Body," in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, eds. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 121.

46. Ibid., 125.

47. Sue Owen, "'Partial Tyrants' and 'Freeborn People' in *Lucius Junius Brutus*," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 31, no. 3 (1991): 473.

48. Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 80.

49. For discussion of Lee's Tullia, see chapter 4.

50. Antony Hammond provides a useful commentary on Brutus's Machiavellian tendencies, his "confusion of ends and means" (Hammond, "The 'Greatest Action,'" 181).

51. Joyce MacDonald, "Public Wounds: Sexual Bodies and the Origins of State in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 32 (2003): 232.

52. In contrast, Livy does not place Collatine among the ranks of the conspirators. He writes, Collatine "resigned the consulship and went into voluntary exile at Lavinium, taking with him everything he possessed" (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 91).

53. Vintidius's creation of false omens may offer a comment on the political culture of the late 1670s. As John B. Rollins points out, the year 1678 "would see two lunar and three solar eclipses: astrologers delighted in assigning the most malign of interpretations to these events": "Judeo-Christian Apocalyptic Literature and John Crowne's *The Destruction of Jerusalem*," *Comparative Drama* 35, no. 2 (2001): 215.

54. Hayne, "'All Language,'" 343.

55. According to Gerald Parker, the power of Brutus's language enables his acts of cruelty: "'History as Nightmare' in Nevil Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* and Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*," *Papers on Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1985): 15. Owen, by contrast, is less suspicious of Brutus, arguing that the mob's reaction reveals the legitimacy of Brutus's cause (Owen, "Partial Tyrants," 471). See also Richard Brown, who comments on the strength of Brutus's oratory: "Heroics Satirized by 'Mad Nat. Lee,'" *Papers on Language and Literature* 19 no. 4 (1983): 385–401.

56. According to Livy, a series of wars subsequently plagued the new republic. Lee, however, ignores this historical fact, leaving his audience with a feeling of restoration, safety, and peace.

57. Hila, "'Justice shall never heare ye,'" 756.

58. For further analysis of disease imagery in Shakespeare's poem, see Belling, "Infectious Rape."

59. Hayne, "'All Language,'" 345.

60. Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 33.

61. Owen, "Partial Tyrants," 478.

62. Many critics have commented on Lee's negative depiction of the royalists. Owen, for instance, writes, "The royalists are associated with tyranny, ambition, lust, greed, lawlessness, and Catholicism. While Brutus hopes and prays for peace, they revel in bloodshed" (ibid., 472). In contrast, she claims, Brutus's government looks positively just.

63. Staves, *Players' Scepters*, 245. In this, Lee's language closely follows Livy's: "A king, they argued, was, after all, a human being, and there was chance of getting from him what one wanted rightly or wrongly; under a monarchy there was room for influence and favour; a king could be angry and forgive; he knew the difference between an enemy and a friend. Law, on the other hand, was impersonal and inexorable. Law had no ears" (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 92).

64. L. Brown, *English Dramatic Form*, 76. See also Frances Barbour, who describes Lee as "consistently anti-divine-right and anti-Tory": "The Unconventional Heroic Plays of Nathaniel Lee," *Studies in English* 20 (1940): 116. Other critics profess fondness for the character of Brutus—Antony Hammond calls him "the man of fierce and passionate principle" (Hammond, "The 'Greatest Action,'" 178), while John Loftis defends the "deserved execution" of Titus and Tiberius: introduction to *Lucius Junius Brutus*, by Nathaniel Lee (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), xxii.

65. Julie Ellison, *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 35.

66. See also MacDonald, "Public Wounds," for whom the replacement of Lucrece with Titus reflects the banishment of the feminine.

67. Ibid., 238.

68. 1 Pet. 2:3.

69. Caroline Walker Bynum, "The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages: A Reply to Leo Steinberg," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1986): 427.

70. Richard Crashaw, "Luke 11. Blessed be the paps which Thou hast sucked," in *The Complete Poetry of Richard Crashaw*, ed. George Walton Williams (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1970), 14, ll. 1–4.

71. J. M. Armistead, *Nathaniel Lee* (Boston: Twayne, 1979), 38.

72. J. Peter Verdurmen concurs: "through [Titus and Teraminta], Lee projects the anguish, paralysis and victimization that Brutus, as the controller of their world, makes unavoidable": "*Lucius Junius Brutus* and Restoration Tragedy: The Politics of Trauma," *Journal of European Studies* 37, no. 2 (1995): 83.

73. See also G. Wilson Knight, who is equally critical of Brutus's new republic: *The Imperial Theme: Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies Including the Roman Plays* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931).

Chapter Four

Rape and the Cannibal Father, 1678–1687

In 1679, Protestant Dissenter-turned-Anglican William Allen made an impassioned plea to Protestant Nonconformists, begging them to eschew separatism and return to the Anglican fold: "I would now with a still small Voice speak Peace and Harmony," he tells his reader, "perswade to Unity and Conformity, and Brotherly Love and Affection. . . . I would bring Balm to your Wounds and Ease to your Griefs of Separation."[1] Allen, like Nathaniel Lee's Brutus, positions himself as a doctor come to heal the realm of schism, but in this case, he will do so through peaceful reunification rather than bloodletting: "I come not . . . with Launcets and Razers, to cut and break up the Wounds, or with Probes and Pledgets to search or keep them open; the Wounds of Division and Separation have been sufficiently handled by able and skilful Chirurgions, and now is the time, if ever, to apply a Cataplasm and healing Plaister."[2] Underlying Allen's call to unity is a fear of Roman Catholic deviousness and a belief that the pope will foster divisions within the Protestant Church that he may overtake and destroy it. Working through the pope, Satan will infect the English people with "the Poyson of Pride, of Ambition, of Luxury and Ease, and of false Doctrine. By this means he set them at Variance with one another, the Children against the Father, the Father against the Children."[3] Allen reminds his reader that all good Protestants have "one Father God" and "one Mother the Church," and thus wonders, "Why . . . this Separation?"[4]

Central to Allen's rhetoric is an image of the English Protestant nation as a single family, with monarch and church as parents. He tells his Nonconformist readers that he speaks to them "as a Friend, as a Brother" because they are all one family under God and king.[5] The Dissenters must "Return like the lost Prodigal Son to the Father of your Country, and into the Bosom

of your Mother."[6] He reminds his reader that "the fifth Commandment, *Honor your Father*," also reaches "to your King the Father of his Country."[7] In rebelling against the established church, the Dissenters prove themselves both privately disobedient and publicly treasonous. They represent "a means of the great increase of *Popery* in this Land" and are the worst sorts of "Unnatural and Disobedient Sons."[8] As they defy their father the king, they sexually dishonor their mother, the Anglican Church: "They bespatter her Reputation, they fling dirt in her Face, they endeavor to pollute her Garments, they would render her Odious, Papistical, Ridiculous; they call her Whore and compare her with *Babylon*."[9] Finally, driven by popish plots and treachery, they devour their mother in an act of perverse cannibalism: The Catholic Church will "make you like Vipers, to gnaw asunder the Womb of your Mother, and to eat your way to Separation thorow [sic] her bowels."[10] Cannibal imagery provides a vocabulary for discussing political and religious conflict and divisiveness within the Protestant family.

Allen is not alone in deploying the discourse of cannibalism in his tract. Entwined images of rape, vampirism, and cannibalism, central to the propaganda pamphlets of the English Civil Wars, again pervade anti-Catholic works between the years of the Popish Plot and the Glorious Revolution. *A Bull Sent by Pope Pius* (1678) describes the Catholics as those who "Murder'd their Kings, and Thrones laid desolate" and who "Are flesh'd with slaughter, drunk with steeming blood."[11] They speak with "polluted Lips,"[12] "eat" their Lord "Carnally,"[13] and are guilty of having "plotted against the Blood, Life, and Estates of the Innocents, in Fathering High Treason upon them."[14] They engage in "Poysons, Rapes," and "Massacres" and insist that "Kings are Usurpers" who must be overthrown.[15] As in the English Civil War tracts, the Catholics are accused of committing horrible acts of sexual violence and infanticide, one tract describing how "Women were Ripped up alive, young Children dashed against the Pavement, Embrio's torn from the bleeding Womb, Hoary Hairs stained with Blood, Churches Robbed, Houses Fired, Women Ravished, Virgins Deflowred, and then Murthered with the most exquisite torment."[16] They defile their Lord through the ceremony of the Eucharist: "I will not here put you in mind of the strange absurdities that must follow from this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, *viz.* that Christ, when he did eat and drink in this Sacrament, must have eaten his own flesh, and that the Apostles must have eaten his body."[17] And they support a Church that is "an Association of Monsters, and a Den of Cannibals," filled with "Injustice, Rapine, and Cold-blooded Murder."[18]

The connections between rape, cannibalism, and familial strife are also foregrounded in Baptist preacher Benjamin Keach's 1679 poem, *Sion in Distress: Or, The Groans of the Protestant Church*. As I explained in the introduction to this study, Keach presents an Anglican Church, Sion, that has been symbolically ravished by the evil Catholic Whore of Babylon. Sion

expresses herself with "deep and piercing sobs," and with utmost pathos describes her victimization at the hands of that "*Babylonish Whore*, / Big with a Bastard" and that "*Brutish Whore*! Of *Cannibals* the worse."[19] Here once again we see the propagandistic tendency to juxtapose two women, one martyred, the other monstrous, to dramatize the conflict between religions. Unlike the loving Sion, the Catholic Church is a truly horrible mother, one who teaches her "tender Children to infringe the Law"[20] and encourages her offspring to commit horrible acts of violence: "From Mothers Womb" they will "tear the heart / Of Unborn-Infants; they'll deflour, / Then rip her up in half an hour."[21] Such children delight in disrupting familial relations by forcing wives and children to turn on husbands and fathers. Writing of the Irish massacre, Keach exclaims:

> They made *poor wives* with *husbands blood* to spill,
> And trembling Youths, their aged Parents kill.
> They forc'd the Son to stab his dearest Mother,
> And then one Brother to destroy the other.
> Some they put fast in Stocks, then teach a Brat
> To ripe them, and make Candles of their Fat.
> How many Virgins did they Ravish first?
> Then with their hearts-blood quench their eager Thirst.[22]

The Catholic Church is the ultimate monstrous mother who glories in the creation of unnatural children. She is also explicitly a vampire, and one who sends her children to "*gore* my *Sides* and spoil my *Interest*," to "rend, to tear, and make a spoil of me."[23] Anti-Catholic tracts of the late 1670s and 1680s thus link depictions of rape and cannibalism with disruptions to family structure. Whig authors often accused the Catholic Church of insidiously seeking to turn family members against one another, both on the macrocosmic level of the English Protestant Church fracturing into sects and on the microcosmic level of the individual family. Priests are accused of committing acts of incestuous rape: "A Sisters Ravishment is held no Sin, / With their own Offspring, some have wicked been."[24] Meanwhile the pope orders a

> Nursing Mother sent
> Unto our Church, with this intent,
> Not to be kind to it, but rather
> T'orelay the Babe, and kill the Father:
> 'Tis he, grand Patron of Confusion,
> Who works in Houses Dissolution:
> 'Tis he who, true Arch-Rebel Monger,
> 'Gainst elder Brother sets the younger.[25]

Underlying all of these representations is the fear that Catholicism will destroy families and set children against their parents and one another.

Set in this context, this chapter explores the prevalence of rape and cannibal imagery as metaphors for political and religious disruptions in the drama and propaganda of the late 1670s and 1680s. Between the years of the Popish Plot and Glorious Revolution, combined descriptions of sexual violence and flesh eating encoded a constellation of anxieties surrounding the appropriate relationship between father and child, subject and monarch. For anti-Catholic polemicists, the Church represented a terrifying source of familial angst, one that encouraged children to replace obedience to their fathers (and, by extension, their monarch) with obedience to the pope. Catholic children in these pamphlets represent a source of profound anxiety; they must always be watched lest they turn on and cannibalize their parents. While Tory tracts often downplayed the harmful aspects of the Catholic Church, they, too, employed the rhetoric of the cannibal child, in this case to protest in microcosm the evils of political rebellion. Such tracts frequently demonized the Duke of Monmouth and blamed the period's civic unrest on Monmouth's poisonous ambition to consume his father. In contrast, in a third strain of cannibal rhetoric, Whig polemicists adopted combined images of rape and flesh eating to demonize monarchical absolutism. The evils of disobedient children are dwarfed in many Whig tracts by the far more terrifying acts of the cannibal father, the depraved patriarch who rapes his daughters-in-law before ingesting his sons in a show of brute force. A warning against the dangers of allowing any one man too much power, the sexually violent cannibal father offers a powerful rhetorical corrective to absolutist philosophy. In all of these cases, acts of rape and flesh eating join to interrogate the appropriate role of the father within the family and, by extension, of the monarch within the nation.

As Tim Harris has suggested, contemporary propagandists on all sides of each political divide employed similar language in attacking their enemies, an observation thoroughly borne out in the decade's treatment of rape and cannibal imagery.[26] To examine the political writings of the late 1670s and 1680s is to uncover the repertoire of common tropes that anti-Catholic polemicists and Catholic supporters, Whigs and Tories alike, all shared to depict political and familial atrocity. Onstage, fears of Catholic violence, disobedient children, and paternal overreach overlap and blend nearly to the point of collapsing into one another, often complicating straightforwardly partisan readings of individual dramas. Disrupted parent-child relationships, frequently encoded in the language of rape and cannibalism, are nearly universal in the rape plays of the period. After a broad look, then, at the figurative mayhem in the tracts and plays of these decades—murder, incest, poison, cannibalism, and repeated rapes—the chapter proceeds with a glance back at Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*, along with analyses of Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* (1682) and Lee's earlier play, *Mithridates, King of Pontus* (1678). In each of these texts, relationships between parents and children

have disintegrated, undermining the security of the body politic. Rather than honoring their parents and protecting their children, the parent-child pairs in these plays are poisonous to each other. Children have become "Villains lurking in my blood" for Lee's Brutus (4.1.226), while the language of rape and/or cannibalism figures forth the diseased individual family in the context of the diseased body politic.

The chapter then turns to John Crowne's *Thyestes. A Tragedy* (1681) and Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* (performed in 1678, published in 1687), two plays that contain literal acts of flesh eating.[27] In both cases, rape and parental cannibalism occur as effects of the collapse of familial and societal boundaries that normally preserve the integrity of the political nation. Thyestes's opening act of incestuous rape precipitates the royal family's decline, while Atreus expresses his parental and monarchical authority through acts of murder and forced cannibalism. Atreus becomes the monstrous parent lurking at the heart of the nation, the cannibal father who destroys his realm instead of nurturing it, and he is fundamentally convinced that as king, he has the absolute right to do so. Despite the fact that Atreus is never punished for his foul deeds, the play condemns his behavior with a vision of oncoming disaster. In the persons of Agamemnon and Menelaus, the play foreshadows the endless fighting and dishonorable deaths of the Trojan War, along with the final collapse of the House of Atreus precipitated by Tantalus's and Atreus's cannibalistic atrocities. Belying Crowne's ostensibly Tory politics, therefore, the play registers a fundamental discomfort with the prospect of monarchical absolutism as symbolized by the House of Atreus's toxic familial interactions.

Ravenscroft, in contrast, uses the image of the cannibal father to restore social boundaries and return the nation to rights. While the play was adapted in 1678 as an allegory of the Popish Plot, it was not published until 1687, in the run-up to the Glorious Revolution. While *Thyestes* condemns the cannibal father, *Titus Andronicus* encodes its author's Tory faith in an absolutist philosophy. Throughout the play, Ravenscroft reveals his terror, not of internal disruptions to the family, but of infiltration and disruption from without. Aron's baby and the mutilated Lavinia become twin sources of concern, the products of racial or cultural miscegenation and the results of the foreign infiltration of the Roman homeland. Evidence of sin made visible, Lavinia and the baby are disruptive in life, and thus their deaths at their own fathers' hands are perversely comforting. Aron consumes his child out of existence, while Lavinia is swallowed by her mother Earth, enacting the erasure of instability and corruption. *Titus* concludes with a fantasy of the reestablishment of political boundaries and the reaffirmation of national identity, both of which are conducted through the act of cannibalism. Parental cannibalism thus emerges from the play as a cure for societal ills, underscoring Raven-

scroft's Tory absolutism and praise for James II's new government. England has been stabilized as *Titus*'s Rome has been stabilized, the treachery of foreign outsiders banished and peace finally restored.

THE EXCLUSION CRISIS AND THE POLITICS OF FAMILIAL COLLAPSE

In many anti-Catholic propaganda tracts, authors accuse the Catholic Church of transforming parents into monsters and children into fiends. Familial relationships disintegrate as individuals privilege allegiance to their church over duty to one another. The Church has "absolved children from honouring their indigent Parents," and worse still, "not only natural Parents, but Kings."[28] Catholics honor their "Ghostly DADS," that is, their priests, before their own blood and nation.[29] They also maltreat their mothers; the Catholic priest "Cares not what dirt he throws in his own Mothers Face."[30] In essence, the Catholic hierarchy, "of which the *Pope* is *Father* and *Head*, and *Rome* the *Mother* and *Nurse*" replaces correct and rightful parents in both the personal and the public spheres.[31] It creates a generation of children, which, when it "were fledg," will "peck out the Eyes of [its] Dam."[32] One 1679 tract, *The Popes Down-fall, At Abergaveny*, literalizes this danger in graphic terms when it relates the story of the parricidal John Kirby. According to the tract's author, Kirby, "being a Papist . . . consequently delighted more in the Blood of a Protestant, though it were of his own Father, then the downfall of the Pope."[33] As such, he becomes the figurative devourer of his own father: "The young Proselyte having the Pope in his belly, had a greater Stomach for Blood and Revenge then for Victuals, and long'd more for a cut of his Father's Throat then the mutton."[34] He then performs a real act of physical violence. When his father attempts to reconcile his son to the Church of England, Kirby refuses to listen and obey: "the Son instead of submitting quietly to the Fatherly Correction, snatcht up the Dish, threw it at his Fathers Head, and therewith dasht out his Brains; [his sister] crying out her Father was kill'd, he answered no, his holy Father was alive."[35] Kirby allows the pope to supplant his biological father in his affections and respect, to horrifying and violent consequences.

Anti-Catholic tracts were not, of course, alone in discussing disruptions to familial structure. As Rachel Weil points out, on both sides of the political divide, "Tracts and treatises during the exclusion crisis wound up being saturated with commentary on the family."[36] The Whig preoccupation with popish treachery and disruptions to familial structure provoked by the pope and his minions was mirrored on the Tory side by a preoccupation with disobedient children who would destroy their parents to satisfy their own

ambitions. As the doctrine of patriarchalism transformed all forms of political strife into instances of familial rebellion, "the fear of disorder, expressed through metaphors of familial chaos, was the Tories' strongest polemical card."[37] According to Filmer,

> If we compare the natural duties of a father with those of a king, we find them to be all one, without any difference at all but only in the latitude or extent of them. As the father over one family, so the king, as father over many families, extends his care to preserve, feed, clothe, instruct and defend the whole commonwealth. His wars, his peace, his courts of justice and all his acts of sovereignty tend only to preserve and distribute to every subordinate and inferior father, and to their children, their rights and privileges, so that all the duties of a king are summed up in an universal fatherly care of his people.[38]

As Gordon J. Schochet explains, Filmer had "inextricably united his argument for divine right of kings with patriarchal authority."[39] To disobey the monarch, then, was not only to commit an act of treason, but to violate the fifth commandment.[40]

Contemporary discussions of the child's duty to his father and the subject's to his king inevitably reflected upon the central political crisis of the day, the conflict of leadership within the Stuart family. Joyce Green MacDonald writes, "At its heart, the Exclusion Crisis was a failure of reproductive biology."[41] It also threatened to turn father Charles against son Monmouth and brother Charles against brother James, presaging, fearsomely, a return to the familial chaos of civil war. Thus while Whig discourse condemned the toxic Catholic child, Tories focused instead on the fractious relationship between James Scott, Duke of Monmouth, and his father and uncle. According to Toni Bowers, "Contemporaries were used to imagining the bastard prince as a kind of walking paradox—the personification of all that was lovely and heroic as well as all that was despicable, ungodly, and treasonous."[42] While Whig tracts praised Monmouth for his "Virtue," "Worth," and "beauteous Mind," Tory tracts treated the Duke as a dangerous, parricidal usurper, a Protestant analogue to the Catholic John Kirby.[43] The author of *A Second Remonstrance by way of Address From The Church of England* asks,

> Can we imagine a Person, who has no *Religion* but Debauchery, will be a fit Instrument to Protect or Establish *Truth* and *Piety*? Can we imagine, He, who never sought any thing but his own *private Ends,* will have any generous thoughts for the *Publick*? Can we imagine, He who *Plotted* the death of a *tender* and a *Royal Father,* and prefer'd the Lives of those *Conspirators,* (who seduced him, before the safety of the *King & Kingdom,*) has any sence of *Piety, Honesty* or *Religion* in him?[44]

Monmouth is described as an ungrateful child, “Unworthy of his Prince, whose tender care / For him did every Day and Hour appear.”[45] He has “soar’d with *Icarus* in too high a Sphere, / Ungratefully Conspiring to Ensnare / His Royal Father, and his Uncle too.”[46] And in fostering a rebellion, he has forced other fathers and children to turn on one another. Because of his ambition, “Parents have lost all the sense and tenderness of Nature; and Children, all the Sentiments of Duty and Obedience; the Eternal Laws of Good and Just, the Laws of Nature and of Nations, of God and Religion, have been violated; Men have been transformed into the cruelty of Beasts, and into the Rage and Malice of Devils.”[47] As such, the author of *The Countreys Advice* begs him to “Think on the guiltless Blood you hourly spill / Where Brother Brother, Father Son does kill.”[48] Rebellion against the rightful patriarch leads only to “Treason, Murther, Rape, and Misserie [sic].”[49] Monmouth himself is a sexually violent monster; he “Delights in Sin,”[50] and according to *The Young Bastards Wish, A Song*, proclaims, “next I’ll Debauch the sweet Wife of my Friends, / And ravish ten Sisters where none dare contend: / Each Night a true Virgin shall come to my Bed / If false the next Morning I’ll cut off her Head.”[51] In such tracts, Monmouth serves as the latest manifestation of the debauched Cavalier, sexually violent, dishonorable, and untrustworthy. A “hopeful parricide,” he is also overly ambitious and will destroy his father and his king to gain a crown, first through his participation in the Rye House Plot and later through his aborted invasion attempt.[52]

Images of destructive children also pervade the theater of the period. In Lee’s *Lucius Junius Brutus*, for instance, children are consistently described as a threatening source of social toxicity. Initially Brutus’s favorite child—“I love thee more than any of my Children” (2.1.278), Brutus says—Titus taints himself first through contact with Tarquin’s blood due to his illicit marriage to Teraminta and later through his complicity in the royalist plot. Brutus comes to see his sons as a form of disease lurking within his own body, a pollutant that will enervate and destroy him. Titus and Tiberius become “two Villains lurking in my blood” (4.1.226), and Brutus weeps “To see his Blood, his Children, his own Bowels / Conspire the death of him that gave’em being” (4.1.288–89). Children represent not futurity, but death, and Brutus will turn on and execute his own flesh and blood rather than allow such disease to fester.

The potential for children to become fatal threats to their parents is most powerfully underscored in *Lucius Junius Brutus* by the unseen presence of King Tarquin’s queen, Tullia. A formidable character in Heywood’s earlier play, which begins before the uprising that made Tarquin king, Tullia exists in Lee’s play only offstage. Nonetheless, Tullia’s memory pervades the play, recalling once again the accusations leveled throughout the 1670s at Henrietta Maria, Donna Olimpia, and the Duchesses of Cleveland and Portsmouth,

and representing another dramatic manifestation of the poisonous Catholic bride. Richard Brown directly links the mob's hatred of Tullia with Lee's dislike of Charles II's foreign women: "In Brutus, Tarquin's 'furious queen,' Tullia, allied with the conniving priesthood, suggests Charles's entanglements with Catholic and foreign women who were thought to endanger English security, that is, his Portuguese queen, Catherine, his favorite sister, Henriette, who lived in France, and his French mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth."[53] Unlike earlier poisonous Catholic brides Fredigond and Laula, Tullia does not appear onstage, but she remains a potent and destructive figure nonetheless. It is only due to her intervention, for instance, that Titus joins the rebel faction. Teraminta reveals, "the Queen has Sworn to end me . . . / both [her priests] have Commission / To stab me in your presence, if not wrought / To serve the King" (3.2.106–9). By threatening Teraminta's life and forcing Titus to rebel, Tullia's actions drive the play's denouement, indirectly provoking Titus's execution and Teraminta's death.

It is also Tullia who stimulates the worst of the mob's anger due to her horrifying treatment of her own father. Vinditius rouses the mob practically to a public lynching by reminding them of Fabritius's complicity in the death of the previous king, Tullia's father, whom she helped her husband depose. Fabritius describes his rise to power, first as Tullia's coachman and later as her courtier and pimp: "I was at first the Son of a Car-man, came to the honor of being Tullia's Coachman, have been a Pimp, and remain a Knight at the mercy of the People" (2.1.116–18), he explains. Vinditius then questions Fabritius about his involvement in the regicide:

> Vinditius: Answer me then. Was not you once the Queen's Coachman?
> Fabritius: I was, I was.
> Vinditius: Did you not drive her Chariot over the Body of her Father,
> the dead King Tullus?
> Fabritius: I did, I did: tho it went against my Conscience. (2.1.96–100)

The callousness and cruelty of the murder enrage the crowd, and thus Brutus employs the same story to foment popular support for his rebellion. He recalls the king's

> past Crimes,
> The black Ambition of his furious Queen,
> Who drove her Chariot through the Cyprian Street
> On such a damn'd Design, as might have turn'd
> The Steeds of Day, and shock'd the starting Gods,
> Blest as they are, with an uneasie moment. (2.1.174–79)

Tullia has committed an act of regicide that is also literally a parricide. Driven by an unfeminine and threatening ambition, she has unrepentantly destroyed her father to gain a throne.[54] Brutus subsequently begs the people, "Drive Tullia out, and all of Tarquin's Race" (2.1.227). Ostensibly the ac-

tions of Tarquin, the rapist, have ignited Brutus's rebellion, but only Tullia's deeds are abhorrent enough to warrant special mention. Tullia emerges from the text as an anti-Lucrece, the monster woman who destroys her blood rather than sacrifice for it. Allied as she is with the play's royalist, implicitly Catholic faction, she also represents a dramatic female version of John Kirby from *The Popes Down-fall, At Abergaveny*. Her story, like Kirby's, encapsulates the danger that children pose to their parents. Tullia rises to power by treading both literally and figuratively on the body of her father, an action Tiberius replicates in his own quest to depose Brutus. The children are locked in a mortal battle for supremacy over their parents, echoing at once a Whiggish fear of Catholic excess and a Tory rejection of Monmouth's ambition.

While Brutus's children threaten their father, Brutus proves no less dangerous than they, for he oversees the execution of his sons. Fears of murderous children are thus tempered in many plays and tracts by an equally pressing fear of toxic, poisonous parents. In some tracts, parental evil is the by-product of Catholic malice; if the Church can convince a child to murder his sire, it can also prevail on parents to destroy their offspring. The dangers that Catholic parents pose to their children had long pervaded pamphlet culture. Catherine de Medici, as we have seen, was depicted as a literally poisonous Catholic mother, insofar as she supposedly poisoned her son to satisfy her ambition. Likewise, the Catholic mother of *A rare Example of a virtuous Maid in Paris* (1674) functions as a parental analogue to John Kirby; where Kirby kills his innocent Protestant father, this mother kills her innocent Protestant daughter. Upset by her daughter's religious dissent, the ballad's mother reveals the girl's heresy first to her extended family and then to the Parisian authorities:

> With weeping and wailing,
> her mother then did go,
> To assemble her Kinsfolks,
> that they the truth may know,
> Who being then assembled,
> they did this maiden call,
> And put her into prison,
> to fear her there withal.[55]

Finally, a judge orders the girl's execution and the mother repents, but too late to save her child. The poem thus suggests that Catholic parents are as untrustworthy as Catholic children. It also reveals the extent to which civic unrest and religious dissension transform the domestic sphere into a fraught and dangerous space, subject to horrifying acts of violence.

More often, however, depictions of murderous parents reflect a broader Whig discomfort with tyrannical fathers as symbols of absolute monarchy. As we saw in chapter 3, some Whig theorists argued that the rapist monarch

earned his overthrow, a concept directly countered in Bohun's Preface to Filmer's *Patriarcha*. According to Bohun, wives, children, and servants never have the right to rebel against their patriarch. He acknowledges that opponents of patriarchal theory invoke the right to self-defense to defend rebellion, asking, "Suppose the Father of a Family in the state of Nature should in a mad or drunken fit go about to kill or maim himself, or one of his innocent Children, can any body think this were rebellion against the Monarch of the Family for his Wife to rescue her innocent Child or self out of his hands by force, if she could not otherwise make him be quiet?"[56] Even in such a case, Bohun concludes, the subordinate has no right to rebel, as society would be torn apart by the rupture of revolt: "What horrible confusion must this introduce into all Societies to give Inferiours a power to judge their Superiours mad or drunk, and thereupon to resist and oppose them with force."[57] Subjects may use persuasion to sway their patriarch—"Wives, Children, and Servants that are dutiful have ways to appease their *Monarchs*"—but they may not lay hands on him.[58] As Bohun points out, the consequences of rebellion, of unleashing an anarchic mob, are far more detrimental than the consequences of a single child harmed. Thus even a rapist or murderous monarch cannot be stopped. Bohun poses the question, "Must I sit still and suffer my throat to be cut, my Estate ruined, my Wife ravished, and not dare in any case to defend my self till God is pleased to interpose, and that in an Age in which Miracles are Ceased?"[59] Yes, he replies, as political upheaval

> can onely serve to fill the World with Rebellions, Wars, and Confusions, in which more thousands of Men and Estates must of necessity be ruined, and Wives Ravished and murthered in the space of a few days, than can be destroyed by the worst Tyrant that ever trod upon the Earth amongst his own Subjects in the space of many years, or of a whole life.[60]

The life of the individual child or subject is worth less than the health of the body politic. To depose a sexually violent king is to expose many more unfortunate innocents to mob violence.

In contrast to Bohun, Whig political philosophers of the period were extremely interested in defining the limits of parental—and by extension, monarchical—authority. The father's role is to nurture, not destroy, his progeny, these authors rebut. According to Rachel Weil, "The idea that the family exists for the benefit of children (rather than for the benefit of fathers, or the keeping of order) became so deeply rooted in the writings of Whig thinkers that it was assumed rather than defended."[61] A child, James Tyrrell argues, does not have to submit uncritically, even unto death, to an unfit ruler. Tyrrell writes, he "would be glad to know where and how God hath given this Absolute power to Fathers over their Children, and by what Law Children are tyed to an Absolute Subjection or Servitude to their parents. . . . I see

no divine Charter in Scripture of any such absolute despotick power granted to *Adam* or any other Father."[62] The father has no right to kill his offspring: he "has no more right over the Life of his Child than another man; being as much answerable to God if he abuse this Right of a Father, in killing his innocent Son, as if another had done it."[63] Instead, it is the father's responsibility to care for and protect that child: "in his Children he is chiefly to design their good and advantage, as far as lies in his power, without ruining himself."[64] If the father becomes violent, the children have the right to self-defense: "it is lawful for the Children to hold, nay binde their mad or drunken Parents, in case they cannot otherwise hinder them from doing mischief, or killing either themselves, their Mothers, or Brethren."[65] For Tyrrell, a father gives life but may not cause death; the "danger of fathers injuring their children is greater than that of children becoming over-enthusiastic about their own rights."[66] If a father proves unfit to rule, he may morally be stopped, stripping "away [Filmer's] biblical support for the father's power of life and death."[67]

Although John Locke did not publish his *Two Treatises of Government* until 1690, the text grew out of the political climate of the 1680s, and it articulates a concept of fatherhood highly relevant to a discussion of that decade. Taking the concepts of divine right and paternal authority to their furthest conclusions, Locke suggests that the doctrine of absolutism licenses any number of societal evils, up to and including infanticide and cannibalism. Such parental behavior is entirely unacceptable, as evidenced by God's wrath at the Canaanites, who sacrificed their children in religious ceremonies:

> They shed innocent bloud even the bloud of their sons and of their daughters when they sacrificed unto the Idols of Canaan. . . . The Land was polluted with bloud, therefore was the wrath of the Lord kindled against his people in so much that he abhorred his own inheritance. The killing of their Children, though it were fashionable, was charged on them as innocent bloud, and so had, in the account of God, the guilt of murder, as the offering them to Idols had the guilt of Idolatry.[68]

As we saw in the introduction to this volume, Locke also condemns the people of Peru, who "begot Children on purpose to Fatten and Eat them."[69] Although for Locke, upstanding Englishmen should reflexively recoil from such "savage" acts, cannibalism functions as the reductio ad absurdum of absolutist rhetoric. Should you allow a father unlimited authority over his children or a king unlimited power over his subjects, you tacitly permit them to commit even cannibal atrocities. Locke continues,

> Be it then as Sir Robert says, that Anciently, it was usual for Men to sell and Castrate their Children. . . . Let it be, that they exposed them; Add to it, if you please, for this is still greater Power, that they begat them for their Tables to fat and eat them: If this proves a right to do so, we may, by the same Argument, justify Adultery, Incest and Sodomy, for there are examples of these too, both Ancient and Modern; Sins, which I suppose, have their Principal Aggravation from this, that they cross the main intention of Nature, which willeth the increase of Mankind, and the continuation of the Species in the highest perfection.[70]

Tyrrell also invokes the image of cannibalism (in this case, of animals eating their young) to describe an imbalanced relationship between parents and children: "all Animals are determin'd by Nature, to prosecute and endeavour the Common Good of their own Species."[71] Once they have children,

> they love and defend, as part of themselves, unless some unusual Distemper intervene, which may sometimes disturb or change these natural Propensions; as when Sows or Rabbets [sic] eat or destroy their young ones; which happening but seldom, is rather to be accounted among the Diseases of the Brain, or Distempers of the Appetite, than to be ascribed to their natural State or Constitution.[72]

Locke's absolutist cannibal father thereby contrasts with the Catholic or ambitious cannibal child; the child who would destroy his parent is mirrored in the parent who would devour his young.

STAGING INTRAFAMILIAL CONFLICT: OTWAY AND LEE

Conflicts between destructive parents and poisonous children play out on the stage as a way for authors to engage with contemporary political movements. If Lee's Tullia and Tiberius represent murderous children, Brutus is all too eager to murder his children to cement his own power. A similar conflict structures Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*, as Otway invokes the language of rape to describe intrafamilial conflict and condemn a father who declines to protect his child. In marrying Jaffeir, Belvidera has disobeyed her father, Priuli, who views her elopement as a form of theft. "You stole her from me, like a Thief you stole her, / At the dead of night," he accuses Jaffeir.[73] He also treats the marriage as a form of disease, an infection in his body:

> But then, my onely child, my daughter, wedded;
> There my best bloud runs foul, and a disease
> Incurable has seiz'd upon my memory,
> To make it rot and stink to after ages.

> Curst be the fatal minute when I got her. (5.1.5–9)

As a result of Belvidera's marriage, Priuli has grown jealous and vindictive, becoming what Philip Harth terms "an inhumane father."[74] First, he curses his child with poverty and barrenness—"A steril Fortune, and a barren Bed, / Attend you both" (1.1.53–54)—and then he uses his political authority to order the removal of all her worldly possessions.[75] According to Derek Hughes, Pierre transforms "the removal of the bed into a metaphor of the prostitution of Jaffeir's marriage."[76] I would suggest, however, that Pierre actually describes the confiscation using the language of rape, or in William H. McBurney's words, "the domestic variant of the national rape."[77] He calls the soldiers who perform the confiscation "The sons of public Rapine" (1.1.234), and he explicitly sexualizes the removal of Jaffeir and Belvidera's bed:

> The very bed, which on thy wedding night
> Receiv'd thee to the Arms of *Belvidera*,
> The scene of all thy Joys, was violated
> By the course hands of filthy Dungeon Villains,
> And thrown amongst the common Lumber. (1.1.245–49)

Belvidera's reaction to the loss also implicitly suggests sexual assault. She "came weeping forth, / Shining through Tears" (1.1.258–59). Thus when Pierre and Jaffeir swear vengeance, their actions recall Lucrece's death scene in Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*. Pierre invokes the image of Belvidera's sufferings to manipulate Jaffeir as Brutus does his supporters. Pierre tells Jaffeir,

> Man knows a braver Remedy for sorrow:
> Revenge! the Attribute of the Gods, they stampt it
> With their great Image on our Natures; dye!
> Consider well the Cause that calls upon thee:
> And if thou art base enough, dye then: Remember
> Thy *Belvidera* suffers: *Belvidera!* (1.1.286–91)

Jaffeir, like Brutus's companions, swears allegiance on the life of the violated woman (in this case, Belvidera), and promises, like Collatine, "I will revenge my *Belvidera's* Tears!" (1.1.255).

Even before the play's first act of actual sexual violence, then, Belvidera has already been metaphorically and financially ravished by her own father. Priuli has violated his duty to protect his daughter, figuratively raping her and sowing in the process illness and rebellion in the realm. From the beginning of the play, parent/child relationships have become fundamentally corrupt—this is a world "Where Brother, Friends, and Fathers, all are false" (1.1.253)—and they grow worse as the play continues. Jaffeir acknowledges that open rebellion will force him to confront and potentially harm the father (in-law) he should honor. He tells his co-conspirators, "if you think it worthy / To cut the Throats of reverend Rogues in Robes, / Send me into the curs'd

assembl'd Senate; / It shrinks not, tho I meet a Father there" (3.2.220–23). Later, his willingness to use Belvidera as collateral to ensure his position among the conspirators is described in the language of corrupt parenthood. Jaffeir characterizes himself as his wife's child, not her husband: "every moment / I am from thy sight, the Heart within my Bosom / Moans like a tender Infant in its Cradle / Whose Nurse had left it" (3.2.17–20). Belvidera extends the simile, representing her husband as a toxic child who brings destruction to the mother who gave him life:

> I fear the stubborn Wanderer will not own me,
> 'Tis grown a Rebel to be rul'd no longer,
> Scorns the Indulgent Bosom that first lull'd it,
> And like a Disobedient Child disdains
> The soft Authority of *Belvidera.* (3.2.22–26)

Just as Jaffeir will commit parricide against Priuli, he will also commit matricide (metaphorically speaking) against his wife.[78]

As Belvidera aligns herself with the wronged parent in her conversation with Jaffeir, she also treats rebellion as a very great evil for both family and state. She tells Jaffeir,

> Murder my Father! Tho his Cruel Nature
> Has persecuted me to my undoing,
> Driven me to basest wants; Can I behold him
> With smiles of Vengeance, butcher'd in his Age?
> The sacred Fountain of my life destroy'd?
> And canst thou shed the blood that gave me being?
> Nay, and be a Traitor too, and sell thy Country? (3.2.155–61)

Here we see Otway's Tory politics in play in ways less explicit than the crude sexuality of the Nicky-Nacky scenes: Rebellion against an individual parent is as horrifying and unacceptable on the local level as political revolt. Jaffeir is contemplating both an act of treason against the state and an act of treason within the family, and both are worthy of condemnation. The righteousness of Jaffeir's actions is further undermined by the fact that Priuli's "rape" of Belvidera is always metaphorical and is, indeed, primarily financial. Such an assault pales before the sexual violence of Renault, which is real and physical and which threatens to transform Belvidera into a latter-day Lucrece. In the aftermath of Renault's attempted assault, Belvidera explicitly invokes the Lucrece myth:

> the old hoary Wretch, to whose false Care
> My Peace and Honour was intrusted, came
> (Like *Tarquin*) gastely with infernal Lust.
> Oh thou *Roman Lucrece*!
> Thou could'st find friends to vindicate thy Wrong;
> I never had but one, and he's prov'd false. (2.1.5–10)

The conspirators and not the senators play the role of Tarquin, suggesting that rebellion and not obedience leads to true misery. Subsequently, her description of mother/child suffering as a consequence of civil war recalls the ever-present imagery of the Irish Rebellion. She laments

> the poor tender lives
> Of all those little Infants which the Swords
> Of murtherers are whetting for this moment;
> Think thou already hearst their dying screams,
> Think that thou seest their sad distracted Mothers
> Kneeling before thy feet, and begging pity
> With torn dishevel'd hair and streaming eyes,
> Their naked mangled breasts besmeard with bloud. (4.1.48–55)

Rebellion against father and rebellion against country are dangerously equivalent, and both lead to devastating suffering and carnage.[79]

Venice Preserv'd has, of course, rightly been read as an allegory of the Popish Plot and treated, often alongside Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, as an example of the most virulent Tory propaganda. According to John Robert Moore, "It is against the party of Shaftesbury that every line of contemporary satire in *Venice Preserv'd* is directed."[80] Harry Solomon likewise calls the play "court propaganda designed to discredit inflammatory Whig rhetoric and to win moderate Whigs to the Tory cause,"[81] while David Bywaters explains that the play "presents a consistent and thorough attack on the Whigs, on the City they misgoverned, and on the plot they manipulated to their ill purposes."[82] Certainly, the "double assault on Shaftesbury" in Renault and Antonio, along with the internal corruption of the conspiratorial faction, suggests the rightness of Tory loyalty.[83] I would agree with Jessica Munns, however, that "the play cannot be reduced to a mere piece of Tory Whig-bashing."[84] The degradation of parent-child relationships in the play produces an anxiety that defies a monolithic political reading, adopting aspects of both Tory and Whig political propaganda. The failure of parent-child relations has sparked the rebellion, with intractable fathers and disobedient children equally to blame for societal destruction. Thus while Priuli and Belvidera reconcile, albeit too late to save her life, the play ends with Priuli's advice to fathers to be less unforgiving: "bid all Cruel Fathers dread my Fate" (5.1.539). As in the world of *Lucius Junius Brutus*, the parents and children have grown toxic to one another, with fathers ravishing daughters and sons seeking to murder their sires. While *Lucius Junius Brutus* urges bloodletting as a cure for disobedience, however, *Venice Preserv'd* ends instead with a plea for intergenerational tolerance and understanding—an understanding that goes beyond political leanings—as a preferable alternative to the bloodshed of civil and intrafamilial war. Parents and children

(along with subjects and their kings) must finally and irrevocably put aside their differences for the sake of peace, both in the individual household and in the wider realm.[85]

The conflict between destructive parents and poisonous children is also apparent in Lee's earlier *Mithridates*, as the discourse of disrupted parent-child relationships combines with the discourse of rape and cannibalism. Jealous of his son Ziphares's relationship with the beautiful Semandra, and angered by Ziphares's greater popularity with the common people, King Mithridates comes to distrust and despise his son. When the crowd celebrates Ziphares's martial success, Mithridates bitterly fumes, "Perish the Bodies that went forth to meet him, / A prey for Worms, to stink in hollow ground. / O, Viper! Villain! not content to take / My Love, but Life! wilt thou unthrone me too?"[86] In his anger, Mithridates constructs a parallel between two forms of perceived property crime, one personal, the other political; because he believes that Ziphares has usurped his rightful mistress, Mithridates assumes that an attempt on his throne will soon follow. He thus renames civil war "Bosom-war" (50), suggesting that for Lee, as for the propaganda authors, civil war divides the national family against itself. Implicit in this image is also the belief that children are a part of their parents, and that for the child to turn on the father is to become an infection conspiring against the will and health of the whole. Like *Lucius Junius Brutus*'s Brutus, Mithridates treats his children as diseased limbs which must be excised that he might survive. Confronted with the true personal and political treachery of his younger son, Pharnaces, Mithridates exclaims, "Pharnaces, / I'll cut thee off, as an infectious limb" (53). Ziphares, meanwhile, becomes his father's figurative rapist—"Die, die, thou Ravisher of my Repose" (35), Mithridates commands—and finally the cannibal that consumes him out of existence. Although eating imagery is initially employed positively to describe Ziphares's gratitude to his father—he promises that he will "devour your hands with Filial dearness" (25)—it later encodes parricidal impulses. Like William Allen's Catholic children who devour their own mother's womb, Ziphares becomes his father's "Bosom-wolf" who vampiristically "laps my dearest blood" (33).

While Mithridates is threatened by his children, he proves just as deadly to his progeny. Pharnaces complains that his father has stolen his mistress and Ziphares's, echoing Mithridates's claim that such a usurpation cannot be tolerated. "She knew my love, before she saw my Father" (16), he says of Monima, his beloved. "For in the Plunder I first lighted on her: / Tho afterwards he took my beauteous spoil, / As now he does my Brothers" (16). Pharnaces insists that Mithridates, despite being father and king, does not have the right to intrude on his subject's (or his son's) rightful property. Recalling Algernon Sidney's rhetoric of rape and tyranny, Pharnaces argues that in turning sexual tyrant, Mithridates has licensed his own overthrow. The king further oversteps himself when he rapes Semandra. In the aftermath

of the assault, she likens him to "a Dragon in his Den," an "Aspic" and a "Baslis[k]" (46), suggesting that he has become a poisonous monster that disfigures his victim. "The temper of her Soul is quite infected," Ziphares complains. "The catching Court-disease, / Has spotted all her white, her Virgin Beauties" (44). Ziphares has confused the stain of rape with the stain of infidelity, but Semandra has been metaphorically spotted nonetheless, disfigured by contact with Mithridates's poisonous soul. Finally, the king poisons his own children to death: "Blame not the guiltless," he tells Archelaus, "for by me he's poyson'd: / By this inhumane Tyrant, Monster, Parricide; / By me the Drugs were mixt, and dol'd about / To my unhappy Children" (76). The play judges this act truly horrible. Earlier, Semandra had warned Mithridates against taking such action, horrified that he might "design [Ziphares's] Death, . . . / reap the Bloody Harvest of his own Life, / And, Atreus-like . . . feed on [his] own Bowels" (22). As the children feed vampiristically on their parent, the father metaphorically ingests the flesh of his progeny.

At the end of the play, Ziphares and Semandra dream of a utopian paradise in which positive parent-child relationships are possible. Semandra prays that

> we'll be wedded too
> In th'other World; our Souls shall there be mixt:
> Who knows, but there our joys may be compleat?
> A happy Father, thou; and I, perhaps,
> The smiling Mother of some little Gods. (74)

Such a happy realm is impossible in the world of *Mithridates*. The "bleeding Country" has not yet healed from Mithridates's tyranny and the Roman takeover (68). Indeed, when the Romans invade the town, Pharnaces begs Pompey to "mow off hoary Heads, hurl infants puling / From the lug'd breast, kill in the very Womb: / To Beauties cries be deaf" (66). In imagery once again reminiscent of the English Civil War tracts, Pharnaces rejoices to see pregnant women assaulted and parental relationships destroyed in the womb. The destruction of parent-child relationships emerges as both the cause and the product of civil war. It also reflects both Whig fears of the poisonous parent and Tory fears of the destructive child, locked in a battle for political and social supremacy.

CROWNE'S *THYESTES* AND THE HORRORS OF THE CANNIBAL FATHER

While Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* and *Mithridates* and Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* all contain images of inappropriately violent parents, depictions of the cannibal father appear most literally in John Crowne's *Thyestes* and Edward Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus*, two plays that include actual acts of intrafamilial cannibalism. As we shall see, Ravenscroft uses images of cannibalism to discredit Whig philosophy and reinforce the rightness of unlimited monarchical authority. Crowne, in contrast, offers a scathing criticism of Tory ideology and an argument against absolutist rhetoric. Despite the fact that at the time of *Thyestes* Crowne was making a living as a Tory playwright, the play promotes a political philosophy more akin to Locke's or Tyrrell's than Bohun's or Filmer's.[87] In 1681, the year Crowne published *Thyestes*, two prior adaptations of the play were already in circulation. Jasper Heywood's *The Seconde Tragedie of Seneca entituled Thyestes faithfully Englished* (1560) offered a fairly literal translation of the Latin text and was, as critics have suggested, particularly influential on later Elizabethan dramatists, including Shakespeare.[88] More closely contemporaneous with Crowne was John Wright's *Thyestes A Tragedy, Translated out of Seneca* (1674), also a relatively faithful translation, although it is attached to his satirical *Mock-Thyestes, in Burlesque*. Unlike these earlier authors, Crowne does not offer a direct translation of the text, and his changes to the work ultimately bespeak his concerns with the state of contemporary politics. Most obviously, the play contains many broad moments of traditional anti-Catholicism. The prologue begins by referring to the contemporary political climate, as Crowne ironically links theatrical skill with the tricks of Roman Catholic prelates: "To day like cunning Romish Priests we try / If we can awe you, with an antient lye," he writes, playing on the traditional antitheatrical association of Catholicism with the stage.[89] He reiterates that association in the epilogue when he commands the audience, "But pray let Poets live, for they no ways / Offend you with damn'd Plots, but in their Plays" (56). Crowne highlights the distinction between the honest living he earns as a playwright and the pope's false living earned by playing on people's credulity and fear. Priests "invade the Poet's Property" (60), while Crowne is, he claims, "like the Pope" insofar as they both "regard not much your praise, / He Tickets sells for Heaven, and we for Plays" (prologue). Crowne will use theater to entertain and enlighten; the pope will use a very different sort of theatrical art to dupe and confuse.

Anti-Catholicism also filters into the play proper in Philisthenes's lengthy, by now clichéd tirade against Atreus's priests. In lines original to Crowne's adaptation, Philisthenes claims that priests are always liars, for it is

their "Trade to lye, you live by lies" (42). "You Cheats," he calls them, "you Murderers, you Quacks of Hell, / You keep mankind diseas'd to vend your Drugs" (42). They are, he continues, sexually lascivious and untrustworthy: "You keep the Keys of Womens Chambers too, / And let men have what share in 'em you please: / When you deliver up a Marriage Lock, / You still reserve a Key for your own use" (43). They care more about monetary gain than spiritual welfare; should the king swear allegiance to "th' infernal Gods, / For money you wou'd aid their hellish Vows, / And curse all honest men that wou'd not aid. / Religion's made by you a Lottery book" (43). They corrupt the king with their evil ways and poison the nation: "The King was cur'd of his disease, Revenge. / And you have sold him some Religious lye, / Has poyson'd him with Cruelty again" (42). And finally they become the king's court-appointed murderers: "ever while you live call Priests," Philisthenes complains bitterly, "If you wou'd have a solemn murder done" (46).

Of even more concern to the play's world, however, and a greater threat than that posed by the priests (who are, after all, only acting at Atreus's behest), is the collapse of familial relationships precipitated by an act of fatherly overreach, and a disruption of boundaries between Self and Other. Crowne's *Thyestes* begins in the aftermath of two horrifying familial tragedies: Tantalus's murder and roasting of his son, Pelops, and Thyestes's incestuous rape of Aerope, his brother Atreus's loyal wife. From the earliest moments of the text, the play diverges from its Roman predecessor, as the Aerope of earlier versions deceived her husband willingly. Seneca's Atreus complains that

> Wife and kingdom, he
> took both. Our ancient
> symbol of power
> he took by deceit. . . .
> The traitor
> dared something huge, he
> took my wife to help,
> he took my ram. . . .
> No part of the family is free
> from traps. My wife is
> corrupted.[90]

Crowne's Aerope, by contrast, is the victim of her brother-in-law's illicit lust, and she protests her innocence throughout the play: Aerope tells Atreus, "I have ever been your faithful Wife, / And ne're deserv'd to lose that glorious Name" (27). Thyestes himself will later admit to the rape: "I ravish'd her, and Hell did ravish me" (40). Thyestes usurps Atreus's wife's body along with his throne, two forms of property crime that enrage and madden the king.

Atreus does not, unfortunately, believe his wife when she tells him she was raped. He expects that, like her Senecan counterpart, she slept with his brother willingly, an act of consensual incest rather than rape. When Aerope becomes distressed at the sight of Thyestes, Atreus can only interpret her anxiety as desire: "the Whore commits / Incest in fancy with the Villain here, / Before my Face: The very sight of him / Has got her Spirit big with Insolence" (39–40), he says, treating their mutual gaze as a species of illegitimate sexual contact. Aerope continues to protest her blamelessness—"I never yet dissembled with the King" (27)—and she insists that if her body is stained, her fundamental being remains pure and untouched. "The Heavens are not so spotless as my Soul. . . . Yet am I thought a Strumpet, nay a lew'd / Incestuous monstrous Strumpet!" (23). Her body, she explains, is like a ruined building—"You build new Palaces on broken Walls" (28), she tells her husband when it appears he might forgive her—but it houses a spotless soul. She also separates her whorish form from pure spirit, calling herself "A shining Strumpt and a tatter'd Wife" and "a hot flaming whore" (25). Aerope thus emerges from the text as a unique character in the annals of Restoration drama: a rape victim who wants to live. Unfortunately, her failure to play Lucrece and kill herself undermines her claims to virtue, and she is forced to spend the play fighting, finally unsuccessfully, against the ideological pressures demanding her death.

While *Thyestes* begins in the recent aftermath of an incestuous rape, it also begins in the distant aftermath of an act of parental cannibalism, fundamentally entwining three discrete evils. In the play's opening scene, Megara the Fury taunts the ghost of Tantalus as he watches what has become of his house. She tells him that as the original cannibal father, he has cursed his family to suffer from "Incest, Treason, Blood" (1), and points out that Atreus has become fatally poisonous: "Nature's diseas'd and scar'd at his approach; / Trees shed their Leaves, as poyson'd men their Hair" (2). She also attributes the evil natures of Atreus and Thyestes to Tantalus's fault: they are "The greatest proof of *Tantalus* his blood" (8). Tantalus therefore laments the effect that his actions have had on his progeny. "Return me to my dark dire Prison in Hell" (2), he begs, rather than be forced to watch the coming destruction. He knows that punishment for his sins will be visited on his descendants and that he has been the prime mover of the disease that now pervades the kingdom.

Atreus, too, knows that the world has grown ill, that he, like Settle's Fredigond and Chlotilda, has both been poisoned and become poisonous: "My gaping aking wounds can ne're be cur'd" (4), he tells his servant. He has been undone by his father's misdeeds, his brother's treachery, and his wife's supposed lust, and he has been consumed by a "Feaver of Revenge" (10). In contrast, Thyestes laments his own complicity in bringing the world to such a state: "How cou'd I carry such a load of sin / And feel no pain?" he

wonders (30). To rape Aerope, he realizes, was to poison her, disfigure her beyond recognition, and engender a social sickness that cannot be eluded. "I was the first that brought / Incest and Treason to my Brother's Court / From my own self came all my Villainy" (30). Unlike Atreus, Thyestes does not consider his sin inborn, the inescapable consequence of his father's actions. Rather, he wonders whether his environment may have proven toxic, leading him to villainy: "Perhaps I felt no sin, because I liv'd / In the'Element of sin, my Brother's Court" (30). Drawing on the Chorus of the original play's valorization of simple living over court life—"When my days have passed / without clatter, / may I die / old and ordinary," the chorus prays—Thyestes abjures the dangerous intrigue and complexity of the court and argues that even the best of men may grow corrupt when inexorably poisoned by the atmosphere of the court.[91] In this, Crowne subtly invokes the trope of the debauched Cavalier/libertine, accusing the court, however obliquely, of the same sorts of evil deeds that pervade Shadwell's play or Settle's.

Ultimately, however, the twin evils of rape and cannibalism merge in the play's world to infect future progeny, destroy the sanctity of parent-child relationships, and transform all pregnancies into monstrous births. Fear of maternal monstrosity permeates the text, with Atreus in particular growing obsessed with dangerous mothers; because his wife has been (involuntarily) unfaithful, Atreus cannot trust in the paternity of his children and he treats them as potential monsters disfiguring his household. He tells Antigone, "By heavens, thy Mother was so rank a Whore, / That it is more than all the Gods can tell / What share of thee is mine" (5). His wife, he explains, is worse than monstrous:

> Why in her stead was I not doom'd to love
> Some gastly, grim, devouring, Hellish Fury;
> Whose Hairs were Serpents and her breath a plague;
> Whose Bones were Gibets, and her Nerves Iron Chains;
> Whose Eyes were Comets, and her Voice was Thunder;
> Whose Teeth were Hooks all gor'd with humane blood;
> Whose Flesh and Blood was a devouring bog,
> Compounded of all poisons in the world?
> In her abhor'd embrace I had not found
> So many Deaths and Hells as I do now. (6)

Atreus refers to his children by Aerope as "these damn'd incestuous Brats / . . . the irruptions of a burning Whore" (5), while his own mental torment, "this hellish mind / Was the creation of that cursed woman" (6). Meanwhile, he has also grown monstrous in his hatred and has begun to destroy the family line. "Oh I am mad, I burn" (9), he exclaims. "Furies with flaming brands are in my breast: / Their Snakes with their own poyson almost burst; / And every Vein o' mine contains a Snake" (9). Like Settle's Fredigond, his blood has been tainted, suggesting that for Crowne, the figure of the poison-

ous Catholic bride has been supplanted by the even more destructive figure of the cannibal father. In such a world, a world where "Brother whor'd Brother's Wife" and "Brother depos'd Brother from his Throne" (1), poison is everywhere, so widespread as to make snakes proud. Megara triumphs,

> Let me have Murders, such as all my Snakes
> May rear themselves to see, and hiss Applause.
> The Father eat the Nephew he begot;
> The Bastard Nephew go out of the World,
> A way more horrid than he came into it. (2)

Even nature has sickened to the point that it can only breed monstrosity. Megara tells Tantalus,

> Let the vast Villainy of thy damn'd Race
> Reach, and confound the Heavens; make the night
> Engender with the Day; the groaning Day
> Bring forth Gygantick darkness at full Noon,
> Such as for hours may pluck the Sun from Heaven.
> At this black Feast, I'le let thee be a Guest,
> Devour thy fill in quiet, when thy Cup
> Flowes with the Blood of thy incestuous Race,
> Nothing shall dare to snatch it from thy Lips. (2)

In imagery reminiscent of William Allen's and Benjamin Keach's contemporary propaganda tracts, Megara combines references to nature's decay with images of inappropriate parentage, monstrous children, and a cannibalistic banquet, finally foreshadowing the play's denouement. In such a society, only monstrous births are possible.

For the world of *Thyestes*, as for the worlds of *Mithridates* and *Lucius Junius Brutus*, the toxin that poisons the kingdom is precipitated at least in part by the collapse of familial boundaries and by parental inability to treat children as entities separate from themselves. When Thyestes rapes Aerope, he commits an act of incest, an act that fundamentally damages the boundary between Self and Other; at least on the sexual level, family members are meant to remain Other. Once that first boundary is breached, others begin to falter. Thyestes, for instance, imagines himself committing an act of incest with his native land. Upon seeing his homeland again for the first time in years, he exclaims,

> Oh! wondrous pleasure to a banish'd man!
> I feel my lov'd, long look'd for Native Soyl;
> My former Incest (horrid to be nam'd)
> Gave me not greater pleasure, than this new
> Innocent Incest with my Mother Earth. (35)

Although this second instance of incest is purely metaphorical, it reflects the way in which Thyestes continues to sexualize familial relationships. He is altogether unable to separate his personal desires from the familial Other.

The collapse of familial boundaries extends to the play's parent-child relationships. Some critics have disparaged Crowne's addition of the love plot, arguing that Crowne included it to pander to Restoration audience tastes: according to Arthur Franklin White, "The taste of Crowne's time demanded a 'love-interest' in tragedy."[92] Thematically, however, the love plot is crucial to the play, as it reflects the extent of the societal collapse precipitated by rape and culminating in cannibalism. Like Thyestes, Atreus cannot discern the boundary that should separate parents from children. Because Philisthenes is Thyestes's offspring, Atreus views him as an extension of his hated father, and equally as poisonous. Philisthenes initially tries to distance himself from his father's ill deeds. When Thyestes laments that "Thou wilt derive unhappiness from me, / Like an hereditary ill disease," Philisthenes insists, "Sir, I was born when you were innocent, / And all the ill you have contracted since, / You have wrought out by painful penitence" (31). He has not been compromised by his father's actions. Atreus, however, does not agree and first uses Philisthenes as bait to snare Thyestes, then kills him in retribution for his father's crimes. Atreus explains his reasoning to a defiant Philisthenes:

> Philisthenes: Why have you order'd me to be thus bound?
> Atreus: To dye.
> Philisthenes: For what?
> Atreus: Thou art *Thyestes* Son.
> Philisthenes: That's not my fault.
> Atreus: But a damn'd fault of his,
> To dare to multiply his cursed self,
> And send a filthy and incestuous Stream
> To poyson all the Ages of the World;
> But here it stops. (44)

For Atreus, Philisthenes is indistinguishable from his father, a copy of Thyestes's original and a poisonous waste product to be destroyed. He cannot conceive of Philisthenes as an independent entity apart from his father and thus treats him as fair game in the battle between brothers: "I cannot wound thy Father, but through thee" (45), he tells Philisthenes.

Likewise, Atreus cannot separate his daughter, Antigone, from himself and his own will. While Atreus is initially suspicious of Antigone's parentage, it quickly becomes clear that she is his flesh and blood and that as such, he can only view her as an extension of himself. As is the case with Lee's Brutus and Mithridates, who are shocked to realize that their children can be

their enemies, Atreus firmly believes that his daughter is a copy of himself, his will, hers. Thus he is blindsided by her supposed treachery, that she dared to love without consent the man Atreus bid her wed. He complains,

> Oh! my murder'd hopes!
> I thought this Maid
> Had Vertues wou'd support our failing House;
> I thought o' her side I was thunder proof,
> And she's as false as any of our Race,
> A Traytress to her Father and her King. (52)

Antigone's love for Philisthenes is the ultimate betrayal: "Hast thou abus'd me so?" Atreus demands (52). She has proven herself Other by her love—"She's none of mine" (52), he subsequently tells Thyestes—and when her life is no longer worth anything to him, he tries to kill her. This is not merely a father punishing his daughter for matrimonial disobedience; rather, Atreus is stunned to realize that any boundary exists between the two, that Antigone is Other and not Self, that she has an interiority he cannot predict and control (insofar as she has obeyed the letter but not the spirit of his commands).

In response, Antigone spends the majority of the play seeking to undermine and flee the imposition of her father's will. In pledging herself to Philisthenes, she seeks to deepen an interiority that marks her as separate from, as Other than, her father's Self. In response to Atreus's demand, "How durst thou, Traytress, love my Enemy," Antigone responds, "He had more worth than all our Race besides, / None of our Race did e're deserve to live, / But this sweet Youth, and me for loving him" (52). She and Philisthenes alone, Antigone insists, deserve to live and thrive, for they have not been tainted by the sins of their fathers; indeed, she claims that in direct opposition to their parents, "Our warring Fathers never ventur'd more / For bitter hate, than we for innocent Love" (14). Antigone seeks, like *Lucius Junius Brutus*'s Titus and Teraminta or *Mithridates*'s Ziphares and Semandra, to divorce herself from her father and avoid the poison in his family line. She replaces Atreus with Peneus in her affection: "I'le be disposed of, *Father*, as you please" (14, emphasis mine), she tells him, calling Peneus father and agreeing to submit to his will rather than Atreus's. In the end, Antigone outsmarts her father, definitively asserting her will through suicide. Antigone will not wait to die by her father's hand (as does Lavinia in Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus*), but instead performs her death on her own initiative. She tells Atreus, "I have so wounded my obedience, / By loving that dear Youth without your leave, / That 'tis too weak to hold my mighty grief, / Which forces me to dye without your leave" (53). As she has loved without Atreus's permission, she will die without his permission. In this, Antigone's death thematically mirrors that of *Valentinian*'s Lucina, who dies in a final expression of force. The suicidal gesture is self-denying, but a gesture of will nonetheless, and in direct contrast to the treatment of poisonous children in

Tory propaganda, her disobedience is celebrated. As in Rochester's *Valentinian*, resistance to an unfit ruler is both necessary and good, and Antigone is heroic in her quest to defy an evil father and monarch.

Contrasting with Antigone is her lover Philisthenes who, unlike Antigone, is less keen to reinforce boundaries within the family; where she replaces and distances, Philisthenes adopts and combines. He honors his connection to his own father, calling himself "One you may trust, / half your own self" (31), and he later celebrates the reunification of his fractured family. Indeed, he is all too willing to accept Atreus as the "Father of my Father" (19) and to make Atreus's will his own. Atreus becomes, at least temporarily, a second father to Philisthenes: "Sir, I wou'd call you,—cou'd I speak for Tears, / Father,—and giver of my best new life" (21). Appropriately then, while Antigone proves her autonomy with her suicide, Philisthenes becomes literally one with his father through the act of cannibalism. Several critics have worked to establish a theoretical understanding of cannibalism both as a physical reality and as a metaphorical construct. For Jeff Berglund, to ingest another human being is to collapse definitively the boundaries of Self and Other and to absorb the Other into one's own being:

> Consumption by another collapses identity boundaries: in being consumed, *You* become *Me*, *I* become *You-Me*. Figuratively, cannibalization threatens one's sense of integrity. Being cannibalized makes one estranged from one's familiar self/selves. In sum, cannibalization makes the familiar unfamiliar. At the same time it threatens to make the unfamiliar familiar. It erases difference through the collapse of boundaries. This fear of losing one's self to another alien culture is also the force responsible for projecting cannibalistic behavior onto others, in what I have referred to as a classic moment of "Othering."[93]

Philisthenes merges with his father through ingestion, the Other becoming the Self, and once Thyestes learns the truth, he is loath even to kill himself, "Lest I in my own bosom stab my Son" (50). Thyestes's child has become a physical part of him, causing Atreus to triumph, "Confusion I have in thy bowels made" (50). Initially, Thyestes breached the boundary between brothers with his unlawful rape. Atreus tells Thyestes, "Thou with my Children wou'dst have treated me, / But that thou wert afraid they were thy own / Incestuous Bastards all" (51). The rape makes Atreus's children indistinguishable from Thyestes's (and renders Antigone's relationship with Philisthenes potentially also incestuous); the two brothers cannot be told apart as parents. Now Atreus, in the ultimate expression of monarchical will, punishes his brother by forcing him to merge with his own son. The evils sown by rape/incest are reaped in the act of cannibalism—the physical realization of all such inappropriate commingling.

At the end of the play, Thyestes dies, murdered by Aerope, his initial victim. As in Settle's *Love and Revenge*, no one has been willing to avenge Aerope's suffering. She begs Atreus, "Not as you are my Husband, but my King . . . / To bring my innocence into the light" (39), but her husband is deaf to her suit. Thus Aerope must become Philomel, taking her moment of revenge and resigning herself to the suicide that will finally prove her innocence. She stabs Thyestes, exclaiming,

> This for the loss of my dear Husband's Love:
> This for the loss of my dear Daughter's Life:
> This for the ruin of my honest Name:
> This for my Life I am about to lose.
> Now I have done my self this little right,
> I can with comfort dye! (54–55)

Aerope then dies while Atreus, despite his evil acts, lives on. Atreus has taken revenge at the expense of family and nation and become the dramatic embodiment of Locke's cannibal father (albeit one who forces other fathers to eat their young, rather than indulging in cannibal acts himself). The banquet represents to Atreus a combined assertion of imperial and fatherly prerogative, a prerogative reaffirmed by the play's lack of poetic justice. Atreus will not be punished for his crimes, indeed cannot be punished in a society where monarchical will is absolute.

This is not to suggest that Crowne finally approves of Atreus's actions. Despite Atreus's belief in his absolute authority, the state of nature at the end of the play exhibits the extent to which he has overstepped and underscores the play's closing political message. Aerope announces, "I was with my two little pretty Sons . . . / When of the sudden, with a thousand groans, / The Air brought forth a monstrous Shade, as black / As Hell had vomited a Lake of Pitch" (54). As Atreus has led both House and nation to more and greater suffering, nature has given birth to its own monstrosity. Meanwhile, the audience is left with the knowledge that Atreus's sons will inherit the throne only to suffer the carnage and destruction of the Trojan War. Peneus prophesies that

> Prince *Agamemnon*, Oracles agree,
> Shall lay a glorious Empire in the Dust,
> And *Menelaus* be the chiefest Cause.
> But yet no Oracle did utter this
> Without ill-boding sounds. (7)

One of these children will, like his father, be condemned to the shame of an unfaithful wife. The other will, like his father, become a monstrous parent in his own right, murdering a daughter in the quest for bloody revenge. Here, then, is the Whig fear of absolutism made horrifyingly literal, belying Crowne's Tory politics and revealing the extent to which patriarchal over-

reach is a fearsome thing indeed. The play's grotesque carnage offers a warning against unfettered absolutist philosophy; rape and cannibalism merge with monarchical tyranny to precipitate political and social destruction.

DEFENDING ABSOLUTE MONARCHY: RAVENSCROFT'S *TITUS ANDRONICUS*

Turning now to Ravenscroft's adaptation of *Titus Andronicus*, the last play of the period to feature a scene of parental cannibalism, we find a very different treatment of the cannibal father. Although *Titus Andronicus* is perhaps the most famous play of the period to feature a scene of onstage flesh eating, it represents in many ways a deviation from the other plays examined in this chapter. First, the play was published almost a decade after its initial performance, an unusually long interval for the period. That the play was resurrected for publication in the lead-up to the Glorious Revolution underscores Ravenscroft's political project. To glorify James II and reassure audiences that the kingdom has been purged of disruptive foreign influences. To that end, images of parental cannibalism in the play bespeak not societal and familial corruption, but as we shall see, the comforting banishment of that corruption. Additionally, unlike the other plays examined in this chapter, *Titus Andronicus* offers an uncritically positive view of monarchy and treats intrafamilial cannibalism as a way to achieve social stability, not attack it. The play begins with a fulsome dedicatory panegyric of James II that clearly establishes Ravenscroft's Tory credentials. He calls James "a Prince whose personal Virtues render him Great, not only by Nature Endow'd, but by Experience taught; a Prince whose Life from his Cradle to his Coronation, was spent in the School of Virtue; and every Action, whilst a Subject, was a Noble Lesson for succeeding Princes to Learn and imitate."[94] Ravenscroft praises the continuation of legitimate monarchical succession, honors James for his virtue in suffering, and celebrates his triumph over his foes. He then traces the line of Stuart kings and praises their individual virtues: "Live, My Lord, in the Service of a Prince whose Descent cannot be parallel'd, if we but turn back our thoughts to the Monarchs of his Race, that have rul'd the English Scepter: The first was James the Learned, the next Charles the Pious, the third Charles the Mercyfull, and now Reigns JAMES the Warlike and the Just" (dedication ll. 37–42). Ravenscroft explicitly juxtaposes Charles II with James II and considers their individual merits as rulers. As Charles was known for his mercy, James will be remembered for his justice.[95]

Titus Andronicus begins when racial, religious, and political foreigners, the Goths, gain entrée into Rome. For Ravenscroft, as was the case with Edward Howard in *The Usurper*, the presence of outsiders at the heart of the Roman Empire initially bespeaks Roman triumph and imperial might. Tamora and her sons have been captured and brought back to the city as trophies of war, and they provide evidence of Titus's superior Roman martial prowess. Tamora even acknowledges that she was "brought to *Rome*, To Beautify thy Triumphs" (1.1.43–44). Despite the Roman military victory, however, parent-child relationships have been destablized in the aftermath of the war with the Goths. First, Titus has ordered the murder of Tamora's son in retribution for his own lost children. Later, when his son disobeys his orders, he willingly becomes his child's executioner, explaining, "My sons would never so dishonour me" (1.1.291). As happens to Lee's Titus and Ziphares, the disobedient child quickly earns the punishment of the treasonous. The successful conclusion of the foreign war does not settle—and indeed, creates—turmoil as father turns on son and brother wars with brother.

The disruptions within the Roman family are further exacerbated when Tamora marries into the imperial clan, effecting an invasion and takeover from within. Saturninus is sexually attracted to Tamora, and thus he inappropriately elevates her status as prisoner.[96] He tells her, "Madam tho' chance of war has brought you here, / You come not to be made a scorn in *Rome*, / Princely shall be your usage Every way" (1.3.95–97). Later, after being shamed before the nation with the loss of Lavinia, Saturninus marries Tamora in a deliberate rejection of Roman women. The archetypal Roman maiden, "*Romes* bright Ornament" (1.1.51), Lavinia has rejected Saturninus, and thus he hastens to make Tamora "Empress of Rome" instead (1.1.51). For Naomi Conn Liebler, Tamora's absorption into the Roman world suggests a redefinition of Roman identity: "Tamora and her sons, former prisoners of war, are absorbed into Roman (or neo-Roman) identity, and the distinction of 'Roman' from 'non-Roman' is no longer persuasive, no longer even possible. Tamora's empowerment enables her to avenge her son's death, but she does so as a new-made Roman."[97] I would argue, in contrast, that Tamora cannot and never does become Roman. Even as he promises to make her his empress, Saturninus still refers to Tamora as "thou Majestick *Goth*" (2.1.34); her ethnic identity is not forgotten or abandoned when she marries, and her presence persists in symbolizing the destructive intrusion of ethnic outsiders into Rome.[98] In postcolonial terms, the periphery has invaded the homeland and will work to destroy it from within.

To accomplish fully their destructive aims, the Goths engage in three acts of illicit sexuality: an exogamous marriage, a sexual assault, and an extramarital, interracial affair. Each of these acts emphasizes the dangers of political invasion—of allowing foreign Others too much access to and control of the domestic Self—and contributes to the disruption of relationships between

parents and children. Unlike Timandra of Howard's *The Usurper*, Ravenscroft's Tamora functions as an archetypal poisonous Catholic bride, a violent and sexually alluring foreigner who is also a "blot and Enemy to our general Name" (3.1.186). That "polluted Empress" (5.3.50), along with her sons and fearsome lover, will infect the nation from within and unsettle the foundations of Roman society.[99] Much like Settle's Fredigond, Tamora subsequently encourages a rape. When Chiron and Demetrius assault Lavinia, rape simultaneously represents an attack on Lavinia as individual, on Lavinia as Titus's child, and on Lavinia as symbol for the Roman nation.[100] In destroying Lavinia's beauty, Chiron and Demetrius are simultaneously striking blows at Lavinia, at Bassianus, at Titus, and at the Rome that has defeated them and paraded them through the streets in disgrace. Lavinia's body becomes a contested site, her suffering, the symbol of Rome's (and by extension, England's) political woes. Underscoring Ravenscroft's depiction of Lavinia, however, is his wider concern that alien influences will infiltrate, penetrate, dismember, and destroy the homeland. To rape Lavinia, Aron explains, is to "make Invasion on a Princes right" (2.1.284). The rape serves as a metaphor for inter- and intranational conflict. Sexual violence, that is, represents another species of imperial conquest, while Lavinia becomes the unfortunate victim of a clash in nationalities, a vessel to be broken in service of revenge. Her body is polluted both by the rape—she "passes beyond the verge of exogamy when she is raped by her father's enemies"—and by the possibility that she has conceived an illegitimate (and hence monstrous) child.[101] Such a baby would disrupt the Andronicus family lineage, destroy Lavinia's value as a potential Roman mother, and represent a horrifying hybrid of Roman and Goth.

At the same time, the rape of Lavinia is treated as a perversely cannibalistic act, linking the acts of rape, vampirism, cannibalism, and ultimately, Catholic ritual. When Aron manipulates Chiron and Demetrius into attacking Lavinia, he compares the act of sex to the act of eating. Sharing a woman, he tells them, is much like sharing a meal: "How stand your Eager appetites affected? / Wou'd each have her all, all to himself, / And not allow the other to breakfast with him?" (2.1.311–13). Ravenscroft draws on Shakespeare's hunting imagery—"What, hast thou not full often struck a doe / And borne her cleanly by the keeper's nose?" (1.1.593–94), Demetrius asks, comparing the act of rape to the act of poaching—and merges it with the image of feasting: "You intend her then but for a running-Banquet, / A snatch or so, to feed like men that go a hunting" (2.1.316–17), Aron says.[102] These words prefigure the banqueting scene at the end of the text, when human bodies are literally consumed. They also blend the rape of Lavinia with Eucharistic ritual. When the Goths imagine feeding on her body, they transform her, perversely, into the Host; she becomes the sacrificial victim in a deviant and unholy Mass.

Ultimately, however, a hybrid child will be produced not by Lavinia's body, but by Tamora's, and Ravenscroft thereby constructs an imaginative parallel between Lavinia's rape and Tamora's interracial transgression. More so than for Shakespeare, the specter of miscegenation in Ravenscroft is meant to enrage and sicken. Shakespeare's Tamora gives birth to her child during the course of the play, in the interval between acts 3 and 4, and its existence represents primarily a political threat. The nurse tells Aaron, Chiron, and Demetrius, "She is delivered, lords, she is delivered" (4.2.62). According to the nurse, the child represents "Our empress' shame and stately Rome's disgrace" (4.2.61), not merely because the child is Aaron's, but because Tamora would gladly pass off the child as Saturninus's heir. As a result, Royster names the child "a foreign invader . . . the product of Tamora's and Aaron's transgression against Saturninus's authority, and, by extension, a transgression against Rome."[103] The child offers proof of Tamora's infidelity and represents the haunting possibility of illegitimacy diverting appropriate lineal descent.

In contrast, the baby in Ravenscroft's play is not the product of an extramarital affair, nor does Tamora intend it as a potential claimant to the throne. The nurse tells Chiron and Demetrius that Tamora "in Secret / . . . was deliver'd after your Royall Father dy'd" (5.1.12–13). Tamora bore the child in the interval between the death of her Gothic husband and her marriage to Saturninus, so when Chiron insists (following Shakespeare's original) that his mother will "dye by the Emperours rage" should the baby be discovered (5.1.79), his fear is provoked not by Tamora's adultery but by her "monstrous" interracial desire. The child's very existence motivates the characters to murderous rage. According to Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, "the disgust over the adultery, the miscegenation, and the actual blackness of Aron and the child exceeds greatly anything found in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*."[104] In both Shakespeare's and Ravenscroft's versions of the play, the child is described as "Black and loathsome" (5.1.12), "black / and dismall" (5.1.29–30), "Accursed" (5.1.32), and "foul and black" (5.1.51). Ravenscroft adds several other, even more powerfully negative descriptions of the baby, calling it "this black brat, / This Babe of darkness" (5.3.138–39), and "the Hellish infant" (5.3.178). The child represents a powerful shame and a threat to Roman culture. Thus Aron will taunt his listeners, calling the child "That Little thing where *Moor* and *Goths* combin'd" (5.3.220), knowing that its mere mention will appall the Roman establishment. Tamora, the poisonous Catholic bride, has given birth to an infectious monster child. The corrupt blood made possible by Lavinia's rape manifests itself in the birth of Aron's baby.

Taken together, Tamora's marriage, the rape of Lavinia, and the birth of the biracial child symbolize the infiltration and corruption of Rome through illicit forms of sexuality. If Lavinia is contaminated by her encounter with

Chiron and Demetrius, sexual contact with Aron is also treated as a form of staining. Bassianus tells Tamora, "Believe me Madam, your Swarthy *Cymerion* / Has made your Honour of his bodies hue, / Black, Loathsome, and Detested" (3.1.78–80). The pollution of Aron's skin color, he claims, bleeds onto and taints Tamora. Later, Lucius imagines Aron as a suffocating sickness: "What dost avail to call thy self a Sun, / That art so muffl'd in black clouds, / The steams that rise from blood, hang round thee like a fog" (5.3.77–79). Aron's skin is the contagious and poisonous miasma of ill health, the disease infecting the empire, the illness festering in the heart of the nation. The poison of rape merges ideologically with the infectious dangers of racial and ethnic impurity.

Ravenscroft's play thus begins with the penetration of the Other into the homeland, underscoring the author's anxiety about the Catholic presence in England. Rome (and, by extension, England) has allowed dangerous influences to fester within its boundaries. The result of such reverse colonization[105] will be a bloodied, wrecked, and dismembered nation (via Lavinia) or monstrous unions and horrific hybrid births (via Tamora). For the rest of the play, however, Ravenscroft works to overcome and banish these threats to the nation. While the play initially stages acts of sexual corruption through rape and miscegenation, it also works to expel these toxins, first by exposing and later by digesting the threat, literally and figuratively. The specter of the outsider is banished from the city, "a visible purgation of evil from Rome," and a fantasy of national purity reestablished.[106] Shakespeare's play, by contrast, concludes with an image of international union, as the Goths band together with the Andronici to fight Saturninus and his hated queen. According to Shakespeare, Lucius joins with the Gothic army. In David Willbern's words, "The Andronici were rejected by the city they shed blood to defend, and both take revenge on that city by joining with the enemy from whose attacks they once protected her."[107] Lucius promises his father, "Now will I to the Goths and raise a power, / To be revenged on Rome and Saturnine" (3.1.300–301). Later, Saturninus learns that Lucius has become the "general of the Goths" (4.4.68) and hears from Emilius that

> The Goths have gathered head, and with a power
> Of high-resolved men bent to the spoil
> They hither march amain under conduct
> Of Lucius, son to old Andronicus,
> Who threats in course of this revenge to do
> As much as ever Coriolanus did. (4.4.62–67)

Although the Goths were once Titus's mortal enemies, they join with the Andronici to help overthrow the tyrant. For Virginia Mason Vaughan, such cooperation represents the "triumph of the colonized people and the establishment of a new Rome" that invites and privileges commingling.[108] Shake-

speare's play concludes with "a loss of racial and cultural purity," as Roman and Goth unite in mutual dislike of Saturninus and Tamora and a newly hybridized Roman state emerges.[109]

No such union occurs in Ravenscroft's text. In his note to the reader, Ravenscroft promises to correct the imperfections of Shakespeare's play, which he describes as "rather a heap of Rubbish than a Structure" ("To the Reader," ll. 12–13).[110] In having his Lucius join with Titus's former legions, Ravenscroft corrects one such perceived flaw: why should the Goths betray their queen for the hated Andronicus family? Ravenscroft's Lucius instead finds support amongst Titus's old regiment:

> The old Legions too by *Titus* late brought home,
> Without the City make their Randevouze;
> Within the People cry Revenge aloud,
> Revenge for the wrong'd *Titus* and his slaughter'd Sons.
> To them the Army Ecchoes with Loud shouts,
> Long live Lucius Emperour of Rome. (5.1.197–202)

Saturninus concurs, acknowledging, "He is the darling of the Souldiers, / Him they did hope should be *Romes* Emperour" (5.1.204). For Ravenscroft, the Goths remain the external enemy driven to destroy Rome and do not transform into a friendly, unified populace.

Ravenscroft's desire to avoid cultural mixing is also apparent in his treatment of Aron's capture. In Shakespeare's play, Aaron is betrayed by a Goth, one of Lucius's soldiers, who captures Aaron out of loyalty to his commander. The Gothic soldier privileges his duty to the Roman Lucius over his ethnic and national identity. Ravenscroft's Aron is also betrayed by a Goth, but for revenge. Aron has murdered a nurse, wife of the Goth who captures him:

> The Nurse that only knew this secret deed—
> This morning dy'd, but with her parting breath
> Declar'd the secret to my Wife her frend.
> And bid her bear this issue to the *Moor*—
> Who wou'd reward her for't—and so he did:
> For she no sooner had perform'd the trust,
> But he his dagger struck into her heart,
> And Bore away the Child in's Arms.—
> I was not then far off, and knew it well.
> And therefore follow'd him with these my friends.
> Seiz'd him in flight, and bring him bound to you. (5.3.37–47)

The Goth comes upon Aron not accidentally as in Shakespeare—Shakespeare's Goth explains, "suddenly / I heard a child cry underneath a wall. / I made unto the noise" (5.1.23–25)—but in a deliberate act of vengeance. He

is a renegade Goth, a defector, not a member of a sympathetic Gothic army. Thus Ravenscroft's play maintains the national boundaries that Shakespeare's play elides.

Most notably, however, Ravenscroft reaffirms national integrity through the digestion both of Lavinia and of Aron's child, those lingering twin specters of cultural corruption. Lavinia's shamefully dismembered body is removed from sight and entombed within the vault of the Andronici. She is, in essence, swallowed by the womb-like earth, imaginatively paralleling the ingestion of Aron's baby. "Like the Earth thou has swallow'd thy own encrease" (5.3.158), Titus tells Aron, directly connecting the deaths of Lavinia and the baby as two perversely cannibalistic moments.[111] Meanwhile the Goths are definitively destroyed. As the architect of evil and the physical embodiment of diseased Otherness, Aron receives the harshest punishment. Ravenscroft's Lucius decrees that Aron shall be both tortured and burned. "It was decreed he should expire in flames, / Around him kindle streight his Funeral Fire. / The Matter is prepar'd, now let it blaze: / He shall at once be burnt and Rack'd to death" (5.3.270–73). Aron is not only executed, but incinerated, his threatening physical body reduced to ashes. At the same time, it is not enough for Tamora merely to kill her child; Aron tells his captors, "She has out-done me in my own Art— / Out-done me in Murder— Kill'd her own Child. / Give it me—I'le eat it" (5.3.232–34). Ravenscroft's Aron cannibalizes his son, reabsorbing the baby into his own being and destroying any trace of its physical existence.[112] Ravenscroft's revision thus demonstrates his almost hysterical revulsion at the idea of the baby and, by extension, his revulsion for the concept of miscegenation. The baby must be ingested and then the physical body of Aron himself burned out of existence for order to be reestablished. In another variation of Lee's Roman blood purge, the infected must bleed and the source of contagion be destroyed before the social order can reassert itself.[113]

When Aron ingests his child, then, his act of violence represents, perversely, the reaffirmation of Roman sovereignty and the reestablishment of racial purity. As we have already seen, the act of cannibalism, like the acts of rape and miscegenation, combines the Self with the Other in ways that disrupt both the individual and the polis. For the Romans to engage in cannibalism would be to participate in another instance of threatening cultural mixing. Ravenscroft therefore emphasizes that cannibalism is a Gothic act. While the Romans compel the Goths to feed on one another, they do not themselves partake of human flesh or allow the Goths into their own bodies by ingesting them. Rather than disrupt the boundary of Self and Other, the acts of cannibalism in Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* work to reaffirm separation. Aron and Tamora eat their own children, reabsorbing Goth into Goth and dividing the foreign Other from the Roman Self. The baby's threatening presence is destroyed as it is ingested by the parent who gave it life, consum-

ing and thereby banishing the specter of Otherness from the political realm. Here, then, the cannibal father serves to reaffirm rather than attack national sovereignty. In sharp contrast to Crowne's *Thyestes*, where acts of cannibalism presage societal destruction, Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* celebrates the rejuvenation of Roman strength, as acts of forced cannibalism shore up the ruling regime rather than undermine it.

In the end, the grotesque and graphic acts of violence that conclude Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus*—torture, infanticide, cannibalism—are also perversely comforting; the play completes its ideological trajectory with the reaffirmation of Roman national integrity and the eradication of any and all lingering signs of personal, racial, religious, and territorial rape. Beginning with infiltration by the Other, the play concludes with the reassertion of Roman control, allegorically an image of Protestant reunification and the expulsion of Catholic (Gothic) poison. If Crowne concludes with a fearsome and destructive act of paternal overreach, Ravenscroft offers instead a fantasy of boundaries reestablished and the xenophobic pleasure of national, familial, and racial purity renewed. This is not, as in the case of Howard's *The Usurper*, a vision of the homeland improved by foreign and feminine influences, but, in essence, a fantasy of ethnic blood purge with cannibalism as the terrifying yet reassuring culmination. Taken together, *Titus Andronicus* and *Thyestes* unequivocally demonstrate how the entwined imagery of rape, disease, and cannibalism underscores anxieties surrounding familial integrity and the sanctity of boundaries as England headed into the Glorious Revolution, while nonetheless stressing alternatives—two opposite sets of possibilities—for an end to the period's political unrest.

CONCLUSION

To examine the propaganda and drama of the late 1670s and 1680s is to realize the fluidity and universality of rape and cannibal imagery in the writings of the period. Whig and Tory, anti- and pro-Catholic polemic all invoke the rhetoric of intrafamilial cannibalism to protest political enemies. Similar crossovers persisted after the Glorious Revolution, as Whigs and Tories continued to employ conflicting yet broadly overlapping forms of atrocity narrative to attack their enemies. As we shall see in chapter 5, in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, images of destructive familial relationships merged with the rhetoric of male violation. While Whig supporters of William and Mary used rape imagery to defend the overthrow of tyrants, Tory supporters of James treated William and Mary as the poisonous ravishers of their own father. Fears of the cannibal father were thus subsumed by the no less strategically terrorizing figure of the father-as-victim.

NOTES

1. William Allen, *A Friendly Call, or a Seasonable Perswasive to Unity* (London, 1679), 3.
2. Ibid., 4.
3. Ibid., 8.
4. Ibid., 9, 10.
5. Ibid., 2
6. Ibid., 51.
7. Ibid., 53.
8. Ibid., 59, 40
9. Ibid., 40.
10. Ibid., 45.
11. *A Bull Sent by Pope Pius*, 1.
12. *A Seasonable Memento, For all that have Voyces in the Choyce of A Parliament* (London, 1681), 1.
13. *The Rise and Fall Or Degeneracy Of The Roman Church* (London, 1680), 14.
14. *A Memorial of the Late and Present Popish Plots* (London, 1680), 4.
15. Oldham, *The Jesuits Justification*, 1.
16. Oates, *A Balm*, 18. For similar commentary, see also AntiPapist, *Fair Warning To take heed of Popery* (London, 1679); Thomas Barlow, *Popery: Or, The Principles & Positions Approved by the Church Of Rome* (London, 1683); Lewis Du Moulin, *A Short and True Account Of The Several Advances The Church of England Hath made towards Rome* (London, 1680); and Titus Oates, *A Balm presented to these Nations, England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London, 1680).
17. Horneck, *The Honesty of the Protestant*, 62.
18. *Salus Britannica: Or, The Safety Of The Protestant Religion* (London, 1685), 3.
19. Keach, *Sion in Distress,* 3, 6, 7.
20. Ibid., 25.
21. Ibid., 85.
22. Ibid., 96–97. For other contemporary representations of the Irish and Parisian massacres, see also *A Short Disswasive From Popery, And From Countenancing and Encouraging of Papists* (London, 1685); Ezerel Tonge, *Jesuitical Aphorismes* (London, 1679); and James Ussher, *Bishop Ushers Second Prophesie Which He delivered to his Daughter on his Sick-Bed* (London, 1681).
23. Keach, *Sion in Distress*, 4.
24. *News from Rome*, 3.
25. *The Common-Hunt, Or, The Pursute of the Pope* (London, 1679), 3. Similarly, the author of *The horrid Popish Plot Happily Discover'd* points out that the city of Rome was founded on an act of fratricide: "*Rome's* Founder by a *Wolf* ('tis said) was nurs'd, / And with his *Brother's blood* her Walls at first / He cemented": *The horrid Popish Plot Happily Discover'd* (London, 1678), 1.
26. Tim Harris articulates usefully the lack of political coherence underpinning Restoration political culture: "This rhetoric was not used solely by the whigs in the context of the popish plot. From the early 1660s, and throughout Charles II's reign, we find concerns being expressed about the security posed by authorities to people's 'lives, liberties and estates' by nonconformist groups protesting against religious persecution. The exclusionist whigs employed this rhetoric, I shall argue, fully aware of the very powerful resonance it had for nonconformists. What is interesting, however, is that for the nonconformists the greatest threat to liberty seemed to come not so much from an absolutist crown, which at times showed itself willing to use its prerogative powers to secure toleration, but from parliament. What has never been noticed is that the tories also used this rhetoric quite extensively during the early 1680s; they were eager to portray themselves as the true defenders of English liberties guaranteed by law, but for them the threat to liberty and property was posed by the whig and nonconformist

challenge to the government in church and state": "'Lives, Liberties and Estates': Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II," in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, ed. Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 218–19.

27. Derek Hughes calls the proliferation of dramatic cannibal imagery "a sign of the deep trauma accompanying the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis": "Human Sacrifice on the Restoration Stage: The Case of *Venice Preserv'd*," *Philological Quarterly* 88, no. 4 (2009): 368.

28. William Lloyd, *Seasonable Advice To All Protestant People Of England* (London, 1681), 20.

29. Mercurius Hibernicus, *A Pacquet Of Popish Delusions, False Miracles, and Lying Wonders* (London, 1681), a4r.

30. *The Pharisee Unmask'd* (London, 1687), 6.

31. Monsieur Jurieu, *Le Dragon Missionaire: Or, The Dragoon Turn'd Apostle* (London, 1686), 14.

32. Gilbert Coles, *A Dialogue Between A Protestant and A Papist* (Oxford, 1679), a3r.

33. *The Popes Down-fall, At Abergaveny* (London, 1679), 5.

34. Ibid., 5–6.

35. Ibid., 6.

36. Rachel Weil, *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680–1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 23.

37. Rachel Weil, "The Family in the Exclusion Crisis: Locke versus Filmer Revisited," in *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 122.

38. Filmer, *Patriarcha*, 12.

39. Gordon J. Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Basic, 1975), 139.

40. As both early modern and contemporary critics of Filmerian theory have pointed out, Filmer entirely ignores the role of the mother in raising children. For modern readings of the treatment of women in seventeenth-century political theory, see Melissa A. Butler, "Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy," *American Political Science Review* 72, no. 1 (1978): 135–50; Margaret J. M. Ezell, *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988); Gordon Schochet, "The Significant Sounds of Silence: The Absence of Women from the Political Thought of Sir Robert Filmer and John Locke (or, 'Why can't a woman be more like a man?')," in *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, ed. Hilda L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 220–42; and Mary Lydon Shanley, "Marriage Contract and Social Contract in Seventeenth Century English Political Thought," *Western Political Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1979): 79–91.

41. Joyce Green MacDonald, "'Hay for the Daughters!' Gender and Patriarchy in *The Misery of Civil War* and *Henry VI*," *Comparative Drama* 24, no. 3 (1990): 196.

42. Toni Bowers, "Behn's Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s," *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 38 (2009): 17.

43. *A Congratulatory Poem on the Safe Arrival of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth at Utretch, on Saturday Sept. 27. 1679* (London, 1679), 1. For other representative laudatory depictions of Monmouth's virtues, see also *Englands Darling, Or Great Brittains Joy and hope on that Noble Prince James Duke of Monmouth* (London, 1681); *Englands Happiness Restored, Or A Congratulation Upon the Return of his Grace James Duke of Monmouth* (London, 1679); *Valiant Monmouth Revived* (London, 1684); and J. F., *Englands Lamentation For The Duke of Monmouth's Departure* (London, 1679).

44. *A Second Remonstrance by way of Address From The Church of England to both Houses of Parliament* (London, 1685), 2.

45. *Perkin's Passing-Bell, Or The Traytors Funeral* (London, 1685), 1.

46. Ibid.

47. *Absalom's Conspiracy; Or, The Tragedy of Treason* (London, 1680), 1.

48. *The Countreys Advice To the Late Duke of Monmouth, And Those in Rebellion with Him* (London, 1685), 1.

49. Ibid., 2.

50. *Monmouth Degraded. Or James Scot, the little King in Lyme. A Song* (London, 1685), 1.

51. *The Young Bastards Wish, A Song* (London, 1685), 1.

52. Matthew Prior, "Advice to the Painter," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. Galbraith M. Crump, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 4:44–49, l. 25. It is, of course, this very sort of depiction Dryden attempted to guard against in *Absalom and Achitophel* when he depicted the duke "as a victim of seduction" by bad counselors (Bowers, "Behn's Monmouth," 23). For discussion of Monmouth's role in the Rye House Plot, see Zook, "Contextualizing Aphra Behn," along with Richard L. Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688–1689* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992); Ronald Hutton, *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); and J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis 1678–1683* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961). For general discussion of Monmouth's life, see Bowers, "Behn's Monmouth," along with Robin Clifton, "James II's Two Rebellions," *History Today* 38, no. 7 (1988): 23–29; Peter Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels: The Road to Sedgemoor* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1977); Mark Goldie, "Contextualizing Absalom: William Lawrence, the Laws of Marriage, and the Case for King Monmouth," in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688*, ed. Donna Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 208–30; Stephen A. Timmons, "Executions Following Monmouth's Rebellion: A Missing Link," *Historical Research* 76, no. 192 (2003): 286–91; and J. N. P. Watson, *Captain-General and Rebel Chief: The Life of James, Duke of Monmouth* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1979).

53. R. Brown, "Heroics Satirized," 45. That Tullia is linked with the explicitly vampiristic royalists furthers the connection between her character and the royal court's Catholic women.

54. Livy describes Tullia's treatment of her father's body as follows: "The story goes that the crazed woman, driven to frenzy by the avenging ghosts of her sister and husband, drove the carriage over the father's body" (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, 72). While Livy's Tullia defaces her father's corpse in a frenzy of fear, Lee's Tullia does so in a display of purposeful disrespect.

55. *A rare Example of a vertuous Maid in Paris* (London, 1674), 1.

56. Edmund Bohun, "A Preface to the Reader," introduction to *Patriarcha: Or The Natural Power Of Kings*, by Sir Robert Filmer (London, 1685), f7v.

57. Ibid., f8r.

58. Ibid., f8r–f8v.

59. Ibid., a3v.

60. Ibid., a4v.

61. Weil, "The Family," 114. Weil links this new understanding of the family with changing attitudes toward child-rearing in the later seventeenth century. See, for instance, J. H. Plumb, "The New World of Children in Eighteenth-Century England," *Past and Present* 67 (1995): 64–95, and Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979).

62. Tyrrell, *Patriarcha non Monarcha*, 9–10.

63. Ibid., 18.

64. Ibid., 17.

65. Ibid., 23.

66. Weil, *Political Passions*, 61.

67. James Daly, *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 67.

68. Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, 201.

69. Ibid., 200.

70. Ibid., 201. As Weil points out, this is actually a deliberate misreading of Filmer's theory: "Reliance on a ludicrously stereotyped version of Filmer gave the whigs an illusion of clarity and unity (*we* do not eat our children)" (Weil, *Political Passions*, 43).

71. James Tyrrell, *A Brief Disquisition Of The Law of Nature* (London, 1692), 66.

72. Ibid., 67.

73. Thomas Otway, *Venice Preserv'd*, in *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 465–502, 1.1.49–50. Further references to *Venice Preserv'd* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

74. Philip Harth, "Political Interpretations of *Venice Preserv'd*," *Modern Philology* 85, no. 4 (1988): 356.

75. Priuli uses his political power to wage a private battle, conflating "sex and politics": Debra Leissner, "Divided Nation, Divided Self: The Language of Capitalism and Madness in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 32, no. 2 (1999): 22.

76. Derek W. Hughes, "A New Look at *Venice Preserv'd*," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 11, no. 3 (1971): 441.

77. William H. McBurney, "Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched: Sensuality in *Venice Preserv'd*," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 58, no. 3 (1959): 390.

78. In contrast, Pat Gill argues that the men of *Venice Preserv'd* are feminized, not infantilized: "Revolutionary Identity in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," in *Illicit Sex: Identity Politics in Early Modern Culture*, ed. Thomas DiPiero and Pat Gill (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 245.

79. Similar imagery appears in John Crowne's 1680 adaptation of Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, *The Misery of Civil War, a Tragedy.* In that play, a return to civil war unleashes roving bands of brutish soldiers who rob, ravish, and kill innocent citizens.

80. John Robert Moore, "Contemporary Satire in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," *PMLA* 43, no. 1 (1928): 168.

81. Harry M. Solomon, "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to *Venice Preserv'd*," *ELH* 53, no. 2 (1986): 289. See also Bessie Proffitt, who aligns Venice with the Whore of Babylon and the Catholic Church: Bessie Proffitt, "Religious Symbolism in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," *Papers on Language and Literature* 7, no. 1 (1971): 26–37.

82. David Bywaters, "Venice, Its Senate, and Its Plot in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," *Modern Philology* 80, no. 3 (1983): 245–57. For other readings of the play's political content, see Michael DePorte, "Otway and the Straits of Venice," *Papers on Language and Literature* 18, no. 3 (1982): 254, and Roswell Gray Ham, *Otway and Lee: Biography from a Baroque Age* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1931).

83. Ellison, *Cato's Tears*, 41. For a reading of gender roles and the Nicky-Nacky scenes, see Danielle Perdue, "The Male Masochist in Restoration Drama," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 1 (1996): 10–21.

84. Jessica Munns, "'Plain as the light in the Cowcumber': A Note on the Conspiracy in Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*," *Modern Philology* 85, no. 1 (1987): 56. Several critics have disputed the reading of the play as allegory. See, for instance, Philip Harth, "Political Interpretations," along with Ronald Berman, "Nature in *Venice Preserv'd*," *ELH* 36, no. 3 (1969): 529–43; Z. S. Fink, *The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth-Century England* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1945); and Gerald D. Parker, "The Image of Rebellion in Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* and Edward Young's *Busiris*," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 21, no. 3 (1981): 389–407.

85. According to Jack D. Durant, the English people should also realize the differences between Priuli and Charles II: "Their political father, wholly unlike Priuli, loves and protects them": "'Honor's Toughest Task': Family and State in *Venice Preserved*," *Studies in Philology* 71, no. 4 (1974): 502. Under such a king, the people have no reason to rebel.

86. Nathaniel Lee, *Mithridates, King of Pontus, A Tragedy* (London, 1678), 36. Further references to *Mithridates* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

87. Although Crowne's father was a parliamentarian during the English Civil Wars, his son did not share those politics after 1660. For biographical information, see Arthur Franklin White, "John Crowne and America," *PMLA* 35, no. 4 (1920): 447–63, and Arthur Franklin White, *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works* (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922).

88. For Jasper Heywood's biography, see Joost Daalder, introduction to *Thyestes*, by Jasper Heywood (New York: Norton, 1989). See also Shivaji Sengupta, "Biographical Note on John Crowne," *Restoration* 6, no. 1 (1982): 26–30.

89. John Crowne, *Thyestes. A Tragedy* (London, 1681), prologue. Further references to *Thyestes* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

90. Lucius Annaeus Seneca, *Thyestes*, trans. Caryl Churchill (London: Nick Hern Books, 1995), 9.

91. Ibid., 16.

92. White, *John Crowne*, 122.

93. Jeff Berglund, *Cannibal Fictions: American Explorations of Colonialism, Race, Gender, and Sexuality* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 9. Modern anthropologists differentiate between anthropophagy, "the actual consumption of human flesh," and cannibalism, a symbolic construct associated with sorcery, savagery, and the monstrous: Gananath Obeyesekere, *Cannibal Talk: The Man-Eating Myth and Human Sacrifices in the South Seas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 14. This book refers to acts of anthropophagy as cannibalism since they are designed to render monstrous Catholic ritual. For further anthropological discussion, see William Arens, "Cooking the Cannibals," in *Consuming Passions: Food in the Age of Anxiety*, ed. Sian Griffiths and Jennifer Wallace (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998); Mark P. Donnelly and Daniel Diehl, *Eat Thy Neighbor: A History of Cannibalism* (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2006); Peter Hulme, "Columbus and the Cannibals," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft and Gareth Griffiths (London: Routledge, 1995); and Frank Lestringant, *Cannibals: The Discovery and Representation of the Cannibal from Columbus to Jules Verne* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

94. Edward Ravenscroft, *Titus Andronicus, or The Rape of Lavinia*, in *Shakespeare Adapatations from the Restoration*, ed. Barbara A. Murray (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), 1–88, dedication ll. 23–28. Further references to *Titus Andronicus* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

95. That Ravenscroft dedicated the play to the Catholic Earl of Arundel also reflects his Tory loyalties.

96. While the marriage is inappropriate from Ravenscroft's perspective, the Romans actually encouraged intermarriage with conquered peoples.

97. Naomi Conn Liebler, *Shakespeare's Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre* (London: Routledge, 1995), 146.

98. As Sid Ray points out, "Saturninus's sexual attraction to Tamora obscures his sense of duty . . . and causes him foolishly to place the enemies of Rome too near the heart of its power": "'Rape, I fear, was the root of thy annoy': The Politics of Consent in *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (1998): 33. See also Emily Bartels, who views the marriage as provoking a "breakdown of distinctions between 'ours' and 'theirs'": "Making More of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1990): 443.

99. While the image of Tamora as the "blot and enemy to our general name" (2.2.182) is original to Shakespeare's text, the view of Tamora as "polluted" is Ravenscroft's addition. In part, this corruption results from Tamora's illicit contact with Aaron, as blackness was frequently viewed as a "natural infection" and "infection of blood": Sujata Iyengar, *Shades of Difference: Mythologies of Skin Color in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 8, 9.

100. The association between Lavinia and Rome dates back to Virgil's *Aeneid*. For discussion of the play's classical antecedents, see Sara Eaton, "A Woman of Letters: Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*," in *Shakespearean Tragedy and Gender*, ed. Shirley Nelson Garner and Madelon Sprengether (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 54–74; Aparna Khastgir, "Endings as *Concordia Discors*: *Titus Andronicus*," *Studia Neophilologica* 73 (2001): 36–47; Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); and Molly Easo Smith, "Spectacles of Torment in *Titus Andronicus*," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 315–31.

101. Helms, "'The High Roman Fashion,'" 558.

102. Ravenscroft constructs another parallel between sexuality and cannibalism when Titus's sons, Quintus and Martius, are lured to Bassianus's body with the promise of sexual gratification. "O Love! How I do long to taste thy Banquet! / And revel with the fair Inviters" (3.1.215–16), Quintus exclaims at the thought of sexually available women, echoing both the final banquet and Aron's suggestion that Chiron and Demetrius "feed" on Lavinia (2.1.316).

103. Francesca T. Royster, "White-Lined Walls: Whiteness and Gothic Extremism in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (2000): 449.

104. Anthony Gerard Barthelemy, *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 99.

105. I have taken this term from Stephen D. Arata's influential essay on imperialism in nineteenth-century fiction. Arata defines the "narrative of reverse colonization" as one in which "the colonizer finds himself in the position of the colonized, the exploiter becomes exploited, the victimizer victimized. Such fears are linked to a perceived decline—racial, moral, spiritual—which makes the nation vulnerable to attack from more vigorous, 'primitive' peoples": "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization," *Victorian Studies* 33, no. 4 (1990): 623. Jack D'Amico's work identifies a similar fear underlying early modern representations of race, a similarity that justifies the adoption of a term first coined for the late Victorian mindset. See Jack D'Amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama* (Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991).

106. Ayanna Thompson, *Performing Race and Torture on the Early Modern Stage* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 63.

107. David Willbern, "Rape and Revenge in *Titus Andronicus*," *English Literary Renaissance* 8, no. 2 (1978): 176.

108. Virginia Mason Vaughan, "The Construction of Barbarism in *Titus Andronicus*," in *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*, ed. Joyce Green MacDonald (London: Associated University Press, 1997), 182.

109. Ibid., 172.

110. Ravenscroft's estimation of Shakespeare's play persisted well into the twentieth century. T. S. Eliot famously termed the play "one of the stupidest and most uninspired . . . ever written": *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt, 1964), 67. Paul Cantor likewise calls *Titus* "obviously an immature work": *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), 211.

111. Several critics have commented on the womb-like nature of the pit containing Bassianus's body. Willbern argues that the pit "is both womb and tomb, and vagina" (Willbern, "Rape and Revenge," 171). Likewise, Wynne-Davies calls the pit a "'swallowing womb' (239) that links female sexuality to death and damnation" (Wynne-Davies, "The Swallowing Womb," 135).

112. See also Thompson, who argues that "the black body becomes digestible in that it is transformed into something consumable" (A. Thompson, *Performing Race and Torture*, 64). In contrast, the baby's fate in Shakespeare's play is never specified. Note that Ravenscroft also excises Shakespeare's white-appearing biracial baby; no hybrid child will linger at the edges of the text to threaten the newly reconstituted Roman Empire.

113. See also Imtiaz Habib, who employs medical terminology to describe the execution of Shakespeare's Aaron: "The 'cure' of Aaron will also thus be the 'cure' of the state": "Elizabethan Racial Medical Psychology, Popular Drama, and the Social Programming of the Late-Tudor Black: Sketching an Exploratory Postcolonial Hypothesis," in *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, ed. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 98.

Chapter Five

Rape in the Aftermath of Revolution: Images of Male Rape, 1688–1699

On November 5, 1688, William, Prince of Orange, landed at Torbay and set foot on English soil. The date of the Prince's landing was doubly significant, being both the eighty-third anniversary of the defeat of the Gunpowder Plot and the centennial anniversary of the destruction of the Spanish Armada. William had come, his supporters claimed, to free England from the bonds of papal tyranny, and he was welcomed by multiple tracts that celebrated him as England's savior. According to one anonymous author, "His injur'd Peoples woes too well he knew, / Too well he saw, and seeing felt 'em too . . . / He came to drive and purge the guilty Land."[1] According to Craig Rose, "There is no doubt that King William's supporters genuinely believed their hero to be a heaven-sent deliverer," and thus they rallied behind his cause and, they later claimed, drove out the hated James with only minimal bloodshed.[2] Thomas Yalden's *On The Conquest Of Namur* (1695) suggested that God had blessed William and made him invincible to James's forces: "A thousand Deaths and Ruines round him fled, / But durst not violate his Sacred Head; / For Angels guard the Prince's Life and Throne."[3] A "Song" set "To the tune of 'Lilli burlero'" (1688) likewise exulted, "The pillars of Popery now are blown down. / One thousand, six hundred, eighty and eight; / Which has frighted our Monarch away from his crown, / One thousand, six hundred, eighty and eight."[4] Such treatments of William helped to construct what Steven Pincus calls the Whig view of the revolution: "bloodless, consensual, aristocratic, and above all sensible," the view that has largely persisted until the present day.[5] In this interpretation, "the English people rose up all across the land to overthrow a despotic king and . . . they were justified in doing so."[6]

Recently, historians have begun to challenge the Whig myth of the so-called Glorious Revolution. Again, according to Steven Pincus, historians "have underplayed how much violence pervaded everyday life in England itself. In 1688 and after, England as well as Scotland and Ireland—and then much of Europe—were plagued by battles, rioting, and property destruction. . . . There were no great set-piece battles in England in 1688–89. There was, however, a good deal of violence involving James's army and what remained of his militia."[7] Pincus continues, "The Revolution of 1688–89 was neither aristocratic nor bloodless. Nor was it consensual."[8] Revisionist views of the revolution notwithstanding, the long triumph of the Whig perspective bespeaks both the success of Whig policies in the eighteenth century and the skill with which William and his supporters manipulated the available media of the time. Unlike James II, who largely eschewed propagandizing techniques, William clearly understood the value of laudatory propaganda to the maintenance of a stable regime. As a result, Elaine McGirr writes,

> Tories left the field open for Whigs to exploit the aesthetic and ideological overlap of the art dedicated to the king, the character attributed to him, and the religion confessed by him. The Whigs inverted and burlesqued the heroic's charged language and characters in order to attack James, his religion, and his alleged predilection for tyranny, cruelty, and arbitrary sway. Given that the Tories did not promote an effective countermodel, the Whig characterization of James and his policies went largely unchallenged.[9]

Unlike James, William encouraged (and in many cases, commissioned) pamphlets to promulgate his favored conception of current events, and, as Lois G. Schwoerer explains, conducted an "intensive campaign of propaganda . . . throughout the months of the Revolution."[10] He even brought his own printing press with him to England and moved rapidly to respond to unfavorable depictions, not only with censorship and prosecutions, but with his own counterpropaganda.[11]

Despite their efforts to drown out and suppress unfavorable representations of their regime, William and Mary could never fully stem the tide of Jacobite publications. Book burnings and prosecutions of Jacobite printers and authors notwithstanding, propagandists continued to condemn William and Mary for being ungrateful, murderous children, monstrous, illegitimate monarchs, and the figurative ravishers of James II and the nation. Such works often sexualized the act of usurpation, treating James as a victim of sexual assault and warning upstanding Englishmen against future attacks on their own persons and livelihoods. Central to such tracts is a discourse of male rape that uses the pathetic figure of the ravished monarch to protest political rebellion. This chapter therefore begins with an analysis of 1690s propaganda tracts, glancing first at Whig rhetoric before turning to the trope of the ravished monarch, the wretched victim of his children's ambitious ire.

The chapter then turns to the drama of the period, examining the prevalence of male rape victims on the 1690s stage. Such imagery was not entirely new to the postrevolutionary era. In the immediate aftermath of the Restoration, for instance, John Dryden praised Charles II's mercy in *Astraea Redux*, "that same mildness, which your father's crown / Before did ravish"[12] likening the regicide to an act of rape. Several years later, in Elkanah Settle's 1680 anti-Catholic polemic, *The Female Prelate: Being the History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan*, the Catholic Church commits a sexual assault on the Duke of Saxony through the body of Joanna Angellica. Although the play does not explicitly call Saxony's experience a rape, it creates a clear parallel between Angeline's bed-trick ravishment and Saxony's, who, like his wife, dies as a Lucrece figure to prove the dangers of Catholic tyranny. After 1688, however, the trope of the male rape victim becomes much more common, both in the propaganda tracts and onstage. Thus the chapter compares Settle's *The Female Prelate* with his first postrevolutionary work, *Distress'd Innocence: or, The Princess of Persia* (1690). Unlike *The Female Prelate*, *Distress'd Innocence* purports to be apolitical, but it uses the image of the male rape victim subtly to protest William and Mary's accession to the throne. Like James, the honest and honorable Hormidas has been unjustly ravished of his rightful position. His sexualized suffering protests his political disenfranchisement, revealing Settle's developing Jacobite loyalties in the aftermath of the revolution.

Settle was not alone in employing tropes of sexual violence to comment on political events. As Derek Hughes explains, rape plays of the late 1690s frequently sought to justify the events of the Glorious Revolution: a "noticeable number of them authorized regicide, even when the slaughtered monarch was a legitimate ruler. . . . Rapist legitimate rulers could simply be killed."[13] Colley Cibber's *Xerxes: A Tragedy* (1699) offers perhaps the clearest example of what Hughes is describing. According to the virtuous Aranthes, "'Tis not who Reigns, but who Reigns well is King," suggesting that the rapist monarch earns his overthrow.[14] The plays examined in the second half of this chapter, however—John Crowne's *Caligula* (1698), Mary Pix's *Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks* (1696), and Nicholas Brady's *The Rape: Or, The Innocent Imposters* (1692)—all use rape imagery to justify the revolution in slightly different ways. While Crowne and Pix use images of female rape to discredit sitting monarchs, they also present their audiences with men who have been politically and economically ravished. Valerius Asiaticus and Amurat, like Julia and Morena, become the victims of sexualized aggression, starkly demarcating the limits of monarchical power. The violated male body, for Crowne and Pix as for Settle, encodes the dangers of tyranny and offers a powerful impetus for regime change. In contrast, it is the villain of Brady's *The Rape* who espouses the rhetoric of male rape. Brady's evil Genselaric makes the specious claim that he has been ravished

of his rightful position and titles, even as he proves himself unfit for those titles because of his acts of sexual assault. By reassigning the language of male ravishment to his villain, Brady implicitly aligns Jacobite rhetoric with tyranny and violence. At the end of the century, then, we have come full circle: as authors of the 1660s displaced accusations of rape onto their villains to redeem Charles II and his court, Brady displaces accusations of male rape onto his villain, rehabilitating by contrast the rule of William and Mary.

WARRING WORDS: PROPAGANDA IN THE 1690S

As part of their campaign to win the allegiance of their new subjects, William and Mary commissioned and encouraged the spread of anti-Catholic propaganda, reviving the by now all-too-familiar litany of Catholic evils to shore up their regime. As in decades past, Catholics are accused of whoredom, idolatry, cannibalism, and sedition. Catholicism is "a Religion Bloody, Damnable, Trayterous, Blind and Blasphemous,"[15] while the Catholics are "guilty of heinous Sins . . . Unrighteousness, Malice, Drunkenness, Murder, and especially . . . Whoredom, and all manner of Uncleanness, even Sodomy it self not excepted."[16] The Church is filled with "*Thieves*, *Whoremongers*, and *Idolaters*,"[17] and the Whore of Babylon is "never so satisfied, as when she can make her self Drunk with the Blood of the Saints."[18] Her very voice is poisonous: from "her Mouth she Rain'd a poys'nous foam,"[19] and thus "'Tis very difficult nay, almost impossible, for a man to be of the *Roman* Church, and not have his Principles Vitiated, and his Morals Depraved by her."[20] The author of *The Pope in a Passion* also links Catholic poison with Catholic cannibalism: "The Papists are Cruel, for they that eat Gods / Must needs have strong Stomachs, and likewise the odds, / They'll poison your Pulpits, and whip you with Rods."[21]

Other tracts resurrected stories of the French and Irish massacres. *Popish Treachery* (1689) describes how French Catholics tortured Protestants:

> They basted their Naked Legs with scalding Grease, or boyling Oyl. Others they made to hold red hot Coals in their Hands; burnt the soals of their Feet; tore the Hair from their Beards, and Nails from their Fingers . . . they beat and bruis'd the Men, and made the Women suffer a thousand indignities. They would often [take] them separately into Chambers, to torment them, but so as they might hear each other cry; and every one in suffering, suffering for themselves, and for the rest of their Family, which they either saw in torments, or heard the crys thereof.[22]

In Ireland, "Women great with Child have been hanged up, and their Bellies ripped open, that the Infant has dropped out, and been thrown into a Ditch," while others were "boiled alive in Cauldrons" and still others "driven through the Streets naked; and if, through weakness, they kept not their pace, they were pricked forward with Spears and Swords."[23] According to the Catholic speaker of *News from the Sessions-House*, the Irish Catholics "committed the most barbarous and execrable Murthers, Villanies, sparing neither Man, Woman, or Child, ripping up Women with Child, ravishing chast Matrons, drowning, putting to the Sword, &c, many thousands of innocent Protestants."[24] Such descriptions mingled with stories of new atrocities committed by Irish forces in Dublin during the years of the revolution. According to Lord Massarene, "The rapines, assaults, robberies and outrages of the papists committed daily upon the Protestants increase."[25] Stories of old enormities thus combined with new to emphasize the continued and pressing Irish Catholic threat.

As stories of atrocity were promulgated, so were depictions of Catholic disruptions to the family. George Walker describes how the Catholics forced mothers to "throw their own Children into the Water; Wives to hang their own Husbands; Children to hang up their own Parents," thus destroying familial relationships with instances of compelled intrafamilial violence.[26] The Catholic Church was accused of encouraging Protestant children to forsake the fifth commandment. *News from the Sessions-House* accuses the personification of "Popery" of declaring "that Children of his Religion owe not Obedience to their Parents."[27] Meanwhile, Catholic women are again accused of birthing monstrosities. In the revolutionary years, images of unnatural motherhood were frequently linked with rumors of the so-called warming-pan scandal, the rumor (propagated in part by the future Queen Anne) that Mary of Modena had not given birth to her son James, but had instead smuggled him into the birthing chamber on a warming pan as a false Catholic heir.[28] One satirist of the period mockingly wrote, "As I went by St. James', I heard a bird sing, / 'Of certain the Queen has a boy in the spring.' / But one of the chairmen did laugh and did say, / 'It was born overnight and brought forth the next day.'"[29] Another satirist writes, Mary "was made the lawful mother / Of tiler's children's youngest brother, / Who was begot, or born, or made, / A Prince of Wales in masquerade."[30] That the child may have been "made" rather than "born" bespeaks its status as a potentially demonic interloper threatening the kingdom. It also reflects the association of Catholicism "with a kind of monstrous motherhood that deprived men of their paternal rights."[31] The general thrust of these tracts was to insist that taking the oath to William amounted to an act of national and individual self-preservation. Without William and Mary, the English would see "the Destruction of our People, the utter Consumption of our Estates, the burning of our Houses, the Ravishing of our Wives and Daughters, the Extirpation of

Families by Sword or Halter, and the utter Ruining our Cities, Towns and Villages."[32] Faced with such a horrible future, Whig authors had no choice but to offer "thanks to Heaven" that "a softer and gentler Coronation Glory, Oblation and Gift, not Rapine and Violence encircled that Brow."[33]

Contrasting with Whig anti-Catholicism, however, was an equally virulent strain of Jacobite anti-Williamite rhetoric that William and Mary never fully succeeded in repressing. Paul Monod explains, "The government could do little more than harass booksellers and printers; even capital punishment was not enough to suppress Jacobite publicists."[34] If anti-Catholic tracts compared the Battle of the Boyne (1690) with the defeat of the Irish Rebellion, Jacobite propagandists "collapsed the Glorious Revolution into the Civil War, equating the dour William of Orange with Oliver Cromwell."[35] Other authors focused critically on William's Dutch blood, resurrecting tales of the demonic Dutchman. According to Rose, "The King's Dutchness was a theme to which Jacobite writers returned again and again."[36] Some authors recalled Dutch treachery at Amboyna, glorifying the memories of the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars and reminding English readers that the Dutch had never repented for their long-ago crime:

> In the Reign of King *Charles* the Second, their Old Reckoning for their Pranks at *Amboyna,* enflam'd by fresh and continual Encroachments upon our *East-India* Traffick, compell'd that Peaceful Prince to humble them by Two several Wars; and yet the late and present Proceedings with us on that side the World do sufficiently shew, That for their Injustice they may indeed be *Punished,* but they can never find in their Hearts to *Repent*.[37]

The author of *The State-Prodigal his Return* (1689) further suggests that Dutch behavior is no better than Irish:

> They take what they will, and pay what they will, with Oaths and blows into the bargain. The Army of King James, in his whole Reign, never committed so many Riots, Batteries and base Murthers, as your Dutch-men in a Years time. Among the rest, think upon that Action of running their Swords through a poor Child in a Cradle, to be revenged of the Mother, for hindring them from Killing the Father.[38]

Meanwhile, Robert Ferguson complains of the "Encroachments, Rapines, and Robberies of the Dutch" and suggests that the nation has placed itself in grave danger by allowing the United Provinces too much control over and access to English trade.[39] The Dutch have gloried in the "Ravishment of Ancient Freeholds and Inheritance from divers of the Subjects of these Dominions,"[40] and will "commit Rapine upon our Liberties" if allowed to control the English government.[41]

Ferguson co-opts the language of rape to describe the negative consequences of political and economic disputes. Depictions of the demonic Dutchman were also, however, occasionally linked with Jacobite attacks on William III's rumored homosexuality. For anti-Williamite polemicists, William's supposed affairs with his Dutch favorites served both as proof of his Dutch sexual "perversion" and as a warning to the nation that William would violate male bodies as he violated the nation. One anonymous satirist asks, "If a willy Dutch Boar for a rape on a Girle / Was hang'd by the Laws approbation / Then what does he merit that Buggers an Earl / And ravish's the whole nation?"[42] According to Paul Hammond, clandestine satires of William's sexuality use "the trope of sodomy as a parodic form of sex . . . to enforce the idea that William is a mere travesty of a king."[43] They also frequently criticize William's preference for his male Dutch courtiers, "young men who monopolize his attention politically and sexually," recalling criticisms of Charles II's powerful mistresses.[44] At the same time, such satires reinforce a view of the Dutch as violent rapists who commit physical as well as economic crimes against the English. As Marvell writes of Charles II in *The Last Advice to a Painter*, William turns a blind eye to the rape committed by one of his fellow Dutchmen because he is too busy indulging his own sexual proclivities. That William's tastes run to men allows the satirist to depict him as a real threat to his people; he may be willing to sodomize his male subjects physically even as he ravishes the nation economically.

Mary II also came in for her share of criticism in the Jacobite press, starkly contrasting with the image of the queen propagated by her supporters. Williamites praised Mary for being both the perfect wife, submissive, loyal, domestic, and kind, and the perfect queen; indeed a "greater number of sermons, elegies, and medals appeared to memorialize Mary's death than that of any other monarch."[45] The Mary of Williamite tracts combines "Female Sweetness" with "Courage Masculine."[46] Within her, "Contrasting contrarieties agreed, / Humble submission and supremacy."[47] She lacks political ambition—"she was always grieved at the occasion of taking the Government, and as glad to resign it"[48] —and prefers virtuous domestic industry to licentious court intrigue:

> She took [her court] Ladys off from that Idleness, which not only wast their time but exposes them to many temptations, and engaged them to work; She wrought many hours a day her self, and had her Maids of honour and Ladys working about her: And whereas the female part of the Court had been in the former reignes subject to much just scandal, She has freed her Court so entirely from all suspitions.[49]

Mary is a model for wives and "a true tender Nursing Mother to the best of Churches."[50] While personally childless, Mary nurtures her nation and her church, in sharp contrast to Mary of Modena's deceptive maternity and the Whore of Babylon's monstrous motherhood. Such images were intended to placate a nation nervous about governmental upheaval and Dutch invasion; as Tony Claydon writes, such treatments of Mary "did much to soothe fears that the crown had fallen into the hands of a foreigner."[51] Even though William was a foreigner, Mary's perfections as a loyal English wife underscored the fundamental rightness of the popular revolt.

Unlike the much-lauded queen of Williamite tracts, the Jacobite Mary was an undutiful child who had destroyed her father to gain a throne. Here the rhetoric of the poisonous child so important to the propaganda of the 1680s comes directly to bear on depictions of the seated monarchs. Writing of Mary, Charlwood Lawton asks Archbishop Tillotson to "*study the fifth commandment*."[52] He goes on to complain that Mary "has partaken with *Thieves* and *Liars* against her own *Father*; *She* is a Receiver of what has been *by them* from him *wrongfully* taken away."[53] In other tracts, Mary is not just a disobedient thief, but an unrepentant parricide. One 1689 poem, "The Female Parricide," likens Mary both to *King Lear's* Goneril and to Tullia of the Lucrece myth, making her the worst sort of unnatural daughter:

> Oft have we heard of impious sons before,
> Rebelled for crowns their royal parents wore;
> But of unnatural daughters rarely hear
> 'Til those of hapless James and old King Lear.
> But worse than cruel lustful Goneril, thou!
> She took but what her father did allow;
> But thou, more impious, robb'st thy father's brow.
> Him both of power and glory you disarm,
> Make him, by lies, the people's hate and scorn,
> Then turn him forth to perish in a storm.
> Sure after this, should his dead corpse become
> Exposed like Tarquin's in the streets of Rome,
> Naked and pierced with wounds on every side,
> Thou wouldst, like Tullia, with triumphant pride
> Thy chariot drive, winged with ambitious fire,
> O'er the dead body of thy mangled sire.[54]

Arthur Mainwaring's *Tarquin and Tullia* (1689) also resurrects the story of Tullia to criticize William and Mary. Mainwaring writes,

> This King removed, th'assembled states thought fit
> That Tarquin in the vacant throne should sit,
> Voted him regent in their senate house,
> And with an empty name endowed his spouse—
> The elder Tullia, who (some authors feign)
> Drove o'er her father's corpse a trembling wain.

> But she, more guilty, numerous wains did drive,
> To crush her father, and her King, alive;
> In glad remembrance of his hastened fall
> Resolved to institute a weekly ball;
> She, jolly glutton, grew in bulk and chin,
> Feasted on rapine and enjoyed her sin.[55]

In such poems, William and Mary become the real-life analogues of the "Villains lurking" in the blood of Lee's Brutus. They are ungrateful, deceitful children who have committed "the ultimate act of filial impiety,"[56] and they have founded a "Government raised by Parricide and Usurpation, entered into by Violation of [William's] own Declaration, supported by the Overthrow of all our Laws Sacred and Civil, and the Perjury of the Nation."[57] Clearly such representations bothered Mary; as Schwoerer points out, performances of *King Lear* were banned during her lifetime.[58]

At the same time, the invocation of the Tullia story reflects the centrality of rape imagery to Jacobite propaganda as well as Williamite. Just as anti-Catholic polemicists warned against popish rapes and massacres, early Jacobite writers insisted that political rebellions would lead only to violence and suffering. Ferguson complains that the mob is too easily manipulated by stories of Irish atrocity: "The very Mob, whom by fictitious Lyes and Falshoods, of a few Irish being every where burning Houses and cutting Throats, [William of Orange] decoyed and enflamed into an insolent and brutal Rage against their Rightful King, and who became the Ladder unto, and the great Pillars of his Throne."[59] Once unleashed, the anarchic crowd threatens the safety of every man, woman, and child in England. In overthrowing their lawful king, the common people have learned that they need not obey any law: "Men might lawfully rob Temples, and plunder Banks and Exchequers, upon the Motive and Design of discharging their Debts. . . . Nay they may virtuously murther their Parents, deflower Maids, and ravish their Sisters, upon the Inducement and in order to the End of getting into Possession of Estates."[60] England will thus become a victim of sexual violence; the country is a "Rose so virgin white before, / Now blusing [sic] with the stain of Gore."[61] The nation's maiden innocence will be destroyed by the violence of revolt.

In overthrowing their rightful king, the English people have "prostitute[d] their Liberties" to the wealthy yet dangerous Dutch and "defac'd the Purity of" the nation with the act of overthrow.[62] As in Dryden's *Albion and Albanius*, where the English Civil Wars are likened to an act of marital infidelity, the Glorious Revolution is treated as evidence of sexual corruption. Some authors applied the language of rape directly to descriptions of usurpation: as Howard Erskine-Hill notes, Jacobite principles "found early expression in the polemical and sensational image of rape, in both senses."[63] As we saw in the introduction to this study, Charles Blount laments the execution of

Charles I, during which the king's "Crown, as well as his Life" were "most unjustly ravished from him."[64] Likewise, Ferguson describes acceptance of William and Mary's reign as a rape upon Anglican principles,

> because the very Things they did, plainly interfered with the whole Religion which they professed and owned. And there was such an outragious Rape committed by [the Revolution] upon their Principles, and such an open deflouring of the Chastity, which their Church had hitherto preserved in point of Allegiance to Lawful and Rightful Monarchs, that were it not that great Multitudes of that Communion both preserved their own Innocency, and have loudly condemned the Crime of their own quondam Brethren and Fellow members; their whole Church would forever lye under the same Blot and Infamy.[65]

The Church has been ravished by revolutionary ideology, while James II has been ravished of his rightful throne. The king in this construction is the victim of sexual assault, while the English people are spotted and stained by their own violent acts. Similar descriptions appear in discussions of James's actions in fleeing London. Crucial to establishing William and Mary's legitimacy was proving that James had voluntarily abdicated his throne, and the debate over James's political actions was likened in satirical tracts to a debate over his sexual virtue.[66] Was James a chaste matron taken by force, likening usurpation to rape? Or was he a licentious whore who voluntarily forfeited his chastity, linking abdication with promiscuity? One circulating broadside described James as a virgin female who suffered a horrible gang rape, only to be declared a whore by the Parliament: "She's made a mere whore by the vow of our state, / Cause surely her maidenhead did she abdicate." [67] James is at once a king wronged by his evil daughter, Tullia, a man implicitly raped by his homosexual Dutch son-in-law, and a Lucrece figure himself, the victim of a sexualized political assault.[68] The image of James as ravished monarch therefore represented an important tool in the Jacobite propaganda arsenal.

By likening James to a rape victim, Jacobite tracts undoubtedly feminize and shame him, even as they protest his maltreatment. At the same time, they reflect the unseen presence of male rape victims both in the political discourse and the theater of the period. Such rhetoric was not, of course, new. Indeed, a glance back at Elkanah Settle's infamous Exclusion Crisis–era play, *The Female Prelate*, is instructive for understanding the treatment of male rape onstage after 1688. The decade's "most virulent piece of propaganda on behalf of the Whigs,"[69] Settle's play uses acts of sexual violence to demonize the Catholic Church and demonstrate the effects of "tyranny in association with popery . . . with its arbitrary judgments, expropriations, rapes, tortures, and murders."[70] To that end, the play concludes with a dire warning about the dangers of an unchecked Catholic Church:

> Oh, Romans, you will live to see that day
> When from your Roofs your Daughters will be dragg'd,
> Their Virgin Innocence abused with dust,
> And thus brought home a lamentable Spectacle.
> Thus shall your Wives and Daughters all be ravished,
> Dishonour'd, Poyson'd.[71]

Echoing the bloodiest of the anti-Catholic propaganda sheets, the Duke of Saxony insists that no woman shall be safe from Catholic violence. If even Angeline, the chaste Duchess of Saxony, can suffer a horrifying violation at the hands of a prelate, lower-class women will have no hope of escaping sexual abuse:

> If this dear Beauty, born of Noble Blood,
> By Wedlock planted in a Prince's Bosom,
> Could not escape from Treason, Rapes and Death,
> How shall your Wives, your Daughters and your Sisters,
> To whom no Awe, nor Guard makes difficult approach.
> Be safe; no, I presage they shall be prostituted all,
> Defiled, abused, torn up with impious lust. (67)

Saxony hopes his story will act as a warning to the Roman nation; the people must curb the excesses of the Catholic Church and the tendency of cardinals to "place themselves above the law" or witness their families destroyed by the excesses of unchecked prelatic lust.[72]

As in many of the anti-Catholic propaganda tracts we have examined thus far, Catholic tyranny leads to the sexual violation of innocent females and enables the growth of overly powerful and destructive women. According to J. Christopher Warner, in the late seventeenth century, tales of Pope Joan provided "a straight-forward personification of monstrous female lust and ambition. She is a symbol of Rome, the Whore of Babylon, as well as a jab at Charles II's much-hated mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth."[73] The treatment of female monstrosity in the play—Joanna's female monstrosity—underscores the continuities between Settle's various dramatic works. Pope Joan is heir to Settle's earlier monstrous women, a new incarnation of *The Empress of Morocco*'s Laula and *Love and Revenge*'s Fredigond. Although critics have generally overlooked the continuities between *The Female Prelate* and *Love and Revenge*, both plays begin with a son who must avenge his murdered father against a poisonous woman who has long concealed her calumny. "I had a Father, / Whose Blood, whose Royal Blood is unrevenged" (2), Saxony tells his wife. According to Saxony, his father was "most basely poysoned: / Nay, poysoned by a Priest, his savage Confessor. / That cursed Slave that fed upon his Smile" (2). Joanna, the old duke's murderer, is figuratively a cannibal in Saxony's description, and one who has grown toxic in her monstrosity. Characters refer to Joanna's "black Blood" and "invenomed Breath" (7, 13). Saxony, meanwhile, calls her a "Hellish Fiend" who

left a "Sulphorous Brand . . . burning in my Father's Heart" (12), a "Monster" (7), and an "incarnate Devil" (52). In *Love and Revenge*, Fredigond's monstrosity stems from an inappropriate sexual drive, the failure of men to police her actions, and a desperate need to avenge the death of her brother. Joanna's monstrosity originates in her inappropriate access to male spheres of knowledge, transforms into an inappropriate sexual drive, and culminates in the need to avenge her status as cast mistress to the old Duke of Saxony. Joanna has found intellectual and social freedom as Cardinal John. She describes her education:

> As many Languages as *Romes* proud Hills
> My Virgin Nonage spoke. As many Arts and Sciences
> As the famed Stagyrite studied to inspire
> The Conqueror of the Universe, were mine.
> So far I fadom'd into Books, Men, Manners,
> Reasons, Religions; I could take all Forms:
> The perfect Christian, or complete Philosopher;
> To Nature, or to Natures God at pleasure:
> Dispute on both sides, and on both sides vanquish. (26)

Joanna's cross-dressed disguise thus affords her both intellectual and physical freedom; she gains access to her (initially) beloved duke through the supposed sanctity of the confessional. John "won so far my Royal Father's Favour" that "His Ear, his Hand, his Soul was all his own" (11). In this, Craig M. Rustici explains, Settle "hyperbolically illustrates the dangerous intimacy between confessor and penitent" and emphasizes Joanna's status as a snake coiled at the heart of the kingdom.[74] She will "twine within that Royal Princes Heart" and spread her malice and disease throughout the land (11).

Because Joanna has rejected the "normal" female way of life—Owen points out that Joanna's cross-dressing "emphasizes [her] monstrosity"—images of maternity are disrupted throughout the play.[75] According to Joanna, "So fair I stood for the world's awful Thunderer, / Wits Goddess from my Brain already born" (26). Joanna replaces her "natural" ability to mother children with the unnatural birth of wit. While she has been sexually active, there is no evidence until the end of the play that she has ever conceived a child (ultimately she is betrayed by her female body when her miscarriage offers proof of her gender). Instead, she gives birth to horrifying plots and ideas, praising her "fertile Brain" (9), not her fertile body. Later, she describes her attraction to Saxony: "Gorged with the Fountain, for the Stream I thirst. / And teeming with the'unnatural Monster burst" (32). Joanna "teems" with unnatural desire and, like *Titus Andronicus*'s Chiron and Demetrius, compares sexual experience to a gluttonous and monstrous banquet. Meanwhile, the Church itself, supposedly the great mother who nurtures her people, is a corrupt whore. Saxony initially praises his late father's religious virtue, saying that the old duke "was a constant Catholick, / His Faith and

Life incorporate, his Principles / Suck'd in from Rome's own Breast" (16). Unfortunately, the people cannot suck salvation from a poisonous teat. Instead, they will be "Profaned and sullied by a Whore, a Syren" (71), their souls endangered by the Church's venom. Joanna's femininity thus forms an integral part of Settle's condemnation of the Catholic Church, and it offers concrete proof of the need for a Protestant, masculine alternative to corrupt female excess.

Contrasting with Joanna is the Duke of Saxony, son to a murdered father and husband to a ravished wife. If the character of Joanna incorporates aspects of Settle's earlier Fredigond, Saxony is the more honorable heir to *Love and Revenge*'s Chlotair and Lewis. A virtuous son, Saxony insists upon his familial duty and invokes, like Clotair, the memory of King Hamlet's ghost. "I had a Father, A Prince so Excellent, so truly Noble, / Too good for this base world" (2), Saxony says, language that "recalls to us Hamlet's praise of Old Hamlet." [76] It is not enough for God to punish his father's murderer, Saxony claims: "Blood requires blood" (3). Although Angeline questions her husband's continued pursuit of vengeance after so many long years—"seven long years have past, / And in that time the mourning Robe should sure / Be quite worn out" (2)—Saxony insists that a child's responsibility to his father's memory never fades. "Never, my *Angeline*. / Methinks I've still that poysoner in my eye" (2). Subsequently, in a climactic scene of the play, Saxony literally encounters his father's ghost; according to the stage directions, on the night of the bed trick, "The Ghost of the old Duke of Saxony rises with a burning Taper in his hand" and "touches a train of fire above him, which immediately writes upon the Wall, in Capital letters in a bloudy fire, the word MURDER; which continues burning some time" (50). In *Love and Revenge*, Nigrello stages a fake fire to expose Fredigond and Clarmount, while Fredigond stages the ghost of Childrick to avoid suspicion. *The Female Prelate* replays these events and literalizes them. The heretics light an actual fire to drive out the hated pope, and Saxony encounters the embodied specter of his father. Ultimately, however, Saxony proves as poor a revenger as Chlotair and Lewis. Already he has waited seven years to effect his vengeance, but when he finally goes to act, he learns that in a world where the Catholic Church reigns supreme, secular rulers are powerless before the whims of the prelacy. Saxony insists that the Church has no right "To judge a King, and doom a Soveraign Head" (17), but he cannot overpower the Church hierarchy or succeed in bringing his revenge plot to fruition. [77]

Because the Church is so powerful, Saxony fails to avenge his father and protect his kingdom. Next, he fails to save his wife from sexual violence. Angeline, the fair lady to Joanna Angellica's dark, is raped, prompting her to compare her suffering to Lucrece's and Philomel's:

> Ravisht! Oh ruine, fate, destruction, Death!

> These Eyes, these Lips, oh Heav'ns, this sacred Bosom,
> Once the blest Throne of thy transported Joys,
> Made a loath'd Monsters Prey! But oh ye Powers,
> This is not half my Scene of Woe! Alas,
> The bleeding *Lucrece* and the mourning *Philomel*
> Could plead as much as this: But I am a wretch
> A thousand times more monstrously deform'd.
> Oh my vast Wounds! (62)

Saxony attempts to ignite the power of the Lucrece myth and use his wife's death as the impetus for political change—"Revenge my Wrongs, and this fair Martyrs Blood" (70), he begs—but the common people are not moved by the sight of her suffering. "Burn him, burn him, burn him" (70), they say of Saxony instead. Although Saxony compares himself to Mark Antony, come to eulogize Julius Caesar's unjust death, he finds instead, as Rustici notes, that the "Romans have degenerated from their ancient virtue. Catholicism's mercenary spirituality has infected their consciousness and eroded their self-reliance."[78] Saxony is no Lucius Junius Brutus, and Angeline is a failed Lucrece. Like the unnamed shepherdess of Shadwell's *The Libertine*, whose suicide goes entirely unheeded, Angeline's death means nothing in the ethical vacuum created by popery. Angeline will not bring change with her suicide, and after she is gone, Catholic treachery will fester indiscriminately and unchecked.

Although Angeline did not consent to sex with Lorenzo, seventeenth-century English law would have been unlikely to define her experience as a rape. After all, she bears no wounds and offered no resistance. Still, Angeline views herself as the victim of sexual violence, her experience made all the worse because she did not resist. Angeline laments,

> When to my fatal Bed th'Adulterer came,
> But oh that hour be blotted from eternity!
> I harmless, languishing, expecting Innocence,
> Met the foul Traytour, kist, embraced him, loved him,
> Around his neck my longing arms I threw;
> For I was kinde, and thought, my Lord, 'twas you.
> Oh horrour, horrour, unexampled horrour! (63)

Angeline expresses her anguish with the vocabulary of rape: she is spotted, stained, and poisoned, a "sullied bloated thing" and a "polluted Monster" (62), and she wants to kill herself to remove the taint. She must seek "Death's kind hand," which "wipes all my stains away" (64), because she has no other way to establish her innocence.

Since Angeline views herself as a victim of sexual violence, the parallels between Angeline's experience and Saxony's suggest that her husband, too, has been sexually assaulted. There is little difference between Angeline's encounter with Lorenzo and Saxony's with Joanna Angellica. Both have

been the victim of bed tricks, believing that they were making love to their spouses when in fact they were unwittingly committing adultery. They describe their experiences in similar terms: while Angeline calls herself a "sullied bloated thing" (62), Saxony laments his "bloated Soul" (59). Like Angeline, Saxony sees himself as having been poisoned, his marriage bed polluted by the extramarital contact: "Horrour unspeakable!" Saxony cries (53), recalling Angeline's "horrour, unexampled horrour!" (63). "What Monster has this night slept in my arms?" He continues,

> Not Christian slaves, wrapt up in Pitch, and light
> Like burning Tapers to the Savage *Nero*,
> Not *Hercules* in his invenom'd shirt,
> Nor *Lucifer* at his first plunge in Hell,
> Felt half the Fires my raging Entrails swell. (52)

Like Angeline, Saxony immediately plans to commit suicide, thereby proving his love and purity: "My *Angeline* / Has been my first, and Death's my second Bride" (58), he cries. Despite the fact that the characters never refer to Saxony's encounter as a rape, he has been violated by Joanna's actions, and in the same way as his wife. When he dies, he does so not just to avenge Angeline, but because he is a rape victim in a Restoration tragedy, where rape victims must die for order to be reestablished. Saxony becomes the play's second Lucrece, another violated, martyred body to display to the mob, and his death is just as ineffectual. Joanna is defeated not by Saxony, but by her own traitorous female body. What *The Female Prelate* finally suggests, then, is that the Catholic Church violates men as well as women. Saxony's rape by Joanna Angellica symbolizes both the sexual dangers posed by the Church and the individual loss of political and economic autonomy inherent to living in a Catholic kingdom. Even as Settle threatens women with physical violation at the hands of lascivious and out-of-control priests, he suggests that men will suffer disempowerment and emasculation at the hands of the prelacy. Saxony cannot protect his kingdom, his wife, or even his own body from the calumnies of the Church.

ARTICULATING JACOBITE SYMPATHIES: SETTLE'S *DISTRESS'D INNOCENCE*

The tropes of male ravishment employed by *The Female Prelate* became much more common in the wake of the Glorious Revolution as images of male rape enabled authors subtly to comment on contemporary politics. Settle himself returned to such themes in his 1690 *Distress'd Innocence: Or, The Princess of Persia*, a play that expresses its Jacobitism in the language of male rape. Settle is, of course, best known for the virulent Whig anti-Catholi-

cism that characterizes *The Female Prelate*, but he was not in fact committed to his Whig politics. According to Don-John Dugas, "Settle became a creature of politics during the 1680s, devoting his creative energies to one thing: ingratiating himself with whomever was in power. To further this end, he wrote confessionals explaining his change of political allegiance, lauding high-placed Tories in verse, and wrote tracts attacking prominent Whigs."[79] By 1690, Settle had alienated both sides of the political divide: his violent support of anti-Catholic policy in *The Female Prelate* and the pope-burning pageants had angered Tories, while his subsequent recantation of those beliefs alienated the Whigs. Thus in the preface to *Distress'd Innocence*, Settle expresses his intent to leave politics behind and write only for general amusement and entertainment:

> [W]ith what shame must I look back on my long Ten Years silence. Alas, I was grown weary of my little Talent in Innocent *Dramaticks*, and forsooth must be rambling into *Politicks*: And much I have got by't, for, I thank 'em, they have undone me. And truly when impertinent Busy Fools in my little post, in the name of Frenzy must aspire to State-Champions, though their Pens are drawn even on the Right side, they deserve no better Fate. . . . And now, after all my repented Follies, if an Unhappy Stray into Forbidden Grounds . . . may be permitted to return to his Native Province, I am resolved to quit all pretensions to State-craft, and honestly sculk into a Corner of the Stage, and there die contented.[80]

On the surface, *Distress'd Innocence* is not a political work in the vein of *The Female Prelate*. Instead, as Robert Hume writes, "Heroic pathos is the keynote" to the play; "Hormidas and Cleomira mingle pathos and nobility . . . Mrs. Barry exults in vengeance; Mrs. Bracegirdle suffers."[81] The play's contents, however, belie the claim that Settle is no longer interested in engaging the political sphere. As we shall see, *Distress'd Innocence* draws on and develops the tropes of *The Empress of Morocco*, *Love and Revenge*, and *The Female Prelate*, along with the discourse of the male rape victim, to consider the impact of political usurpation on the nation and the individual.

In the course of *Distress'd Innocence*, Cleomira, wife of the righteous general Hormidas, nephew of the king, is raped by the evil and ambitious Otrantes at the command of King Isdigerdes. Because Hormidas is envied far and wide, Otrantes and his compatriots view the rape of Cleomira as a form of homosocial punishment for Hormidas. "I'le stab thee through thy *Cleomira's* heart" (34), Otrantes tells Hormidas, suggesting that he will dishonor the husband by assaulting the wife. Later, access to Cleomira's body (now revealed to be royal) is equated with access to political authority. Otrantes will seek her hand to place himself closer to the line of succession. Cleomira is thus violated by two father figures, Otrantes, whom she has regarded as an uncle, and Isdigerdes, the king who should protect her but who instead orders

and sanctions the rape. Isdigerdes links his authority to rule with Otrantes's ability to rape. He rages over his "impotent Revenge" and tells Otrantes, "If thou dost not win her, / Say I'm a Girl, and my weak Infant Vengeance / More worthy of a Rattle than a Scepter" (29). The king, like Otrantes, seeks to disenfranchise the innocent Hormidas through ill-treatment of his wife. Cleomira subsequently emerges from her experience as yet another ruined female vessel, and she joins the long tradition of Lucrece figures in seeking death. Isdigerdes explicitly compares Cleomira to Lucrece as he plans the rape: "This Vertue, my coy *Lucrece*, shall not guard thee" (29). After the assault, Cleomira views herself as poisoned and poisonous; like *Thyestes*'s Aerope, she becomes "Lovely Ruins" (44), a "bleeding *Lucrece*" tainted by a "Scorpion Wound" that "has stung so deep / That all the Scorpions Blood can never cure" (46, 47). She then dies both to proclaim her innocence and because she has no reason left to live.

Contrasted with the martyred Cleomira is the ambitious Orundana, and the two form another variation of Settle's virtuous woman / villainous woman pairings. Initially, the two women seem quite similar, as both have been victimized by the fathers in their lives and by the same baby-swapping trick. Orundana has been unfairly elevated to the status of princess, while Cleomira, the true princess, was raised as a foundling and pauper. Any parallels between the two women, however, subsequently break down. While Cleomira is raped, Orundana becomes a rapist. Like Fredigond and Joanna Angellica, Orundana has grown poisonous from her time spent at court, and her ambition drives her to destroy potential opponents to her throne. She speaks poisonous language to her (supposed) father, Isdigerdes, spreading rumors about Hormidas to discredit him politically. Hormidas calls the slanders "foul-mouth'd Falsehood, and invenom'd Malice," and begs the king to "Hear not this fowl polluting Calumny" (7). Like Joanna Angellica, Orundana also becomes an unnatural mother, overseeing the birth of plots, rather than children: "Let me embrace thee for this pregnant Mischief," she tells Rugildas, when he plans to disgrace Hormidas. "The great *Minerva* from the brain of *Jove* / Was not a Birth like this" (12). Most damningly, Orundana encourages the rape of Cleomira to protect her own position. In the lead-up to the assault, Cleomira begs Orundana for mercy, calling out to her as Lavinia calls to Tamora and using the language of natural motherhood to spark Orundana's sympathy:

> Snatch the Poor Lamb from the Wild Ravenous Wolves,
> And give him to a Longing Mothers Arms.
> Oh Royal Virgin, Love will one day make
> Thee a blest Mother too, and then thou'lt feel
> A Tender Mother's Love. (27)

Cleomira is herself a mother, and she attempts to melt Orundana with the rhetoric of motherhood, but, as is also the case for Lavinia, to no avail. Orundana has become unnatural, her fertility redirected from the positive force of childbirth to the negative birth of plots.

Despite her willingness to use sexual assault as a political weapon, Orundana ironically speaks of herself as a rape victim. She compares the loss of political authority to the experience of sexual violation and names herself a Philomel who must take revenge. She keeps her ears open for reports of challenges to her authority because

> Id'e have my Wrongs alarum'd in my Ears,
> Repeated oftner than my very Prayers;
> It whets my Vengeance keen, the Edge wou'd rust else.
> She who wou'd sing Revenge must play the watchful *Philomel*;
> Hold the sharp pointed Thorn against her Breast
> To keep her Ayres awake. (3)

Orundana refers in these lines to Philomel's power as a singer and nightingale; however, the sexually violent content of the text suggests that Orundana is worried that she, too, will be ravished, with ravishment here used to denote a form of property crime. Like James II, she will be ravished of what she believes is her rightful throne. Cleomira and Orundana thus emerge from the text both as parallels and as polar opposite types of rape victim; one has suffered physical assault, while the other equates political disenfranchisement with physical violation.

Just as Orundana uses sexual assault to represent the loss of political position, the play treats Hormidas as yet another type of rape victim. Like *The Female Prelate*'s Duke of Saxony, Hormidas uses sexual violence as a metaphor for political disruptions. As nephew to the king, Hormidas should be second in line to the throne, but a suspicious Isdigerdes strips him of his titles and relegates him to the status of stable boy. In expressing pity for Hormidas's situation, the other characters use sexually tinged speech. Hormidas, like Crowne's Aerope and Settle's Angeline, becomes a ruined building; Theodosius calls him "Thou Royal Ruines" (23). He also laments the "drowing [sic] Deep in which thou'rt swallow'd" and insists that he will "Hoist thy sunk Glories, and weigh up thy Ruins" (24, 25).[82] That Cleomira is also referred to as a ruin in the wake of her rape underscores the sexualizing of Hormidas's political state. Hormidas himself eroticizes political disenfranchisement when he begs the king to "Unplume me, rifle me, degrade me . . . / Be kind, and strip me naked" (7). Hormidas has been ravished, poisoned, diseased, and stained. His reputation, like that of a rape victim, has been besmirched; the slanderers, he says, have sought to "blacken my fair Truth" (9), and although he claims that he still possesses his "fair spotless Truth" (23), Cleomira agrees that his "unspotted Faith" has been "blemisht" (9). Hormidas also refers to Otrantes as the "Unpunisht Ravisher of all my Hon-

ours" (24), and he warns Cleomira that his "Infectious Ruine" may blemish her as well (26). His political disenfranchisement becomes a source of social toxin, infecting Hormidas metaphorically and the nation politically. Meanwhile, in treating a faithful servant so unfairly, by ravishing Hormidas metaphorically as he orders the rape of Cleomira physically, Isdigerdes, like Valentinian, stains himself and the reputation of his rule. He will finally lament his behavior, saying, "Oh, poor *Hormidas*! Were the ravish'd Coronets / Torn from thy Brow for Chaplets for this Villain? / Oh the mistaken Favours of the Crown!" (54). He will later proclaim both Hormidas and Cleomira "Spotless as a new born Day" (56), and he will blame his priests for "Religious Sacrilege" and "Rapines" (56), but too late to restore either to life. Nor can he punish the true villains. Rugildas tells him at the last, "No, silly, credulous, and thoughtless King, / I am past thy spight" (60).

What I want to suggest, then, is that Settle's interest in the male rape victim, in *The Female Prelate*, a sign of Whig leanings and a warning against Catholic policy, becomes in *Distress'd Innocence* an expression of Jacobite sympathies. As in Jacobite propaganda, the act of usurpation is likened to the act of rape; to take the throne by force, even from a corrupt monarch, is a violation of both the body politic and individual bodies natural. Settle's subtle Jacobitism also finally manifests itself in the play's treatment of King Isdigerdes. Isdigerdes survives the play's final bloodbath and continues his rule unopposed (if perhaps chastened by his experiences), while the attempted usurpers prove themselves unfit to rule. The king oversteps himself both sexually and politically and places his faith in the wrong sorts of councilors, but his actions do not finally license his overthrow or offer justification for contractual rulership.

DEFENDING THE REVOLUTION: VARIATIONS ON THE TROPE OF MALE RAPE

Settle's *Distress'd Innocence* represents in many ways an aberration, as the majority of the rape plays of the 1690s sought to defend the events of the Glorious Revolution. Such a usage of rape imagery is perhaps most blatant in Colley Cibber's 1699 *Xerxes*, a play that explicitly articulates a contractual theory of monarchical governance.[83] According to Artabanus, the play's hero, "He that neglects the Regal Office, / Should be compell'd to lay it down; / And we who feel the smart of that neglect, / Are only proper Judges, where to place it" (21). A ruler is only a ruler so long as he is fit to rule, and his right stems from his merit, not his birth: "I ha' no King, 'tis Merit, not a

Crown / That makes a King" (18), Mardonius insists. Meanwhile, Aranthes claims that rebellion in certain circumstances is not only permissible, but necessary:

> That Loyalty's Dishonorable,
> That bids me bear Dishonour: When Subjects
> Are no more the Care of Kings, we then
> Have only left the Laws of Nature to Protect us,
> And Nature tyes us all to Self Defence. (19)

In attempting to rape an innocent woman (Artabanus's wife), Xerxes oversteps his authority sufficiently to prove himself unfit to rule, thereby necessitating his eventual overthrow.

From the beginning of the play, Xerxes has gone mad, celebrating victories that were actually defeats and insisting upon the boundless depths of his personal power. He accepts unironically and uncritically the sycophantic Cleontes's rhetorical insistence upon his divinity—Cleontes calls him "Thou Deity Ador'd! Immortal *Xerxes*" (6)—a sentiment he echoes at the end of the play, even in the face of death. "My Words have more than Power of common Kings" (45), he insists. Yet Xerxes, like Valentinian, ultimately faces the limit to his personal rule. When he demands that his minions resurrect the dead victims of his torture—"By Heav'n I'll have 'em Rackt to Life again!" (25)—he learns that even a king has no dominion over death. Like Crowne's Atreus, he also discovers that his subjects have an interiority that he can neither control nor compel. He can rape Tamira's body—indeed, he views the violation of a chaste woman to be the most exquisite form of pleasure, "a Joy for Gods to taste" (33)—but Tamira's mind and heart are her own. Thus she refuses to reveal Artabanus's hiding place, saying she has hidden him "in my Heart, / Where you, nor yours can enter to remove him" (25). Xerxes subsequently attempts to access that otherwise guarded interior via rape. He exclaims, "In her unwilling Ears I'll pour such Tales / Of Loose Desire, her very Soul shall feel the Rape" (29). Like Major Oldfox of Wycherley's *The Plain Dealer*, who threatens to ravish the Widow Blackacre "through the ear, lady, the ear only,"[84] Xerxes commits aural rape in an attempt to reach the untouched soul of Tamira's being.[85] Tamira, however, reminds him that although he may torture her body, her true being remains untouched: "Now satiate thy Rage, strip off my trembling Flesh, / And when thou'st Piece-meal torn these frailer Limbs away, / Still shalt thou leave unmov'd a naked Mind / Erect to Heaven" (27).

Tamira finally avoids Xerxes's assault by feigning wantonness, but it is also too late for his rule, as his cruel actions have unleashed the power of the mob. Mardonius enumerates the reasons for rebellion:

> Your Liberties infring'd, your Rights destroy'd,
> Your antient Glory sunk in Sloth and Tyranny;

Your Ransack'd Houses, and exhausted Treasure,
Your Tender Virgins, and your Wives deflower'd,
The publick Wrongs, and poor *Tamira's* Rack,
Are Stings too venom'd, not to swell Resentment. (40)

Once unleashed, the vengeance of the mob is as violent and threatening as any act perpetrated by Xerxes. Tamira, like Lee's Teraminta, is attacked by the crowd, her child threatened by people who would treat it as spoils of war: "The Child's my lawful Plunder, and I will keep it" (41), says a member of the rabble. In this, the play offers a qualified endorsement of rebellion; a king must rule well without violating the rights of his subjects—here, as in earlier plays, symbolized by the monarchical act of rape—yet the cost of revolution is high. Thus Mardonius warns,

Let Kings and jarring Subjects hence be warn'd,
Not to oppress, or drive Revenge too far:
Kings are but Men, and Men by Nature err;
Subjects are but Men, and cannot always bear.
Much shou'd be born before Revenge is sought:
Ever Revenge on Kings is dearly bought. (48)

The play contains both a warning to the king to foreground his subjects' best interests and a warning against the rush to revolt.

Xerxes is characteristic of the treatment of rape in quite a few of the plays of the 1690s. As Susan Staves explains, in numerous works, "Elaborate debates over lineage, history, and primogeniture have now given way to the idea of a utilitarian contract between sovereigns and subjects. If the sovereign brings harm to his subjects, he is deposed with a minimum of revolutionary guilt; if he confers benefits on them, they reward him with loyalty."[86] Thus in play after play, the audience is presented with a rapist ruler whose overthrow is treated as both right and good. William Mountfort's *The Injur'd Lovers: Or, The Ambitious Father* (1688), George Powell's *Alphonso King of Naples* (1690), and Charles Gildon's *The Roman Brides Revenge* (1696) all feature "Imperial Ravisher[s]" who must be deposed for the good of the nation.[87] Powell's play in particular stresses that merit is more important than birth in determining the right to rule. Although Cesario is not a nobleman, he has earned the right to marry the king's daughter because he "does deserve her: / H'as bravely fought, and bravely conquer'd for her."[88] Contrasted with the brave Cesario is the corrupt King Alphonso, who finally must abdicate for the good of the kingdom. He tells his successor, "when the Royal Helm is in thy hand, / Oh let my Wrack thy warning Seamark stand, / Shun but my Guilt" (47), reflecting his acknowledgment of his crimes against the country and his recognition that he has effectively lost his right to rule. Other playwrights continue to use rape to demonize the Catholics: John Bancroft's *King Edward the Third, With the Fall of Mortimer, Earl of March* (1690) features a sexually violent Catholic bishop whose power is sustained by Queen Isa-

bella, the play's poisonous Catholic bride, while Powell's adaptation of John Fletcher's *Bonduca: Or The British Heroine* (1695) features a Roman invasion leading to multiple rapes and eventual deaths. In all of these cases, the suffering of female bodies offers a straightforward justification for contractual views of monarchy.

Other Whig plays of the period use images of rape in a less conventional manner; they adopt the rhetoric of male ravishment to mock and dismiss the tenets of Jacobite discourse and legitimate William and Mary's regime. At first glance, John Crowne's *Caligula* (1698) closely resembles Cibber's *Xerxes* in its politics. Dedicated to Henry Sidney, Earl of Romney, brother to the executed Algernon Sidney and one of William's principal commanders at the Battle of the Boyne, the play depicts yet another tyrannical monarch who must be dethroned for the good of the nation. According to Annius Minutianus, the emperor "has Vices I abhor to name; / They cover me with everlasting shame."[89] He takes credit for military victories he has not earned and has committed incest with his own sister: "He whored her on the Bridal Night" (5). Caligula, like Valentinian and Xerxes, believes in the absolute power of his authority and his unbounded ability to do as he pleases without mercy or restraint. He complains to Valerius Asiaticus, "Must I give reasons, Sir, for my Decrees? / I may do what I please, with whom I please. / Perhaps I burn proud Towns, and slaughter Men, / Only to please my humour, Sir—what then?" (9). Caligula believes himself to be a god, a belief first substantiated by Vitellius, who describes him as "Caesar, of Gods, the greatest and the best" (6), and later confirmed when he receives his "Image wrought in gold" (16), a graven image of himself for the people to worship. As a god, Caligula also refuses to be ruled by his parliament. He says, "I'll have no Guardians, I'm at Age to reign; / What my Birth gave, my Courage shall maintain. / I will endure no Partners in my Throne, / I'll govern as I please, and rule alone" (15). Caligula's callous treatment of his subjects and disgusting sexual excess are thus linked with his propensity for absolutism.

Of course, Caligula is not a god, but merely a "Ravisher of beauteous Wives, / Of Virgins, Realms, Religions, Laws, and Lives" (49). His monarchical overreach is reflected in his rape of Julia, the chaste wife of Valerius Asiaticus. Initially, Valerius counsels his wife to leave the court, a place infected with the "scent of Lust and Blood" (25). He warns her that she has

> vertues that [Caligula] slights,
> And Rapes and Rapines, are his high delights.
> He loves to make all Nature feel his force;
> Rivers he Ravishes, and turns their course . . .
> He scorns the Pleasure he can gain with ease. (24)

Caligula displays his power over all the world through acts of sexual force. At the same time, Valerius Asiaticus applies the rhetoric of rape to his own sufferings. First, he complains that the "Emperors Bawds ravish'd my Wife away" (38), ravishment here referring to Julia's abduction rather than her physical violation. In the aftermath of her rape, he also insists,

> New Giants have bound *Jove,* so he lies still,
> And lets this filthy Tyrant take his fill
> Of Whoredom, Blood, Rapes, Incest, what he will.
> Had *Caesar* ravish'd from me all my Lands,
> Bottomless treasures, numberless commands,
> But to thy beauty never had approach'd,
> Had left me thee unblemish'd, and untouch'd;
> My heart is so devoted to thy love,
> I wou'd not have chang'd happiness with *Jove*. (39)

Julia has been physically assaulted, but her unlawful abduction represents a ravishment of the husband as well as a rape of the wife. Later, Valerius views himself as blemished by Julia's assault. He demands revenge, that he may, "with [Caligula's] blood wash all my spots away" (39). Valerius thus transforms Julia's physical sufferings into a manifestation of his own wrongs, an appropriation of rape discourse to describe male political and economic suffering. For Crowne as for Settle in *The Female Prelate*, the male rape victim suffers due to a tyrannical and overreaching ruler (in this case, the king rather than the Catholic Church). This is not the Jacobite rhetoric of the ravished king unfairly dethroned, but the ravished subject disenfranchised by absolutist tyranny.

The figure of the male rape victim appears more prominently in Mary Pix's *Ibrahim*. Despite Constance Clark's claim that "It is hard to discern what Pix's political leanings were," the play clearly treats monarchical sexual tyranny as a justification for revolution.[90] Ibrahim, like so many other monarchs discussed in this study, has come to overestimate the extent of his authority. Like Valentinian, Ibrahim has grown soft and effeminate in his tastes, forgoing war in pursuit of pleasure:

> The great Forefathers of this degenerate Man,
> Instead of treading on *Persian* Carpets,
> Trod upon the Necks of *Persian* Kings;
> Whilst now (curs'd reverse of time) softness and ease,
> Flatterers and Women, fill alone our Monarch's Heart;
> Women enough to undo the Universal World
> Are here maintain'd, whose useless hundreds
> Are with such a train of Pride and Luxury,
> That Eyes before ne'er saw, nor can endless words describe.[91]

What's worse, he has begun to overstep himself economically, confiscating merchant goods for his harem's use and attacking the fundamental rights of his subjects to control their property:

> Wou'd you believe it? the Vultures deckt in Painted Plumes,
> So eager are for their vain trappings,
> That soon as a Merchant Ship salutes the Port,
> His Goods are seiz'd, and brought to the *Seraglio*
> Without Account, Value, or Justice. (2)

Like Caligula, Ibrahim speaks the language of absolutism:

> . . . absolute I'll be, or, cease to Reign!
> That easie King, whose People gives him Law,
> Flatters himself with Majesty and awe;
> The Royal Slave the daring rout commands,
> And force his Scepter from his feeble Hands. (32)

A monarch must rule alone, Ibrahim maintains, or else he is no better than a slave, and he may force any woman to his will, merging rape with the political philosophy of absolutism.

Contrasted with Ibrahim's faith in his own powers is a range of characters who seek to limit the monarch's authority. The Mufti, for instance, holds that the power of the throne does not entitle Ibrahim to defile women indiscriminately. He tells the king, "My Daughter is no Slave, and our holy Law / Forbids that you should force the free" (19). According to the Mufti, the "holy Law" supersedes the king's earthly authority and cannot be touched by royal prerogative. Morena herself insists that she owes allegiance to a higher authority than the king: "Holy, binding vows are past already / And horrid imprecations, which if I break, / Distraction, despair, eternal ruine / Straight will seize me" (23). She laments the existence of a king who could conceal an act of horrific violence behind a façade of political authority, leading Solyman to proclaim the need for revolt: "Nor / Shall I fear to purge the contagious / Veins of Majesty in such a cause" (30). The king does not have the right to rape, no matter how unfettered he considers his authority.

The trajectory of *Ibrahim* is such, then, that Morena must learn to disobey authority in the service of higher ideals. At the beginning of the text, even Amurat comments on the seriousness with which Morena views her duty to her father. "I know well, though her poor Slave shou'd suffer / A thousand wracks, she'd tread the rigid paths of Duty, / And let me die, rather than forefeit her obedience" (6), Amurat explains in act 1.[92] By the end, however, she disobeys, choosing to kill herself and gain everlasting fame rather than obey her father's injunction to live. She tells him,

> My Father! draw near; forgive this
> First, last act of Disobedience!
> You taught me, Sir, that Life no longer

> Was a good, then a clear Frame attended it;
> My Dishonour Rings through the Universe—
> Pardon my quitting it! (40)

The play is somewhat cautious of the idea of political rebellion—as in *Xerxes*, the revolt unleashes a frightening and uncontrollable mob that is not necessarily preferable to the hated monarch:

> Who can express the Terrours of this dismal Night!
> The mad *Janizaries* up, and raging for Revenge,
> Put private Broils upon the publick score,
> Murder and Rapine, with Fury uncontroll'd
> Raging through the City, and make the Devastation
> Horrible, the mangled *Visier* they have
> Piece-meal torn. (38)

Still, Morena's decision to rebel against her father and die is treated with approbation. Amurat calls her "once my / Living Mistress, now my dead Saint" (41). Rebellion under certain circumstances is preferable to the alternative of everlasting shame.[93]

Amurat, beloved by Morena, dies along with her—dual victims of Ibrahim's excess. As the pair loved each other in life, they die together as parallel figures.[94] Ibrahim is not, however, the play's only villain; indeed, he is arguably not even the play's worst villain. It is not Ibrahim's death, also at play's end, that signals the play's climax, but rather the death of Sheker Para, Ibrahim's primary mistress and bawd, an Eastern variation on the poisonous Catholic bride. It is Sheker Para who both hatches the rape plot and encourages its completion. According to the Mufti, "that vile Woman . . . with the Visier, / Joins to ruin *Ibrahim*" (2). Sheker Para represents the dark foil to Morena's virtuous light, continuing the tradition of creating parallel and opposing female figures. Like Settle's Fredigond, Sheker Para also urges her lover to softness and vice: "To charm my Monarch is the only study and / Business of your Slave," she promises, "and to that end, / Twenty fair Virgins whom yet your Eyes ne'er saw, / I have pick'd and chosen from a thousand, / And set in order for your view" (4). She later encourages Ibrahim's sexually violent tendencies both to increase her political power and to obtain the object of her sexual desires. She is proud that "the Sultan gives me greater Privilege / Than ever Woman had in the Ottoman Court" (5), and would rise ever higher.

Just as Fredigond wants Clarmount and Joanna Angellica desires the Duke of Saxony, Sheker Para lusts after the virtuous Amurat. As a result, Amurat is feminized in his interactions with the king's mistress. When she propositions him, Amurat's defenses are those of a woman; he blushes and turns pale, he refuses and attempts to flee: "heedless and cold he flew / From my Embrace" (13), Sheker Para complains. "Awe me not with thy blushes" (13), she tells him, and accuses him of having ice water in his veins, a turn of

phrase generally applied to women who refuse. *Valentinian*'s Lucina, for instance, is described as a "Cake of Ice" (2.2.114), while Achmet comments on the "stoick vertue" that "rules in" Amurat's "cold Icy Veins" (5). Sheker Para, like Valentinian, also thinks that Amurat's refusals have undermined her claim to political power; as male monarchs discover in other plays, she cannot hope to command an empire if she cannot command Amurat's sexual submission:

> Have I seen Scepter'd Slaves kneeling
> At my feet, forgetting they were Kings,
> Forgetful of their Gods, calling alone on me;
> Passing whole days and hours as if measur'd
> With a Moment's Sand, and now refus'd
> By a Curst Beardless Boy! (13)

Amurat is a boy, not a man, feminine both in his hairlessness and his chastity.

Amurat will not actually be raped in Pix's *Ibrahim*. Nor will he become, like Settle's Duke of Saxony, the victim of a bed trick. Yet in constructing Amurat as an effeminate analogue to Morena, Pix evokes the image of the male rape victim once more. Before killing herself, Morena tells Ibrahim that "With dishevell'd hair, torn Robes, and / These bloody hands, I'll run thro' all thy Guards / And Camp, whilst my just complaints, compel rebellion!" (24); that is to say, Morena will play Lucrece, inspiring revenge before dying. The final death in the play is not Morena's, however, but Amurat's, and he refuses to take revenge against Sheker Para, choosing instead suicide over dishonor. Although she offers to let him "strike / Your Poynard to my Heart" (37), Amurat responds,

> The contaminated Blood shall never
> Stain the Sword of *Amurat*.
> Live! Detested Creature! Loaded
> With Shame and Infamy! Be it
> Thy Curse to live! Whilst
> Pointing Fingers, and busie Tongues
> Proclaim them. (37)

What Sheker Para offers Amurat is a revenge tinged with sadomasochistic sexual overtones; she will allow him to penetrate her in death as she could not compel him to do in life, an offer Amurat refuses. Instead he chooses suicide, another victim of the Sultan and Sheker Para's overreach. Like Morena, he lives as a chaste Lucina and dies a defiled Lucrece.[95] The man, like the woman, falls victim to monarchical tyranny and its radiating trails of destruction, presenting once more a justification for rebellion and regicide.

While some Whig plays co-opted the rhetoric of the male rape victim to illustrate the dangers of monarchical overreach for men, other plays employed this rhetoric to discredit Jacobite condemnations of James II's unfair

ravishment. Derek Hughes has called Nicholas Brady's *The Rape* "a generally anomalous play,"[96] while Hume calls it "serious, pretentious, and overinflated."[97] Still, Brady's treatment of male rape in the play is quite revealing. His Williamite sympathies are already on display in the play's prefatory materials. Dedicating the play to Charles, Earl of Dorset and Middlesex (a champion of William's reign), Brady praises his services to the new government. Brady values Dorset's "true Affection to the Protestant Religion, and the English Liberties; Both of which were visibly struck at, and had infallibly been overturned, had not Providence made use of their present Majesties to rescue and relieve them."[98] God himself, that is, approved the overthrow of James II. When the play begins, the evil Genselaric is furious that the king has elected to wed his only son, Albimer, to Genselaric's beloved Eurione, daughter to the vanquished queen of the Goths. Genselaric subsequently rapes Eurione, yet ironically views himself as the one ravished. When he learns he cannot wed Eurione, he complains,

> Death to my hopes! he's fix'd unmoveably,
> And all my Wishes blasted: But shall I,
> Who nobly past through twenty rough Campaigns,
> Tamely look on, and see a puling Boy,
> A young effeminate Stripling, ravish from me
> A Mistress and a Crown! It must not be. (7)

Genselaric views Albimer as the only thing standing between himself and the achievement of his political and sexual ambitions. Thus when he talks of ravishment, he both expresses his irritation at the loss of property he believes to be rightfully his—ravishment in the older sense of property crime—and hooks into the rhetoric of male rape.

When King Gunderic officially decrees Eurione's engagement, Genselaric once again describes his experience in the language of sexual violence:

> How could I stand
> Thus tamely by, and see my panting Heart
> Pluck'd from my trembling Bosom fresh and bleeding
> By this inhumane King? Am I a Coward?
> Answer me, Friends, am I that wretched thing?
> I must be sure; I could not else look on
> And see the Tyrant ravish from my Soul
> All it holds dear and precious. (20)

Ironically, of course, it is only two scenes later that Genselaric becomes a rapist in fact. In one of the decade's more explicit stagings of sexual violence, "The scene draws, and discovers Eurione in an Arbour, gagg'd and bound to a Tree, her hair dishevel'd as newly Ravish'd, a Dagger lying by her" (25). According to Marsden, "The elaborately coded tableau carefully presents Eurione to the audience's gaze: Eurione's 'Ravish'd' hair becomes the symbol of her violation, the ropes and gag testify to her helpless state,

and a dagger, the symbolic representation of her violation, lies by her side."[99] The scopophilic aspects of the play are undeniable, and they bespeak the use of female bodies as symbols of political unrest. Eurione has been diseased by her contact with Genselaric, and she will spend the remainder of the play anticipating her death: she cries, "here's she that was Eurione; / Now she is nothing but a loathsome Leprosie, / Which spread all o'er the Gothish Royal Blood, / Infects the Noble Race" (25). Yet her assailant, too, speaks of being assaulted, mirroring the behavior of Settle's Orundana, who also claims victimization. In *The Rape*, however, there is no innocent and "ravished" Hormidas to offset the ridiculousness of Gensalaric's claims. Instead, the language of property ravishment is placed into the mouth of a despicable, irredeemable villain, a tactic that ultimately works to discredit that rhetorical trope.[100]

What Brady offers, then, is a work ideologically similar in design to the rape plays of the 1660s. In those earlier works, accusations of rape were displaced onto the parliamentarian faction to absolve the royalist party of wrongdoing. Now, at the end of the century, Brady displaces the rhetoric of male rape onto the one who would destroy the nation. Those who deploy images of male ravishment—implicitly the Jacobite propagandists—represent the true threat to English women and English national stability. That the play concludes with the stabilizing marriage of a foreign royal son (Princess Valdaura, now revealed to be a man) to the domestic princess and heir to the throne (Prince Agilmond, secretly a female in disguise) also bespeaks the rightness of William and Mary's invasion. William and Mary will set England to rights as Valduara and Agilmond will restore their own realm. Meanwhile, Genselaric, despite his proclamations of victimhood, will suffer death by torture: "For me, I vow to keep / An Everlasting silence" (54), he says, his final words and refusal to speak reminiscent of Shakespeare's villainous Aaron. The male political rape victim is discredited, punished, and finally silenced.

CONCLUSION

By the end of the century, representations of rape had undeniably changed yet also come full circle. Images of sexual violence, used during the Civil Wars to discredit the monarchy and justify the regicide, returned in the early years of the Restoration, first to reinforce the rightness of monarchical rule, and later to delineate the limits of contractual monarchy. Although the targets of sexually violent propaganda shifted throughout the century, rape as a rhetorical tool remained remarkably static. Occupying a nebulous zone between crime against property and violation of the individual, acts of rape

provided a consistent, emotionally charged set of tropes to guarantee some form of political response. An examination of the period's rape plays exposes the extent to which playwrights drew upon, responded to, and interacted with the offstage culture of political propaganda pamphlets. Scenes of dramatic sexual violence are designed not only to titillate and entice, but to engage with the wider political culture of the later seventeenth century, a culture often fluid and lacking in political coherence. Through an analysis of dramatic sexual assault, then, modern critics can recover a number of late-century struggles, including the place of the subject in both the individual family and the broader body politic, the negotiation of appropriate and inappropriate forms of sexual expression, and the battle against any and all sources of perceived cultural corruption, ranging from monarchical absolutism and court libertinism to foreign mistresses and, of course, that perennial threat, the Catholic Church.

NOTES

1. *The Murmurers. A Poem* (London, 1689), 2, 4.
2. Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and Wars* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 20. See also Gerald Straka, who argues that contemporary politicians treated William's accession to the throne as another occasion of deliverance from Catholic tyranny: "The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688–1702," *English Historical Review* 77, no. 305 (1962): 642.
3. Thomas Yalden, *On The Conquest Of Namur, A Pindarique Ode. Humbly Inscrib'd To His Most Sacred and Victorious Majesty* (London, 1695), 10.
4. "Song to the tune of 'Lilli burlero,'" in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:317, ll. 1–4.
5. Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 5.
6. Ibid., 15.
7. Ibid., 254.
8. Ibid., 278. Pincus downplays the role of religion in provoking the revolution, arguing that James II moved too quickly to modernize the British state. For other readings of the Glorious Revolution, see John Carswell, *From Revolution to Revolution: England 1688–1776* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973); Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000); Graham Goodlad, "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *History Review* 58 (2008): 10–15; J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1972); Bill Speck, "Religion's Role in the Glorious Revolution," *History Today* 38, no. 7 (1988): 30–35; Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); and John Van der Kiste, *William and Mary* (Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2003).
9. Elaine McGirr, *Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660–1745* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009), 102. McGirr argues that while James initially enjoyed popular support, he "did not press the advantage by having his proven propagandists mount heroic productions to divert his subjects and mythologize his rule" (Ibid., 102). In 1688 James did attempt to limit seditious speech, "but he was unable effectively to enforce this declaration": Lois G. Schwoerer, "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688–89," *American Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (1977): 859.
10. Ibid., 847.

11. For discussion of William's printing press, see Schwoerer, "Propaganda."

12. John Dryden, "Astrea Redux," in *Restoration Literature: An Anthology*, ed. Paul Hammond (Oxford: Oxford Universiy Press, 2002), 23–32, ll. 258–59.

13. Hughes, "Rape," 232–33. In his earlier drama survey, Hughes also writes, "From mid-1696 onwards . . . there was an open season on rapist tyrants": Derek Hughes, *English Drama, 1660–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 430.

14. Colley Cibber, *Xerxes, A Tragedy* (London, 1699), 21. Further references to *Xerxes* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

15. J. Gailhard, *Four Tracts* (London, 1699), 4:15.

16. Timothy Wilson, *A Seasonable Question, In A Sermon on Joshua 5.13* (London, 1690), 10.

17. B. H., *The Parliament of Bees. A Fable* (London, 1697), 1.

18. *Popish Treachery: Or, A Short and New Account of the Horrid Cruelties Exercised on the Protestants In France* (Edinburgh, 1689), 13.

19. Mr. Crown [John Crowne], *Daeneids, Or The Noble Labours of the Great Dean of Notre-Dame In Paris* (London, 1692), 5.

20. *Popish Treachery*, 12.

21. *The Pope in a Passion; Or, Bad News for England* (London, 1689), 1.

22. *Popish Treachery*, 8–9.

23. George Walker, *The Protestant's Crums of Comfort* (London, 1697), 98–99, 100, 101.

24. *News from the Sessions-House*, 3.

25. Massarene to Newdigate, cited in Pincus, *1688*, 273.

26. Walker, *The Protestant's Crums*, 100.

27. *News from the Sessions-House*, 2–3.

28. For discussion of the warming-pan scandal and Anne's role in fostering the rumors, see Edward Gregg, *Queen Anne* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), and Rachel Weil, *Political Passions*, 86–104.

29. Anonymous, "An Excellent New Ballad Called The Prince of Darkness, Showing how Three Nations may be Set on Fire by a Warming Pan," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. Wiliam J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:332, ll. 1–5.

30. Henry Mildmay, "The Progress," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:332, ll. 54–57.

31. Weil, *Political Passions*, 94.

32. Sir James Montgomery, *Great Britain's Just Complaint For Her Late Measures, Present Sufferings, And the Future Miseries She is exposed to* (London, 1692), 57.

33. *An Account of Mr. Blunts late Book, Entitled King William and Queen Mary Conquerors* (London, 1693), 6.

34. Paul Monod, "The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689–95," in *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks and Edward Corp (London: Hambledon Press, 1995), 142. For discussion of the early Jacobites, see also Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688–1788* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

35. McGirr, *Heroic Mode*, 129. For further discussion of Civil War rhetoric in the Glorious Revolution, see also Rose, *England in the 1690s*, along with Paul Kléber Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

36. Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 34.

37. *Englands Crisis: Or, the World Well Mended* (London, 1689), 1. Here the author rewrites history, offering the British a more favorable outcome to the Second and Third Anglo-Dutch Wars than is historically accurate.

38. *The State-Prodigal his Return; Containing a true State of the Nation. In a Letter to a Friend* (London, 1689), 4.

39. Robert Ferguson, *A Brief Account*, 56.

40. Ibid., 22.

41. Robert Ferguson, *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard, Discovering a Conspiracy against the Laws and ancient Constitution of England* (London, 1694), 7.

42. "Untitled," cited in Paul Hammond, *Figuring Sex between Men from Shakespeare to Rochester* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 174.

43. Ibid., 181.

44. Ibid.

45. Lois Schwoerer, "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689–95," *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1989): 743.

46. Henry Park, *Lachryme Sacerdotis. A Pindarick Poem Occasion'd by the Death Of that most excellent Princess, our late Gracious Sovereign Lady, Mary the Second, Of Glorious Memory* (London, 1695), 4.

47. Mr. Hume [Patrick Hume], *A Poem Dedicated to the Immortal Memory Of Her Late Majesty* (London, 1695), 7.

48. Daniel Defoe, *The Life Of That Incomparable Princess Mary, Our Late Sovereign Lady, Of ever Blessed Memory* (London, 1695), 60.

49. Cited in Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 42.

50. Thomas Bowber, *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of St Swithin, London, March 10th, 1694/5* (London, 1695), 24.

51. Tony Claydon, *William III* (London and New York: Longman, 2002), 45. See also Weil, who suggests that elegies for Mary facilitated the posthumous transfer of authority to William (Weil, "Family," 115).

52. Charlwood Lawton, *A Letter formerly sent to Dr Tillotsen, and for Want of an Answer made publick* (London, 1748), 2:243.

53. Ibid. Other writers treated Mary's early death as a punishment for filial disobedience. See, for instance, Thomas Ken, *A Letter To The Author of a Sermon Entitled, A Sermon Preach'd At The Funeral Of Her late Majesty Queen Mary, Of ever Blessed Memory* (London, 1695).

54. "The Female Parricide," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:157, ll. 1–16.

55. Arthur Mainwaring, "Tarquin and Tullia," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:47–56, ll. 97–108.

56. Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 32.

57. Nathaniel Johnston, *The Dear Bargain. Or, A True Representation of the State of the English Nation under the Dutch* (London, 1690), 24.

58. Schwoerer, "Images," 735.

59. Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Parliament be not in Law Dissolved by the death of the Princess of Orange* (London, 1695), 56.

60. Robert Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End, that was designed in the Late Revolution?* (London, 1695), 6.

61. Cited in Monod, *Jacobitism*, 65.

62. *Some Remarks upon our Affairs* (London, 1690), 2; *A Short History Of The Convention, Or, New Christened Parliament* (London, 1689), 1.

63. Howard Erskine-Hill, "Literature and the Jacobite Cause: Was There a Rhetoric of Jacobitism?" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 49.

64. Charles Blount, *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, a3r.

65. Ferguson, *Whether the Preserving*, 30–31.

66. For discussion of the controversy surrounding James's abdication, see George L. Cherry, "The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688–1689," *Journal of Modern History* 22, no. 4 (1950): 309–21; H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1977); and J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689–1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). For discussion of Jacobite beliefs, see also J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 125.

67. "Untitled," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:59, ll. 17–18.

68. The suggestion that William had assaulted James also underlies Ralph Gray's 1689 "The Coronation Ballad, 11th April 1689." Gray calls William "An unnatural beast to his father and uncle" while mocking his inability to perform sexually with his wife: "The Coronation Ballad, 11th April 1689," in *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. William J. Cameron, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 5:43, ll. 57, 58.

69. J. Christopher Warner, "The Question of Misogynistic Polemic in Elkanah Settle's *The Female Prelate* (1680 and 1689)," *Restoration* 25, no. 1 (2001): 19.

70. Owen, *Restoration Theatre*, 128–29.

71. Elkanah Settle, *The Female Prelate: Being The History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan. A Tragedy* (London, 1680), 67. Further references to *The Female Prelate* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

72. Owen, *Restoration Theatre*, 142.

73. Warner, "The Question of Misogynistic Polemic," 23. For the historical roots of the Pope Joan legend, see C. A. Patrides, *Premises and Motifs in Renaissance Thought and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 152, and Clement Wood, *The Woman Who Was Pope: A Biography of Pope Joan, 853–855 A.D.* (New York: William Faro, 1931).

74. Craig M. Rustici, "Gender, Disguise, and Usurpation: *The Female Prelate* and the Popish Successor," *Modern Philology* 98, no. 2 (2000): 282.

75. Owen, *Restoration Theatre*, 174.

76. Warner, "The Question of Misogynistic Polemic," 26.

77. As Craig Rustici points out, "In Settle's view, no Catholic monarch was truly sovereign" (Rustici, "Gender, Disguise, and Usurpation," 281).

78. Ibid., 285.

79. Dugas, "Elkanah Settle," 383.

80. Elkanah Settle, *Distress'd Innocence: Or, The Princess of Persia. A Tragedy* (London, 1691), a3r–a3v. Further references to *Distress'd Innocence* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

81. Hume, *Development of English Drama*, 400.

82. The image of Hormidas swallowed up by the deeps calls to mind the fate of *Titus Andronicus*'s Lavinia, finally swallowed up by the devouring earth.

83. To the extent that *Xerxes* has received any modern critical attention, it has been largely panned as a commercial and dramatic failure. See Leonard R. N. Ashley, *Colley Cibber* (New York: Twayne, 1965), and Helene Koon, *Colley Cibber: A Biography* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1986).

84. William Wycherley, *The Plain Dealer*, ed. Leo Hughes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), 5.2.435–36.

85. Here Xerxes's behavior recalls that of Atreus in Crowne's *Thyestes*. It is not enough for Atreus to control his daughter's behavior; he also demands control over her interior thoughts and desires.

86. Staves, *Players' Scepters*, 100.

87. William Mountfort, *The Injur'd Lovers: Or, The Ambitious Father. A Tragedy* (London, 1688), 64.

88. George Powell, *Alphonso King of Naples. A Tragedy* (London, 1691), 36. Further references to *Alphonso King of Naples* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

89. John Crowne, *Caligula. A Tragedy* (London, 1698), 4. Further references to *Caligula* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

90. Constance Clark, *Three Augustan Women Playwrights* (New York: Peter Lang, 1986), 207.

91. Mary Pix, *Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks: A Tragedy* (London, 1696), 1. Further references to *Ibrahim* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

92. While the developing relationship between Morena and Amurat at first appears illicit, it actually occurred beneath the watchful eyes of the Mufti. Morena does not love without her father's explicit or implied permission.

93. That the rape and death scenes were so explicitly violent—Margo Collins calls "the scene leading up to the rape . . . perhaps one of the most graphic of its kind"—likely contributed to the play's success: "Feminine Conduct and Violence in Mary Pix's She-Tragedies," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 18, no. 1 (2003): 7. See also Jean I. Marsden, who calls the "brilliantly stylized rape scene, both titillating and graphic": "Mary Pix's *Ibrahim*: The Woman Writer as Commercial Playwright," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 32, no. 2 (1999): 39.

94. In this, I think the play is more radical than Jacqueline Pearson would allow. Pearson criticizes "Pix's rather stereotypical view of women" and argues that the "polarisation of" Morena and Sheker Para "is conventional but vividly handled. Pix is not unconventional enough to allow the raped woman to survive or deny that she is 'polluted' (p. 38), though she goes as near as she dares" (Pearson, *The Prostituted Muse*, 177, 176). The construction of a male analogue to Morena is, however, a much more unconventional act. For a contrasting view of Pix, see Patsy S. Fowler, who argues that Pix's "plays contain significant feminist views": "Rejecting the Status Quo: The Attempts of Mary Pix & Susannah Centlivre to Reform Society's Patriarchal Attitudes," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 2 (1996): 49.

95. In this, my argument differs fundamentally from that of Margo Collins. For Collins, Amurat gains power over Sheker Para by "order[ing] her to live in infamy" (Collins, "Feminine Conduct," 8). I believe instead that Sheker Para's loss of power is equivalent to that of the rapist figures Ibrahim, Valentinian, Caligula, and Xerxes.

96. Hughes, "Rape," 232.

97. Hume, *Development of English Drama*, 401.

98. Nicholas Brady, *The Rape: Or, The Innocent Impostors* (London, 1692), a2r. Further references to *The Rape* are from this edition and will be cited parenthetically in the text by page number.

99. Marsden, "Rape," 191.

100. For a similar treatment of the male rape victim as villain, see also Charles Hopkins's *Boadicea Queen of Britain* (1697), where the rapist complains of his own "ravish'd Arms" and calls himself his victim's "Ravisht Lover": *Boadicea Queen of Britain. A Tragedy* (London, 1697), 21.

Works Cited

Adams Jr., Joseph Quincy. "William Heminge and Shakespeare." *Modern Philology* 12, no. 1 (1914): 51–64.

Allen, William. *A Friendly Call, or a Seasonable Perswasive to Unity*. London, 1679.

Allman, Eileen. *Jacobean Revenge Tragedy and the Politics of Virtue*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999.

Alssid, Michael. *Thomas Shadwell*. New York: Twayne, 1967.

Anderson, Thomas P. *Performing Early Modern Trauma from Shakespeare to Milton*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.

Andrews, R. *A perfect Declaration of The Barbarous and Cruell practices committed by Prince Robert, the Cavalliers, and others in his Majesties Army*. London, 1642.

Anonymous. *Absalom's Conspiracy; Or, The Tragedy of Treason*. London, 1680.

———. *An Abstract of Some few of those Barbarous, Cruell Massacres and Murthers, of the Protestants, and English, in some parts of Ireland Committed since the 23, of Octob, 1641*. London, 1662.

———. *An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland*. Scotland, 1700.

———. *An Abstract Of The Unnatural Rebellion And Barbarous Massacre Of The Protestants In the Kingdom of Ireland, In the Year 1641*. London, 1689.

———. *An Account of Mr. Blunts late Book, Entitled King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*. London, 1693.

———. *A barbarous and inhumane Speech Spoken by the Lord Wentworth, Sonne to the late Earle of Straford*. London, 1642.

———. *Battering Rams Against Rome's Gates*. London, 1641.

———. *The Black Book Opened, Or Traytors Arraigned and Condemned by their own Confession*. London, 1660.

———. *A Blazing Starre seen in the West at Totneis in Devonshire, on the fourteenth of this instant November, 1642*. London, 1642.

———. *A Bloody Battell: Or the Rebels Overthrow, And Protestants Victorie*. London, 1641.

———. *A Bloody Tragedie, Or Romish Maske. Acted by five Iesuites, and sixteene young Germaine Maides*. London, 1607.

———. *The Bloudy Persecution of the Protestants in Ireland, Being The Contents of severall Letters brought by his Majesties Post from Ireland, November the 21. 1641*. London, 1641.

———. *A Bull Sent By Pope Pius To encourage the Traytors in England, pronounced against Queen Elizabeth, of ever glorious Memory; shewing the wicked designs of Popery*. London, 1678.

———. *The Burning of the Whore of Babylon, As it was Acted, with great Applause, in the Poultrey, London, on Wednesday Night, being the Fifth of November last, at Six of the Clock*. London, 1673.
———. *The Case is Altered. Or, Dreadful news from Hell*. London, 1660.
———. *A Caution To All True English Protestants, Concerning the Late Popish Plot*. London, 1681.
———. *The Cavaliers Catechisme: Or, The Reformed Protestant catechising the Antichristian Papist, Malignants, Incendiaries, and other ill-affected Persons under the name of Cavaliers*. London, 1647.
———. *The Character of a Papist*. London, 1673.
———. *A Collection of Certain Horrid Murthers in Several Counties of Ireland. Committed since the 23. of Octob. 1641*. London, 1679.
———. *The Common-Hunt, Or, The Pursute of the Pope*. London, 1679.
———. *A Congratulatory Poem on the Safe Arrival of His Grace James Duke of Monmouth at Utretch, on Saturday Sept. 27. 1679*. London, 1679.
———. *A Copie of the King's Message sent by the Duke of Lenox*. London, 1644.
———. *The Countreys Advice To the Late Duke of Monmouth, And Those in Rebellion with Him*. London, 1685.
———. *The Dammee Cavalliers Warning Piece, In a view on the Prophecy of the Prophet Obadiah*. London, 1643.
———. *Englands Crisis: Or, the World Well Mended*. London, 1689.
———. *Englands Darling, Or Great Brittains Joy and hope on that Noble Prince James Duke of Monmouth*. London, 1681.
———. *Englands Happiness Restored, Or A Congratulation Upon the Return of his Grace James Duke of Monmouth, On Thursday night the 27th of this instant November 1679*. London, 1679.
———. *Englands Miserie, If Not Prevented by the speedie remedie of a happie union between His Maiestie and this Parliament*. London, 1642.
———. *The English Pope, Or A Discourse Wherein The late mysticall Intelligence betwixt the Court of England, and the Court of Rome is in part discovered*. London, 1643.
———. *An exact and true Relation of A most cruell and horrid Murther committed by one of the Cavaliers, on A Woman in Leicester, Billetted in her House*. London, 1642.
———. "The Female Parricide." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:157. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *The Grand Abuses Stript and Whipt; Being an Account of some of the Injuries, Pride, and the insulting Insolences of the Hogen Mogen States of Holland*. London, 1672.
———. *A Gratulatory Poem On The Just And Piovs Proceedings Of The King and Parliament Against The Papists*. London, 1674.
———. *The Great Eclipse of the Sun, Or, Charles His Waine*. London, 1644.
———. *A great Robbery in the North, Neer Swanton in Yorkshire*. London, 1642.
———. *Hell's Higher Court of Justice: Or, The Trial of The three Politick Ghosts, Oliver Cromwell, King of Sweden, and Cardinal Mazarine*. London, 1661.
———. *The horrid Popish Plot Happily Discover'd*. London, 1678.
———. *The Insolency and Cruelty of the Cavaliers*. London, 1643.
———. *The Key To The Kings Cabinet-Counsell*. London, 1644.
———. *The Kings Maiesties Speech On the 2. Day of December, 1641*. London, 1641.
———. "The King's Vows." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:159–62. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *A Letter From The Devil, To The Pope And His Prelates*. London, 1670.
———. "A Litany." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:190. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *The Manner of the Burning the Pope in Effigies in London On the 5th of November, 1678*. London, 1678.
———. *A Mappe of Mischiefe, Or a Dialogue between V. and E. concerning the going of Qu. M. into V*. London, 1641.

———. *A Memorial Of The Late And Present Popish Plots, Published to refresh the Memories of all undepraved Englishmen, and thereby prevent the Ruine of this Nation, by disbelieving, or forgetting of them*. London, 1680.

———. *A Memento for Holland: Or A True and Exact History of the most Villainous and Barbarous Cruelties used on the English Merchants residing At Amboyna in the East-Indies, by the Netherland Governour and Councel there*. London, 1652.

———. *Monmouth Degraded. Or James Scot, the little King in Lyme. A Song*. London, 1685.

———. *The Murmurers. A Poem*. London, 1689.

———. "Nell Gwynne." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:420. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

———. *A Nest of Nunnes Egges, strangely Hatched, with the Description of a worthy Feast for Ioy of the Brood*. London, 1680.

———. *A New Ballad To the praise of James D. of Monmouth*. London, 1682.

———. *A New Mercury, Called Mercurius Problematicus. Proposing severall Problems; AND Resolving them by way of Quaere*. London, 1644.

———. *Newes out of East India: Of the cruell and bloody usage of our English Merchants and others at Amboyna, by the Netherlandish Governour and Councell there*. London, 1624.

———. *News from Rome, Or, A Dialogue Between His Holinesse And a Cabal of Cardinals At A Late Conclave*. London, 1680.

———. *News from the Sessions House. The Tryal, Conviction, Condemnation, and Execution of Popery, for High-Treason*. London, 1689.

———. *Nocturnall Occurrences Or, Deeds Of Darknesse: Committed, By the Cavaleers in their Rendezvous*. London, 1642.

———. "On the Prorogation." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:179–84. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

———. *A Parly Between The Ghosts Of The Late Protector, And The King of Sweden, At their Meeting in Hell*. London, 1660.

———. *A Passionate Satyr Upon a Devilish Great He-Whore That lives yonder at Rome*. London, 1675.

———. *Perkin's Passing-Bell, Or The Traytors Funeral*. London, 1685.

———. *The Pharisee Unmask'd: In A New Discovery Of The Artifices Used by Roman Catholic Priests To Convert Prisoners both at, and before the Time of Execution*. London, 1687.

———. *The Pope in a Passion; Or, Bad News for England*. London, 1689.

———. *Popery Absolutely Destructive to Monarchy*. London, 1673.

———. *The Popes Down-fall, At Abergaveny, Or A true and perfect Relation of his being carried through the Fair in a solemn Procession with very great Ceremony*. London, 1679.

———. *A Popish Political Catechism: Or, A View of the Principles of the Synagogue of Antichrist, concerning the Power of Kings*. London, 1685.

———. *Popish Treachery: Or, A Short and New Account of the Horrid Cruelties Exercised on the Protestants In France*. Edinburgh, 1689.

———. *A Powerfull, Pitifull, Citi-Full Cry, of Plentifull Children, And their Admirable, lamentable Complaint*. London, 1643.

———. *A Protestant Catechisme for Little Children, or Plain Scripture against Popery*. London, 1673.

———. *The Protestation And Declaration of the Popish, and evill affected Cavaliers*. London, 1642.

———. *The Queens Lamentation*. London, 1660.

———. *A rare Example of a vertuous Maid in Paris*. London, 1674.

———. *The Reformed Malignants. Or, A discourse Upon the present state Of our affaires Betwixt a cavalier And a convert*. London, 1643.

———. *A Relation Of The Most Material Matters Handled In Parliament Relating To Religion, Property, And The Liberty Of The Subject*. Netherlands, 1673.

———. *The Rise and Fall Or Degeneracy Of The Roman Church, With A Lamentation for all Degenerate and Unregenerate Christians*. London, 1680.

———. "The Royal Buss." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:263–65. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *Salus Britannica: Or, The Safety Of The Protestant Religion, Against all the present Apprehensions Of Popery Fully Discust and Proved*. London, 1685.
———. *A Scheme Of Popish Cruelties Or A Prospect of what wee must Expect under a Popish Successor*. London, 1681.
———. *A Seasonable Memento, For all that have Voyces in the Choyce of A Parliament*. London, 1681.
———. *A Second Remonstrance by way of Address From The Church of England to both Houses of Parliament*. London, 1685.
———. *A Short Disswasive From Popery, And From Countenancing and Encouraging of Papists*. London, 1685.
———. *A Short History Of The Convention, Or, New Christened Parliament*. London, 1689.
———. *A Short Memorial Of The Most Grievous Sufferings Of The Ministers Of The Protestant Churches In Hungary*. London, 1676.
———. *Some Remarks upon our Affairs*. London, 1690.
———. "Song to the tune of 'Lilli burlero.'" In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:317. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *Speculum Papismi: Or, A Looking-Glass For Papists Wherein They may see their own sweet Faces*. Cambridge, 1669.
———. *The State-Prodigal his Return; Containing a true State of the Nation. In a Letter to a Friend*. London, 1689.
———. "A Summons from a True Protestant Conjurer to Cethegus' Ghost, To Appear September 19, 1682." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by Howard H. Schless, 3:263–66. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *Terrible Newes From York*. London, 1642.
———. *A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell And Hugh Peters In Saint James's Park*. London, 1660.
———. *The Tragedy Of The Kings Armies Fidelity Since their entring into Bristol*. London, 1643.
———. *A True and Compendious Narration; Or (Second Part of Amboyney[sic]) Of Sundry Notorious or Remarkable Injuries, Insolences, and Acts of Hostility which the Hollanders Have Exercised from time to time against The English Nation in the East-Indies, &c.* London, 1665.
———. *A True and Perfect Relation of A victorious Battell Obtained against the Earl of Cumberland And his Cavaliers*. London, 1642.
———. *A True Relation of the Unjust, Cruel, and Barbarous Proceedings against the English at Amboyna In the East-Indies, by the Netherlandish Governour & Council there*. London, 1651.
———. *A True Relation Of two Merchants of London, Who were taken prisoners by the Cavaliers*. London, 1642.
———. *University Newes, Or, The Unfortunate proceedings of the Cavaliers in Oxford*. London, 1642.
———. "Untitled." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:59. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
———. *Valiant Monmouth Revived*. London, 1684.
———. *The Wicked Resolution Of The Cavaliers; Declaring Their malice and hatred to the Parliament the Commonwealth, and especially the City of London*. London, 1642.
———. *The Young Bastards Wish, A Song*. London, 1685.
AntiPapist. *Fair Warning To take heed of Popery*. London, 1679.
Arata, Stephen D. "The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization." *Victorian Studies* 33, no. 4 (1990): 119–44.
Arens, William. "Cooking the Cannibals." In *Consuming Passions: Food in the Age of Anxiety*, edited by Sian Griffiths and Jennifer Wallace, 157–66. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

Armistead, J. M. *Nathaniel Lee*. Boston: Twayne, 1979.
———. "The Tragicomic Design of *Lucius Junius Brutus*: Madness as Providential Therapy." *Papers on Language and Literature* 15 (1979): 38–51.
Arnade, Peter J. *Beggars, Iconoclasts, and Civic Patriots: The Political Culture of the Dutch Revolt*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
Ashley, Leonard R. N. *Colley Cibber*. New York: Twayne, 1965.
Ayloffe, John. "Britannia and Raleigh." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, ed. George deF. Lord, 1:228–36. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
Baker, John Hamilton. *An Introduction to English Legal History*. London: Butterworths, 1979.
Bamford, Karen. *Sexual Violence on the Jacobean Stage.* New York: St. Martin's, 2000.
Barbour, Frances. "The Unconventional Heroic Plays of Nathaniel Lee." *Studies in English* 20 (1940): 109–16.
Barlow, Thomas. *Popery: Or, The Principles & Positions Approved by the Church Of Rome*. London, 1683.
Bartels, Emily. "Making More of the Moor: Aaron, Othello, and Renaissance Refashionings of Race." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1990): 433–54.
Barthelemy, Anthony Gerard. *Black Face, Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.
Bashar, Nafize. "Rape in England between 1550 and 1700." In *The Sexual Dynamics of History: Men's Power, Women's Resistance*, edited by The London Feminist History Group, 28–46. London: Pluto Press, 1983.
Beach, Adam R. "Carnival Politics, Generous Satire, and Nationalist Spectacle in Behn's *The Rover*." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28, no. 3 (2004): 1–19.
Beaulieu, Luke. *Take heed of Both Extremes Or, Plain and useful Cautions Against Popery, And Presbytery*. London, 1675.
Behn, Aphra. *The Rover, Part I*. In *The Works of Aphra Behn*, edited by Janet Todd, 5:445–521. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995.
Belling, Catherine. "Infectious Rape, Therapeutic Revenge: Bloodletting and the Health of Rome's Body." In *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, edited by Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson, 113–32. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.
Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London: Methuen, 1985.
Bender, Ashley Brookner. "Moving Miniatures and Circulating Bodies in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*." *Restoration* 31, no. 1 (2007): 27–46.
Berglund, Jeff. *Cannibal Fictions: American Explorations of Colonialism, Race, Gender, and Sexuality*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.
Berman, Ronald. "Nature in *Venice Preserv'd*." *ELH* 36, no. 3 (1969): 529–43.
Bevington, David, et al., ed. *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*. New York: Norton, 2002.
de Bévotte, Gendarme. *La Légende de Don Juan: Son Évolution Dans La Littérature Des Origines Au Romantisme*. Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.
Blount, Charles. *An Appeal From the Country To the City, For the Preservation of His Majesties Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion*. London, 1679.
———. *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*. London, 1693.
Boebel, Dagny. "In the Carnival World of Adam's Garden: Roving and Rape in Behn's *Rover*." In *Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama*, edited by Katherine Quinsey, 54–70. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
Bohun, Edmund. "A Preface to the Reader." Introduction to *Patriarcha: Or The Natural Power Of Kings*, by Sir Robert Filmer, a1r–g4r. London, 1685.
Bowber, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached in the Parish-Church of St Swithin, London, March 10th 1694/5, Upon the Much Lamented Death of our Most Gracious Queen*. London, 1695.
Bowers, Fredson. *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
———. "The Stabbing of a Portrait in Elizabethan Tragedy." *Modern Language Notes* 47, no. 6 (1932): 378–85.

Bowers, Toni. "Behn's Monmouth: Sedition, Seduction, and Tory Ideology in the 1680s." *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 38 (2009): 15–44.

Boyle, Roger, Earl of Orrery. *The Generall.* In *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle*, edited by William S. Clark II, 1:101–64. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Bradburn, Beth. "Bodily Metaphor and Moral Agency in *A Masque*: A Cognitive Approach." *Milton Studies* 43 (2004): 19–34.

Brady, Nicholas. *The Rape: Or, The Innocent Impostors*. London, 1692.

Broaddus, James. "'Gums of Glutinous Heat' in Milton's Mask and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*." *Milton Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2003): 205–14.

Broude, Ronald. "Revenge and Revenge Tragedy in Renaissance England." *Renaissance Quarterly* 28, no. 1 (1975): 38–58.

Brown, Cedric. *John Milton's Aristocratic Entertainments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Brown, F. C. *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Brown, Laura. *English Dramatic Form, 1660–1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Brown, Richard. "Heroics Satirized by 'Mad Nat. Lee.'" *Papers on Language and Literature* 19, no. 4 (1983): 385–401.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape.* New York: Bantam, 1975.

Bullinger, Henry. *A Confutation Of the Popes Bull which was published more than two yeres agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland, and against the noble Realme of England*. London, 1572.

Burks, Deborah G. *Horrid Spectacle: Violation in the Theater of Early Modern England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2003.

Burnet, Gilbert. *The Mystery of Iniquity Unvailed*. London, 1673.

Burnett, Anne Pippin. *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. *Tragedies of Tyrants: Political Thought and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Butler, Melissa A. "Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy." *American Political Science Review* 72, no. 1 (1978): 135–50.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. "The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages: A Reply to Leo Steinberg." *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 3 (1986): 399–439.

Byrne, Peter. "'Where Appetite Directs': Tragic Heroism's Recovery in Rochester's *Valentinian*." *Pacific Coast Philology* 40, no. 1 (2005): 158–77.

Bywaters, David. "Venice, Its Senate, and Its Plot in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." *Modern Philology* 80, no. 3 (1983): 256–63.

C., G. *Popish Plots And Treasons From the beginning of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. London, 1676.

Campbell, Lily B. "Theories of Revenge in Renaissance England." *Modern Philology* 28, no. 3 (1931): 281–96.

Cantor, Paul A. *Shakespeare's Rome: Republic and Empire*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Carew, Thomas. "A Rapture." In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 8th ed., edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 1:1672–75. New York: Norton, 2006.

Carswell, John. *From Revolution to Revolution: England 1688–1776*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Cartwright, William. *The Game at Chesse. A metaphoricall discourse shewing the present estate of this Kingdome*. London, 1643.

Carver, Larry. "Rochester's *Valentinian*." *Restoration and Eighteenth Century Theatre Research* 3, no. 1 (1989): 25–38.

Castaldo, Annalisa. "'These were spectacles to please my soul': Inventive Violence in the Renaissance Revenge Tragedy." In *Staging Pain, 1580–1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater*, edited by James Robert Allard and Matthew R. Martin, 49–56. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.

Chalmers, Hero. *Royalist Women Writers, 1650–1689*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.

Charles II. *A Proclamation To Restrain the Spreading of False News, and Licentious Talking of Matters of State and Government*. London, 1672.

Chaytor, Miranda. "Husband(ry): Narratives of Rape in the Seventeenth Century." *Gender and History* 7, no. 3 (1995): 378–407.

Chernaik, Warren L. *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Cherry, George L. "The Legal and Philosophical Position of the Jacobites, 1688–1689." *Journal of Modern History* 22, no. 4 (1950): 309–21.

Choudhury, Mita. "Orrery and the London Stage: A Loyalist's Contribution to Restoration Allegorical Drama." *Studia Neophilologica* 62, no. 1 (1990): 43–59.

Cibber, Colley. *Xerxes, A Tragedy*. London, 1699.

Clark, Constance. *Three Augustan Women Playwrights*. New York: Peter Lang, 1986.

Clark, J. C. D. *English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Clark, Sandra. *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher: Sexual Themes and Dramatic Representation*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.

Clark, W. S. "The Earl of Orrery's Play *The Generall*." *Review of English Studies* 2, no. 8 (1926): 459–60.

Clark, William S. "Further Light upon the Heroic Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery." *Review of English Studies* 2, no. 6 (1926): 206–11.

Claydon, Tony. *William III*. London and New York: Longman, 2002.

Clifton, Robin. "James II's Two Rebellions." *History Today* 38, no. 7 (1988): 23–29.

———. "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution." *Past and Present* 52 (1971): 23–55.

Codrington, Robert. *His Majesties Propriety, And Dominion On The British Seas Asserted*. London, 1672.

Coles, Gilbert. *A Dialogue Between A Protestant And A Papist*. Oxford, 1679.

Collins, Margo. "Feminine Conduct and Violence in Mary Pix's She-Tragedies." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 18, no. 1 (2003): 1–16.

Collinson, Patrick, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham. "Religious Publishing in England 1557–1640." In *The Cambridge History of the Book, Volume IV, 1557–1695*, edited by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, 29–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Combe, Kirk. *A Martyr for Sin: Rochester's Critique of Polity, Sexuality, and Society*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Cooke, Alexander. *A Present for a Papist: Or The Life and Death Of Pope Joan*. London, 1675.

Coox, Alvin D. "The Dutch Invasion of England: 1667." *Military Affairs* 13, no. 4 (1949): 223–33.

Copeland, Nancy. "'Once a Whore and Ever?' Whore and Virgin in *The Rover* and Its Antecedents." In *Early Women Writers: 1660–1720*, edited by Anita Pacheco, 149–59. London: Longman, 1998.

———. *Staging Gender in Behn and Centlivre*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Cousins, A. D. "The Idea of a 'Restoration' and the Verse Satires of Butler and Marvell." *Southern Review* 14, no. 2 (1981): 131–42.

Crashaw, Richard. "Luke 11. Blessed be the paps which Thou hast sucked." In *The Complete Poetry of Richard Crashaw*, edited by George Walton Williams, 14. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1970.

Crouch, John. *The Muses Joy For the Recovery of that Weeping Vine Henrietta Maria*. London, 1660.

Crowne, John. *Caligula. A Tragedy*. London, 1698.

———. *Daeneids, Or The Noble Labours of the Great Dean Of Notre-Dame In Paris, For the Erecting in his Quire a Throne for his Glory, and the Eclipsing the Pride of an Imperious, Usurping Chanter*. London, 1692.

———. *The Misery of Civil War*. In *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Restoration*, edited by Barbara A. Murray, 89–192. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005.

———. *Thyestes. A Tragedy*. London, 1681.

Cruickshanks, Eveline. *The Glorious Revolution*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.
Daalder, Joost. Introduction to *Thyestes*, by Jasper Heywood, x–xlv. New York: Norton, 1989.
Daly, James. *Sir Robert Filmer and English Political Thought*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
D'Amico, Jack. *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*. Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991.
Darby, Graham, ed. *The Origins and Development of the Dutch Revolt*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
Dauncey, John. *The History Of The Thrice Illustrious Princess Henrietta Maria de Bourbon, Queen Of England*. London, 1660.
D'Cruze, Shani. "Approaching the History of Rape and Sexual Violence: Notes towards Research." *Women's History Review* 1, no. 3 (1993): 377–96.
Defoe, Daniel. *The Life Of That Incomparable Princess Mary, Our Late Sovereign Lady, Of ever Blessed Memory. Who departed this Life, at her Royal Pallace at Kensington, the 28th of December, 1694*. London, 1695.
de las Casas, Bartolomé. *The Spanish Colonie, Or Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies, called the newe World*. London, 1583.
Dennis, John. *Original Letters, Familiar, Moral, and Critical*. 2 vols. London, 1721.
Denton, William. *The Burnt Child dreads the Fire*. London, 1675.
DePorte, Michael. "Otway and the Straits of Venice." *Papers on Language and Literature* 18, no. 3 (1982): 245–57.
DeRitter, Jonas. "The Gypsy, *The Rover*, and the Wanderer: Aphra Behn's Revision of Thomas Killigrew." *Restoration* 10, no. 2 (1986): 82–92.
Detmer-Goebel, Emily. "The Need for Lavinia's Voice: *Titus Andronicus* and the Telling of Rape." *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001): 75–92.
Diamond, Elin. "*Gestus* and Signature in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*." In *Early Women Writers: 1660–1720*, edited by Anita Pacheco, 160–82. London: Longman, 1998.
Dickinson, H. T. *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1977.
Diehl, Huston. *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1997.
Digby, Lettice. *A Full and True Account Of The Inhumane and Bloudy Cruelties Of The Papists To The Poor Protestants In Ireland In the year, 1641*. London, 1689.
Dolan, Frances. *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999.
Donnelly, Mark P., and Daniel Diehl. *Eat Thy Neighbor: A History of Cannibalism*. Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2006.
Doyle, Anne. "Dryden's Authorship of *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco* (1674)." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 6, no. 3 (1966): 421–45.
Dryden, John. *Albion and Albanius*. In *The Works of John Dryden*, edited by Vinton Dearing, 15:1–55. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
———. *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*. In *The Works of John Dryden*, edited by Vinton A. Dearing, 12:1–79. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
———. "Astraea Redux." In *Restoration Literature: An Anthology*, edited by Paul Hammond, 23–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
Duffy, Maureen. *The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn, 1640–89*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1977.
Dugas, Don-John. "Elkanah Settle, John Crowne and Nahum Tate." In *A Companion to Restoration Drama*, edited by Susan J. Owen, 378–95. Malden: Blackwell, 2001.
Du Moulin, Lewis. *A Short and True Account Of The Several Advances The Church of England Hath made towards Rome: Or, A Model of the Grounds upon which the Papists for these Hundred years have built their Hopes*. London, 1680.
Durant, Jack D. "'Honor's Toughest Task': Family and State in *Venice Preserved*." *Studies in Philology* 71, no. 4 (1974): 484–503.

E., T. *The Lawes Resolutions of Womens Rights: Or, the Lawes Provision for Women*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1978.

Earle, Peter. *Monmouth's Rebels: The Road to Sedgemoor*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1977.

Eaton, Sara. "A Woman of Letters: Lavinia in *Titus Andronicus*." In *Shakespearean Tragedy and Gender*, edited by Shirley Nelson Garner and Madelon Sprengether, 54–74. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Eliot, T. S. *Selected Essays*. New York: Harcourt, 1964.

Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Erskine-Hill, Howard. "Literature and the Jacobite Cause: Was There a Rhetoric of Jacobitism?" In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 49–69. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

F., J. *Englands Lamentation For The Duke of Monmouth's Departure: Reflecting on his Heroick Actions*. London, 1679.

Farnell, J. E. "The Navigation Act of 1651, the First Dutch War, and the London Merchant Community." *Economic History Review* 16, no. 3 (1964): 439–54.

Fenner, William. *Four Select Sermons Upon Several Texts of Scripture. Wherein The Idolatry, and Will-worship of the Church of Rome, is laid Open and Confuted, &c*. London, 1668.

Ferguson, Robert. *A Brief Account of some of the late Incroachments and Depredations of the Dutch upon the English*. London, 1695.

———. *A Letter to Mr. Secretary Trenchard, Discovering a Conspiracy against the Laws and ancient Constitution of England: With Reflections on the present Pretended Plot*. London, 1694.

———. *Whether the Parliament be not in Law dissolved by the Death of the Princess of Orange*. London, 1695.

———. *Whether the Preserving the Protestant Religion was the Motive unto, or the End, that was designed in the Late Revolution?* London, 1695.

Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Fink, Z. S. *The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth-Century England*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1945.

Finkelpearl, Philip J. *Court and Country Politics in the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Fisk, Deborah Payne. Introduction to *Four Libertine Plays*, xi–xliv. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Flores, Stephen P. "Orrery's *The Generall* and *Henry The Fifth*: Sexual Politics and the Desire for Friendship." *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 37, no. 1 (1996): 56–74.

Foulis, Henry. *The history Of Romish Treasons & Usurpations: Together with A Particular Account Of many gross Corruptions and Impostures In the Church of Rome*. London, 1671.

Fowler, Patsy S. "Rejecting the Status Quo: The Attempts of Mary Pix & Susannah Centlivre to Reform Society's Patriarchal Attitudes." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 2 (1996): 49–59.

Fox, George. *The Arraignment And Condemnation Of Popery*. London, 1675.

Foxe, John. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Blacksburg: Wilder Publications, 2009.

Gailhard, J. *Four Tracts*. London, 1699.

Gammon, J. D. "Ravishment and Ruin: The Construction of Stories of Sexual Violence in England, c. 1640–1820." PhD diss., University of Essex, 2001.

Gascoigne, George. *The Spoyle of Antwerp. Faithfully reported, by a true Englishman, who was present at the same*. London, 1576.

Gauden, John. *Cromwell's Bloody Slaughter-house*. London, 1660.

A Gentleman of good quality. *True Intelligence From The West: Or A true Relation of the desperate Proceedings of the Rebels, and Cavaliers gathered together at Angry-Fisherten in Wilt-shire*. London, 1647.

Gerwirtz, Arthur. *Restoration Adaptations of Early 17th Century Comedies*. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982.
Gill, Pat. "Revolutionary Identity in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." In *Illicit Sex: Identity Politics in Early Modern Culture*, edited by Thomas DiPiero and Pat Gill, 239–55. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.
Gillespie, Raymond. "The End of an Era: Ulster and the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising." In *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534–1641*, edited by Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie, 191–248. Bungay: Irish Academic Press, 1986.
Goldie, Mark. "Contextualizing Absalom: William Lawrence, the Laws of Marriage, and the Case for King Monmouth." In *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540–1688,* edited by Donna Hamilton and Richard Strier, 208–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
Goodlad, Graham. "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *History Review* 58 (2008): 10–15.
Goodwin, John. *Anti-Cavalierisme, Or, Truth Pleading As well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of this present War, for the suppressing of that Butcherly brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries, who are now hammering England, to make an Ireland of it*. London, 1642.
Grantley, Darryl. "Masques and Murderers: Dramatic Method and Ideology in Revenge Tragedy and the Court Masque." In *Jacobean Poetry and Prose: Rhetoric, Representation and the Popular Imagination*, edited by Clive Bloom, 194–212. New York: St. Martin's, 1988.
Gray, Ralph. "The Coronation Ballad, 11th April 1689." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:43. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
Greaves, Richard L. *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688–1689*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Greer, Margaret, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, eds. *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
Gregg, Edward. *Queen Anne*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
Groenveld, Simon. "The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640–1652." *Historical Journal* 30, no. 3 (1987): 541–66.
H., B. *The Parliament of Bees. A Fable*. London, 1697.
H., I. *A briefe Relation, Abstracted out of severall Letters, of A most Hellish, Cruell, and Bloudy Plot against the City of Bristoll*. London, 1642.
Habib, Imtiaz. "Elizabethan Racial Medical Psychology, Popular Drama, and the Social Programming of the Late-Tudor Black: Sketching an Exploratory Postcolonial Hypothesis." In *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*, edited by Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson, 93–112. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.
Hadfred, John. *A wonderfull And Strange Miracle or Gods Just Vengeance against the Cavaliers*. London, 1642.
Haliczer, Stephen. *Sexuality in the Confessional: A Sacrament Profaned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Hall, H. Gaston. "Dom Juan: Personnage Europeen Du XVIIe Siecle." In *Horizons européens de la literature française au XVIIe siècle*, edited by Wolfgang Leiner, 139–47. Tübingen: Narr, 1988.
Haller, William. *The Elect Nation: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
Hallet, Charles A. and Elaine S. *The Revenger's Madness: A Study of Revenge Tragedy Motifs*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980.
Ham, Roswell G. "Dryden versus Settle." *Modern Philology* 25, no. 4 (1928): 409–16.
———. *Otway and Lee: Biography from a Baroque Age*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1931.
Hammond, Antony. "The 'Greatest Action': Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*." In *Poetry and Drama, 1570–1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*, edited by Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond, 175–85. London: Methuen, 1981.

Hammond, Paul. *Figuring Sex between Men from Shakespeare to Rochester*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hargrove, Anne. Introduction to *The Fatal Contract*, by William Heminge, iv–xxii. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1978.

Harris, Tim. "'Lives, Liberties and Estates': Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II." In *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, edited by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie, 217–41. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Harsnett, Samuel. *A Declaration of egregious Popish Impostures, to with-draw the harts of her Maiesties Subjects from their allegeance, and from the truth of Christian Religion professed in England, vnder the pretence of casting out deuills*. London, 1603.

Harth, Philip. "Political Interpretations of *Venice Preserv'd*." *Modern Philology* 85, no. 4 (1988): 345–62.

Hayne, Victoria. "'All Language Then Is Vile': The Theatrical Critique of Political Rhetoric in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*." *ELH* 63, no. 2 (1996): 337–65.

Helms, Lorraine. "'The High Roman Fashion': Sacrifice, Suicide, and the Shakespearean Stage." *PMLA* 107, no. 3 (1992): 554–65.

Herman, Eleanor. *Mistress of the Vatican: The True Story of Olimpia Maidalchini: The Secret Female Pope*. New York: William Morrow, 2008.

Hermanson, Anne. "Monstrous Women in Aphra Behn's *Abdelazer* and Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*." In *Aphra Behn (1640–1689): Le Modèle Européen*, edited by Mary Ann O'Donnell and Bernard Dhuicq, 25–32. Entrevaux, France: Bilingua GA Editions, 2005.

Heminge, William. *The Fatal Contract*. In *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge*, edited by Carol A. Morley, 309–89. Madison: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Rape of Lucrece. A True Roman Tragedie. With the severall Songs in their apt places, by Valerius, the merrie Lord amongst the Roman Peers*. London, 1608.

Hibbard, Caroline M. "Henrietta Maria (1609–1669) ." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004–12. Accessed February 10, 2011. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/12947.

Hibernicus, Mercurius. *A Pacquet Of Popish Delusions, False Miracles, and Lying Wonders*. London, 1681.

Higgins, Lynn A., and Brenda R. Silver, eds. *Rape and Representation*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.

Hila, Marina. "'Justice shall never heare ye, I am justice': Absolutist Rape and Cyclical History in John Fletcher's *The Tragedy of Valentinian*." *Neophilologus* 91, no. 4 (2007): 745–58.

Hill, Christopher. *Milton and the English Revolution*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.

Hook, Lucyle. "The Publication Date of Rochester's *Valentinian*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 19, no. 4 (1956): 401–7.

Hopkins, Charles. *Boadicea Queen of Britain. A Tragedy*. London, 1697.

Horneck, Anthony. *The Honesty Of The Protestant, And Dishonesty Of The Popish Divinity, In A Letter To A Lady Revolted to the Church of Rome*. London, 1681.

Howard, Edward. *The Usurper, A Tragedy*. London, 1668.

Howe, Elizabeth. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hughes, Derek. *English Drama, 1660–1700*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

———. "Human Sacrifice on the Restoration Stage: The Case of *Venice Preserv'd*." *Philological Quarterly* 88, no. 4 (2009): 365–84.

———. "A New Look at *Venice Preserv'd*." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 11, no. 3 (1971): 437–57.

———. "Rape on the Restoration Stage." *The Eighteenth Century* 46, no. 3 (2005): 225–36.

———. *The Theatre of Aphra Behn*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Hulme, Peter. "Columbus and the Cannibals." In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft and Gareth Griffiths, 365–69. London: Routledge, 1995.

Hume, Mr. [Patrick Hume]. *A Poem Dedicated to the Immortal Memory of Her Late Majesty*. London, 1695.

Hume, Robert D. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
———. *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama, 1660–1800*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983.
Hutner, Heidi. *Colonial Women: Race and Culture in Stuart Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
Hutton, Ronald. *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
Israel, Jonathan. "Competing Cousins: Anglo-Dutch Trade Rivalry." *History Today* 38 (1988): 17–22.
Iwanisziw, Susan. "Tortured Bodies, Factionalism, and Unsettled Loyalties in Settle's Morocco Plays." In *Staging Pain, 1580–1800: Violence and Trauma in British Theater*, edited by James Robert Allard and Matthew R. Martin, 111–36. Burlington: Ashgate, 2009.
Iyengar. Sujata. *Shades of Difference: Mythologies of Skin Color in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
Jaffe, Aaron. "Seditious Appetites and Creeds: Shadwell's Libertines and Hobbes's Foole." *Restoration* 24, no. 2 (2002): 55–74.
Johnson, James William. *A Profane Wit: The Life of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2004.
Johnston, Nathaniel. *The Dear Bargain. Or, A True Representation of the State of the English Nation under the Dutch*. London, 1690.
Jones, J. R. *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis 1678–1683*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
———. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, 1972.
Jurieu, Monsieur. *Le Dragon Missionaire: Or, The Dragoon Turn'd Apostle*. London, 1686.
Kaufman, Anthony. "'The Perils of Florinda': Aphra Behn, Rape, and the Subversion of Libertinism in *The Rover*, Part I." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 2 (1996): 1–21.
Keach, Benjamin. *Sion in Distress: Or, The Groans Of The Protestant Church*. London, 1681.
Keen, Benjamin. "The Black Legend Revisited: Assumptions and Realities." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 49, no. 4 (1969): 703–19.
Ken, Thomas. *A Letter To The Author of a Sermon Entitled, A Sermon Preach'd At The Funeral Of Her late Majesty Queen Mary, Of ever Blessed Memory*. London, 1695.
Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*. London: Phoenix Press, 1972.
———. *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689–1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
Kerrigan, John. "Orrery's Ireland and the British Problem." In *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, edited by David J. Baker and Willy Maley, 197–225. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
Khastgir, Aparna. "Endings as *Concordia Discors*: *Titus Andronicus*." *Studia Neophilologica* 73 (2001): 36–47.
Kilgour, Maggie. *From Communion to Cannibalism: An Anatomy of Metaphors of Incorporation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
Kittermaster, Thomas. *A Wonderfull Deliverance Or Gods abundant mercy in preserving from the Cavaliers the towne of Draiton In the County of Hereford*. London, 1642.
Knight, G. Wilson. *The Imperial Theme: Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies Including the Roman Plays*. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.
Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Koon, Helene. *Colley Cibber: A Biography*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1986.
Kunz, Don R. *The Drama of Thomas Shadwell*. Salzburg: Institut Für Englische Sprache Und Literatur, 1972.
Lacy, John. "Satire." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:425–28. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Lake, Peter. "Antipopery: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603–1642*, edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 72–107. London and New York: Longman Group, 1989.

Lawrence, George. *The Debauched Cavalleer: Or the English Midianite*. London, 1642.

Lawton, Charlwood. *A Letter formerly sent to Dr Tillotsen, and for Want of an Answer made publick*. London, 1748.

Lee, Nathaniel. *Lucius Junius Brutus*. In *Works*, edited by Thomas B. Stroup and Arthur L. Cooke. New Brunswick: Scarecrow Press, 1954.

———. *Mithridates, King of Pontus, A Tragedy*. London, 1678.

Leissner, Debra. "Divided Nation, Divided Self: The Language of Capitalism and Madness in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 32, no. 2 (1999): 19–31.

Lestringant, Frank. *Cannibals: The Discovery and Representation of the Cannibal from Columbus to Jules Verne*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Leti, Gregorio. *The Life Of Donna Olimpia Maldachini, Who Governed the Church during the Time of Innocent the X*. London, 1666.

Liebler, Naomi Conn. *Shakespeare's Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Lilly, William. *The Dangerous Condition of the United Provinces Prognosticated, And Plainly Demonstrated, By Mr. William Lilly, In his Observations of that Comet which appeared in the Year of our Lord, 1652. And published in his annual Predictions in the Year 1654, &tc*. London, 1672.

Lindley, Keith J. "The Impact of the 1641 Rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641–5." *Irish Historical Studies* 18, no. 70 (1972): 143–76.

Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. Translated by B. O. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Lloyd, William. *Papists No Catholicks: And Popery No Christianity*. London, 1677.

———. *Seasonable Advice To All Protestant People Of England*. London, 1681.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Loftis, John. Introduction to *Lucius Junius Brutus*, by Nathaniel Lee, i–xxiv. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Lord, George deF., ed. *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*. 7 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Love, Harold. "The Rapes of Lucina." In *Print, Manuscript & Performance*, edited by Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol, 200–214. Athens: Ohio State University Press, 2000.

———. "Shadwell, Flecknoe and the Duke of Newcastle: An Impetus for *MacFlecknoe*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1985): 19–27.

———. "Shadwell, Rochester, and the Crisis of Amateurism." *Restoration* 20, no. 2 (1996): 119–34.

———. "State Affairs on the Restoration Stage, 1660–1675." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 14, no. 1 (1975): 1–9.

———. "Was Lucina Betrayed at Whitehall?" In *That Second Bottle: Essays on John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, edited by Nicholas Fisher, 179–90. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Lovelace, Richard. "To Lucasta, Going to the Wars." In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature,* 8th ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al., 1:1682. New York: Norton, 2006.

Lowenthal, Cynthia. *Performing Identities on the Restoration Stage*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003.

Lynch, Kathleen M. *Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965.

MacDonald, Joyce Green. "'Hay for the Daughters!' Gender and Patriarchy in *The Misery of Civil War* and *Henry VI*." *Comparative Drama* 24, no. 3 (1990): 193–216.

———. "Public Wounds: Sexual Bodies and the Origins of State in Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 32 (2003): 229–44.

Maguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660–1670*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Mainwaring, Arthur. "Tarquin and Tullia." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:47–56. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Mandel, Oscar. *The Theatre of Don Juan: A Collection of Plays and Views, 1630–1963*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.

Marcus, Leah S. "John Milton's *Comus*." In *A Companion to Milton*, edited by Thomas N. Corns, 232–45. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Markley, Robert. *The Far East and the English Imagination, 1600–1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

Marsden, Jean I. "Mary Pix's *Ibrahim*: The Woman Writer as Commerical Playwright." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 32, no. 2 (1999): 33–44.

———. "Rape, Voyeurism, and the Restoration Stage." In *Broken Boundaries: Women & Feminism in Restoration Drama,* edited by Katherine M. Quinsey, 185–200. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1996.

Marvell, Andrew. *An Account of the Growth Of Popery And Arbitrary Government in England*. Amsterdam, 1677.

———. *The Last Instructions to a Painter*. In *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, edited by H. M. Margoliouth, 2:147–72. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

———. "Upon his Majesty's being made Free of the City." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by George deF. Lord, 1:237–42. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Maus, Katherine Eisaman. "'Playhouse Flesh and Blood': Sexual Ideology and the Restoration Actress." *ELH* 46, no. 4 (1979): 595–617.

May, Thomas, Henry Parker, and John Sadler. *The Kings Cabinet opened*. London, 1645.

McBurney, William H. "Otway's Tragic Muse Debauched: Sensuality in *Venice Preserv'd*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 58, no. 3 (1959): 380–99.

McGirr, Elaine. *Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660–1745*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.

Middleton, Thomas. *The Revenger's Tragedy*. In *English Renaissance Drama: A Norton Anthology*, edited by David Bevington et al., 1297–1370. New York: Norton, 2002.

Mildmay, Henry. "The Progress." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by William J. Cameron, 5:332. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Miles, Abraham. *The last farewel of three bould Traytors*. London, 1661.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England, 1660–1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Milton, John. *Of True Religion, Haeresie, Schism, Toleration, And what best means may be us'd against the growth of Popery*. London, 1673.

———. *The Riverside Milton*. Edited by Roy Flannagan. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Miola, Robert S. *Shakespeare's Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Monod, Paul. "The Jacobite Press and English Censorship, 1689–95." In *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks and Edward Corp, 125–42. London: Hambledon Press, 1995.

———. *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Montgomery, Sir James. *Great Britain's Just Complaint For Her Late Measures, Present Sufferings, And the Future Miseries She is exposed to*. London, 1692.

Moore, John Robert. "Contemporary Satire in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." *PMLA* 43, no. 1 (1928): 166–81.

Morley, Carol A. Introduction to *The Plays and Poems of William Heminge*, by William Heminge, 17–32. Madison: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006.

Mountfort, William. *The Injur'd Lovers: Or, The Ambitious Father. A Tragedy*. London, 1688.

Mullaney, Stephen. "Mourning and Misogyny: *Hamlet*, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, and the Final Progress of Elizabeth I." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (1994): 139–62.

Munns, Jessica. "'Plain as the light in the Cowcumber': A Note on the Conspiracy in Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." *Modern Philology* 85, no. 1 (1987): 54–57.

Nalson, John. *The Project of Peace, Or, Unity of Faith And Government, The only Expedient to Procure Peace, Both Foreign and Domestique*. London, 1678.

Novak, Maximillian E. Introduction to *The Empress of Morocco and Its Critics*, by Elkanah Settle, i–xix. Berkeley: Augustan Reprint Society, 1968.

Oates, Titus. *A Balm presented to these Nations, England, Scotland, and Ireland, To Cure the Wounds of the Bleeding Protestants, and open the Eyes of the deluded Papists, that are Ignorant of the Truth, &c*. London, 1680.

Obeyesekere, Gananath. *Cannibal Talk: The Man-Eating Myth and Human Sacrifices in the South Seas*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Oldham, John. *The Jesuits Justification, Proving they Died as Innocent as the Child Unborn*. London, 1679.

Orr, Bridget. *Empire on the English Stage, 1660–1714*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ott, Michael. "Pope Innocent X." In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: Robert Appleton, 1910. Accessed April 20, 2011. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08020b.htm.

Otway, Thomas. *Venice Preserv'd*. In *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, edited by David Womersley, 465–502. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Owen, Susan J. "Drink, Sex and Power in Restoration Comedy." In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Adam Smyth, 127–39. Rochester: D.S. Brewer, 2004.

———. "'He that should guard my virtue has betrayed it': The Dramatization of Rape in the Exclusion Crisis." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 9, no. 1 (1994): 59–98.

———. "'Partial Tyrants' and 'Freeborn People' in *Lucius Junius Brutus*." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 31, no. 3 (1991): 463–85.

———. *Perspectives on Restoration Drama*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

———. *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

———. "'Suspect my loyalty when I lose my virtue': Sexual Politics and Party in Aphra Behn's Plays of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678–83." In *Aphra Behn*, edited by Janet Todd, 57–72. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

P., H. *A Satyr Against Common-wealths*. London, 1684.

Pacheco, Anita. "Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn's 'The Rover.'" *ELH* 65, no. 2 (1998): 323–45.

Palmer, M. A. J. "The 'Military Revolution' Afloat: The Era of the Anglo-Dutch Wars and the Transition to Modern Warfare at Sea." *War in History* 4, no. 2 (1997): 123–49.

Park, Henry. *Lachryme Sacerdotis. A Pindarick Poem Occasion'd by the Death Of that most excellent Princess, our late Gracious Sovereign Lady, Mary the Second, Of Glorious Memory*. London, 1695.

Parker, Derek. *Nell Gwyn*. Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2000.

Parker, Geoffrey. "The Origins of the Dutch Revolt." *History Today* 34, no. 7 (1984): 17–21.

Parker, Gerald. "'History as Nightmare' in Nevil Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* and Nathaniel Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 21, no. 1 (1985): 3–18.

———. "The Image of Rebellion in Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd* and Edward Young's *Busiris*." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 21, no. 3 (1981): 389–407.

Pateman, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Patrides, C. A. *Premises and Motifs in Renaissance Thought and Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Patterson, Annabel M. *Marvell and the Civic Crown*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Payne, F. W. "The Question of Precedence between Dryden and the Earl of Orrery with Regard to the English Heroic Play." *Review of English Studies* 1, no. 2 (1925): 173–81.

Pearson, Jacqueline. *The Prostituted Muse: Images of Women & Women Dramatists, 1642–1737*. New York: St. Martin's, 1988.

Pellegrin, Helen. Introduction to *Thomas Shadwell's The Libertine: A Critical Edition*, by Thomas Shadwell, ix–xxxiii. New York and London: Garland, 1987.
Penn, William. *A Seasonable Caveat Against Popery. Or A Pamphlet, Entituled, An Explanation of the Roman-Chatholick* [sic] *Belief, Briefly Examined*. London, 1670.
Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, edited by Robert Latham and William Matthews. 11 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970–83.
Perdue, Danielle. "The Male Masochist in Restoration Drama." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 11, no. 1 (1996): 10–21.
Pincus, Steve. "From Butterboxes to Wooden Shoes: The Shift in English Popular Sentiment from Anti-Dutch to Anti-French in the 1670s." *Historical Journal* 38, no. 2 (1995): 333–61.
———. "Popery, Trade and Universal Monarchy: The Ideological Context of the Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Dutch War." *English Historical Review* 107, no. 422 (1992): 1–29.
———. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
Pipkin, Amanda. "'They were not humans, but devils in human bodies': Depictions of Sexual Violence and Spanish Tyranny as a Means of Fostering Identity in the Dutch Republic." *Journal of Early Modern History* 13 (2009): 229–64.
Pix, Mary. *Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks: A Tragedy*. London, 1696.
Plumb, J. H. "The New World of Children in Eighteenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 67 (1995): 64–95.
Post, J. B. "Ravishment of Women and the Statutes of Westminster." In *Legal Records and the Historian: Papers Presented to the Cambridge Legal History Conference, 7–10 July 1975, and in Lincoln's Inn Old Hall on 3 July 1974*, edited by J. H. Baker, 150–60. London: Swift Printers, 1978.
Powell, George. *Alphonso King of Naples. A Tragedy*. London, 1691.
Powell, Philip Wayne. *Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971.
Prior, Matthew. "Advice to the Painter." In *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, edited by Galbraith M. Crump, 4:44–49. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.
Proffitt, Bessie. "Religious Symbolism in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 7, no. 1 (1971): 26–37.
Raman, Shankar. *Framing "India": The Colonial Imaginary in Early Modern Culture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.
Ravenscroft, Edward. *Titus Andronicus, or The Rape of Lavinia*. In *Shakespeare Adapatations from the Restoration*, edited by Barbara A. Murray, 1–88. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005.
Ray, Sid. "'Rape, I fear, was the root of thy annoy': The Politics of Consent in *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (1998): 22–39.
Read, James Morgan. "Atrocity Propaganda and the Irish Rebellion." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (1938): 229–44.
Riebling, Barbara. "England Deflowered and Unmanned: The Sexual Image of Politics in Marvell's 'Last Instructions.'" *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 35 (1995): 137–57.
Rist, Thomas. "Religion, Politics, Revenge: The Dead in Renaissance Drama." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 9, no. 1 (2003): 1–20.
———. *Revenge Tragedy and the Drama of Commemoration in Reforming England*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.
Rollins, John B. "Judeo-Christian Apocalyptic Literature and John Crowne's *The Destruction of Jerusalem*." *Comparative Drama* 35, no. 2 (2001): 209–24.
Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and Wars*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
Rowan, Herbert. "The Dutch Revolt: What Kind of Revolution?" *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (1990): 570–90.
Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. *9th Report*, *Part I*, Manuscripts of the West and North Ridings. London, 1883.
Royster, Francesca T. "White-Lined Walls: Whiteness and Gothic Extremism in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51, no. 4 (2000): 432–55.

Rugge, Thomas. *The Diurnal of Thomas Rugg, 1659–1661*, edited by William L. Sachse. Camden Third Series, vol. 91, no. 90. London: Royal Historical Society, 1961.

Rustici, Craig M. "Gender, Disguise, and Usurpation: *The Female Prelate* and the Popish Successor." *Modern Philology* 98, no. 2 (2000): 271–98.

S., G. *A Briefe Declaration Of The Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northerne Irish Rebels, and many others in severall Counties up-rising against the English, that dwelt both lovingly and securely among them*. London, 1641.

Sadler, Anthony. *The Subjects Joy For The Kings Restoration, Cheerfully made known in A Sacred Masque*. London, 1660.

Salamon, Linda Bradley. "Gascoigne's Globe: *The Spoyle of Antwerp* and the Black Legend of Spain." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no. 1, special issue 18 (2008): 7.1–38.

Sale, Carolyn. "Representing Lavinia: The (In)Significance of Women's Consent in Legal Discourse of Rape and Ravishment and Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*." In *Women, Violence, and English Renaissance Literature: Essays Honoring Paul Jorgensen*, edited by Linda Woodbridge and Sharon Beehler, 1–27. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003.

Salmon, James. *Bloudy Newes from Ireland, Or The barbarous Crueltie By the Papists used in that Kingdome*. London, 1641.

Schochet, Gordon J. *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*. New York: Basic, 1975.

———. "The Significant Sounds of Silence: The Absence of Women from the Political Thought of Sir Robert Filmer and John Locke (or, 'Why can't a woman be more like a man?')." In *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition,* edited by Hilda L. Smith, 220–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Schwoerer, Lois. "Images of Queen Mary II, 1689–95." *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1989): 717–48.

———. "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688–89." *American Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (1977): 843–74.

Scott, Jonathan. *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623–1677*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

———. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Seaward, Paul. "The House of Commons Committee of Trade and the Origins of the Second Anglo-Dutch War, 1664." *Historical Journal* 30, no. 2 (1987): 437–52.

Seidel, Michael. *Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Selden, Raman. "Rochester and Shadwell." In *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*, edited by Jeremy Treglown, 177–90. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Thyestes*. Translated by Caryl Churchill. London: Nick Hern Books, 1995.

Sengupta, Shivaji. "Biographical Note on John Crowne." *Restoration* 6, no. 1 (1982): 26–30.

Settle, Elkanah. *Distress'd Innocence: Or, The Princess of Persia. A Tragedy*. London, 1691.

———. *The Empress of Morocco. A Tragedy*. London, 1687.

———. *The Female Prelate: Being The History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan. A Tragedy*. London, 1680.

———. *Love and Revenge: A Tragedy*. London, 1675.

Shadwell, Thomas. *The Libertine*. In *Four Restoration Libertine Plays*, edited by Deborah Payne Fisk, 1–85. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Shagan, Ethan Howard. "Constructing Discord: Ideology, Propaganda, and English Responses to the Irish Rebellion of 1641." *The Journal of British Studies* 36, no. 1 (1997): 4–34.

Shakespeare, William. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: Norton, 1997.

Shanley, Mary Lydon. "Marriage Contract and Social Contract in Seventeenth Century English Political Thought." *Western Political Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1979): 79–91.

Shell, Allison, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Shullenberger, William. "Girl Interrupted: Spenserian Bondage and Release in Milton's Ludlow Mask." *Milton Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2003): 184–204.

Sidney, Algernon. *Discourses concerning Government*, edited by Thomas G. West. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1990.

Skinner, John. *A True Relation Of The Unjust, Cruell, And Barbarous Proceedings against the English at Amboyna in the East-Indies, by the Neatherlandish Governour and Councel there*. Saint-Omer, 1624.

Smith, Molly Easo. "Spectacles of Torment in *Titus Andronicus*." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 36 (1996): 315–31.

Smuts, Malcolm. "Religion, European Politics and Henrietta Maria's Circle, 1625–41." In *Henrietta Maria: Piety, Politics and Patronage*, edited by Erin Griffey, 13–38. Burlington: Ashgate, 2008.

Solomon, Harry M. "The Rhetoric of 'Redressing Grievances': Court Propaganda as the Hermeneutical Key to *Venice Preserv'd*." *ELH* 53, no. 2 (1986): 289–310.

Speck, Bill. "Religion's Role in the Glorious Revolution." *History Today* 38, no. 7 (1988): 30–35.

Spink, Ian. "Purcell's Music for 'The Libertine.'" *Music and Letters* 81, no. 4 (2000): 520–31.

Sprague, Arthur Colby. *Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Staves, Susan. *Players' Scepters: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

Stephens, Edward. *Popish Policies and Practices Represented in the Histories of the Parisian Massacre; Gun-powder Treason; Conspiracies Against Queen Elizabeth And Persecutions Of The Protestants in France*. London, 1674.

Stewart, Ann Marie. "Rape, Patriarchy, and the Libertine Ethos: The Function of Sexual Violence in Aphra Behn's 'The Golden Age' and *The Rover, Part I*." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 12, no. 2 (1997): 26–39.

Stocker, Margarita. *Apocalyptic Marvell: The Second Coming in Seventeenth Century Poetry*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1986.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Straka, Gerald. "The Final Phase of Divine Right Theory in England, 1688–1702." *English Historical Review* 77, no. 305 (1962): 638–58.

Stroub, Thomas B. "Shadwell's Use of Hobbes." *Studies in Philology* 35, no. 3 (1938): 405–32.

Suckling, Sir John. "Out upon It!" In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 8th ed., edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al., 1:1681. New York: Norton, 2006.

Szechi, Daniel. *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688–1788*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.

Taylor, John. *The Noble Cavalier Caracterised, And A Rebellious Caviller Cauterised*. Oxford, 1643.

Thomas, Catherine. "Chaste Bodies and Poisonous Desire in Milton's Mask." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 46, no. 2 (2008): 435–59.

Thompson, Ayanna. *Performing Race and Torture on the Early Modern Stage*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Timmons, Stephen A. "Executions Following Monmouth's Rebellion: A Missing Link." *Historical Research* 76, no. 192 (2003): 286–91.

Todd, Janet. *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660–1800*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Tomlinson, Tracey E. "The Restoration English History Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery." *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 43, no. 3 (2003): 559–77.

Tonge, Ezerel. *Jesuitical Aphorismes; Or, A Summary Account Of The Doctrine Of The Jesuites, And some other Popish Doctors*. London, 1679.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *Counter-Reformation to Glorious Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Tricomi, Albert H. "The Aesthetics of Mutilation in *Titus Andronicus*." In *Shakespeare and Language*, edited by Catherine M. S. Alexander, 226–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

A true Son of the Catholick Apostolick Church. *A Catholick Pill To Purge Popery*. London: 1677.

Tumbleson, Raymond D. *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Turner, James Grantham. "The Libertine Abject: The 'Postures' of *Last Instructions to a Painter*." In *Marvell and Liberty*, edited by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, 217–48. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

———. *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics, and Literary Culture, 1630–1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Turner, Robert Y. "Responses to Tyranny in John Fletcher's Plays." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 4 (1989): 123–41.

Tyrrell, James. *A Brief Disquisition Of The Law of Nature, According to the Principles and Method laid down in the Reverend Dr. Cumberland's (now Lord Bishop of Peterboroughs) Latin Treatise on that Subject*. London, 1692.

———. *Patriarcha non Monarcha. The Patriarch Unmonarch'd*. London, 1681.

Underwood, Dale. *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Ussher, James. *Bishop Ushers Second Prophesie Which He delivered to his Daughter on his Sick-Bed*. London, 1681.

Van der Kiste, John. *William and Mary*. Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2003.

Van Lennep, William, ed. *The London Stage, 1660–1800*. 5 vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960.

Van Stipriaan, René. "Words at War: The Early Years of William of Orange's Propaganda." *Journal of Early Modern History* 11, no. 4/5 (2007): 331–49.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason. "The Construction of Barbarism in *Titus Andronicus*." In *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*, edited by Joyce Green MacDonald, 165–80. London: Associated University Press, 1997.

Veevers, Erica. *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Verdurmen, J. Peter. "*Lucius Junius Brutus* and Restoration Tragedy: The Politics of Trauma." *Journal of European Studies* 37, no. 2 (1995): 81–98.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Edited by H. E. Gould and J. L. Whiteley. London: Duckworth, 2007.

Walker, George. *The Protestant's Crums of Comfort*. London, 1697.

Waller, Edmund. *Upon Her Majesties new buildings at Somerset-House*. London, 1665.

Warner, J. Christopher. "The Question of Misogynistic Polemic in Elkanah Settle's *The Female Prelate* (1680 and 1689)." *Restoration* 25, no. 1 (2001): 19–34.

Warren, William. *Strange, true, and lamentable Newes from Exceter, And other parts of the Western countreyes shewing how cruelly the resolute Cavaliers have dealt with the inhabitants since the departure of that Right Noble Commander the Earl of Stamford*. London, 1643.

Warwicke, Robert, Earl of. *A Most Worthy Speech, Spoken by the Right Honourable Robert Earle of Warwicke*. London, 1642.

Watson, J. N. P. *Captain-General and Rebel Chief: The Life of James, Duke of Monmouth*. Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1979.

Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996.

Webster, Jeremy W. *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Weil, Rachel. "The Family in the Exclusion Crisis: Locke versus Filmer Revisited." In *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, edited by Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, 100–124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

———. *Political Passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England 1680–1714*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
Wheatley, Christopher J. *Without God or Reason: The Plays of Thomas Shadwell and Secular Ethics in the Restoration*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1993.
Whetcombe, Tristram. *The Rebels Turkish Tyranny in their march Decem. 24, 1641*. London, 1641.
White, Arthur Franklin. “John Crowne and America.” *PMLA* 35, no. 4 (1920): 447–63.
———. *John Crowne: His Life and Dramatic Works*. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1922.
White, Michelle Anne. *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
Wiener, Carol S. “The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism.” *Past and Present* 51 (1971): 27–62.
Wilkinson, Robert. *The Stripping of Ioseph, Or The crueltie of Bretheren to a Brother*. London, 1625.
Willbern, David. “Rape and Revenge in *Titus Andronicus*.” *English Literary Renaissance* 8, no. 2 (1978): 159–82.
Wilmot, John, Earl of Rochester. *Lucina’s Rape Or The Tragedy of Valentinian*. In *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, edited by Harold Love, 133–231. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
———. “A Satyr on Charles II.” In *Restoration Literature: An Anthology*, edited by Paul Hammond, 38–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
———. “To her Sacred Majesty.” In *Epicedia Academiae Oxoniensis, in Obitum Serenissimae Mariae Principis Arausionensis*. Oxford, 1660.
Wilson, J. Harold. “Rochester’s *Valentinian* and Heroic Sentiment.” *ELH* 4, no. 4 (1937): 265–73.
———. “Satiric Elements in Rochester’s *Valentinian*.” *Philological Quarterly* 16 (1937): 41–48.
Wilson, Timothy. *A Seasonable Question, In A Sermon on Joshua 5.13*. London, 1690.
Winn, James. *“When Beauty Fires the Blood”: Love and the Arts in the Age of Dryden*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.
Wood, Clement. *The Woman Who Was Pope: A Biography of Pope Joan, 853–855 A.D*. New York: William Faro, 1931.
Wright, John. *Mock-Thyestes*. In *Thyestes A Tragedy, Translated out of Seneca. To which is Added Mock-Thyestes, in Burlesque*. London, 1674.
Wycherley, William. *The Plain Dealer*, edited by Leo Hughes. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
Wynne, Sonya. “The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics.” In *The Stuart Courts*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks, 171–90. Gloucestershire: Sutton, 2000.
Wynne-Davies, Marion. “‘The Swallowing Womb’: Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*.” In *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, edited by Valerie Wayne, 129–51. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
Yalden, Thomas. *On The Conquest Of Namur, A Pindarique Ode, Humbly Inscrib’d To His Most Sacred and Victorious Majesty*. London, 1695.
Zimbardo, Rose. *A Mirror to Nature: Transformations in Drama and Aesthetics, 1660–1732*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986.
Zook, Melinda. “Contextualizing Aphra Behn: Plays, Politics, and Party, 1679–1689.” In *Women Writers and the Early Modern British Political Tradition*, edited by Hilda Smith, 75–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Zwicker, Steven N. “Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration.” In *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 230–70. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
———. “Virgins and Whores: The Politics of Sexual Misconduct in the 1660s.” In *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell,* edited by Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins, 85–110. Brookfield, VT: Scolar Press, 1990.

Index

absolutism, 8, 20–21, 22, 24, 25, 51, 69, 70, 124, 150, 151–152, 156, 158–159, 165, 173, 173–174, 182n26, 210, 211, 212, 216
An Abstract of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland, 5, 16
An Abstract Of The Unnatural Rebellion And Barbarous Massacre Of The Protestants In the Kingdom of Ireland, In the Year 1641, 11
Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, 42, 51
adultery, 13–14, 49, 58, 67, 71, 76, 78, 88, 88–89, 92, 113–114, 123, 127, 159, 164, 167, 177, 197, 203
Allen, William: *A Friendly Call, or a Seasonable Perswasive to Unity*, 147–148, 163, 169
Amboyna, massacre at, 71–73, 194; in Dryden, 20, 22, 69, 71, 73, 75–76, 105n41
Anglican Church. *See* Church of England
Anglo-Dutch wars, 7, 11, 22, 69, 70–71, 72, 73, 103n15, 104n22, 105n56, 194, 218n36
Anne, Queen of England, 193, 218n27
anti-Catholicism, 1–3, 10–11, 14–16, 16–19, 25, 28n49, 36–37, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 77–79, 81, 99, 114, 118, 128, 141, 148–150, 152, 165, 191, 192, 194, 197, 199, 204; blood drinking, 19, 50, 128, 141; cannibalism, 7–8, 12, 19–21, 24–25, 37, 49, 58, 70, 73, 76, 78, 93, 143, 148–149, 150–151, 158–159, 163, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173, 174, 176, 180–181, 186n93, 192, 199; flesh eating, 19, 24, 76, 150, 151, 174, 180; poisonous Catholic bride, 7–8, 12, 15–16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 32, 51–52, 53–54, 58, 59, 69, 79, 81, 88, 90, 155, 176, 177, 210; poisonous Catholic mistress, 22, 33, 65, 69, 79–80, 84, 90, 118, 155, 195, 199, 213, 216; popes and popery, 6–7, 18, 22, 37, 51, 53, 56, 70, 71, 77, 78, 80, 81, 147, 148, 149, 150, 152, 156, 165, 189, 192, 193, 198, 201, 202, 204; vampirism, 19, 37, 49, 50, 52, 55, 67, 78, 97, 99, 128, 141, 148, 149, 163, 164, 176, 184n53; Whore of Babylon, 15–16, 18, 148, 185n81, 192, 196, 199
anti-Dutch propaganda. *See* Amboyna, massacre at; demonic Dutchman
anti-Irish propaganda. *See* anti-Catholicism; demonic Irishman
antitheatricalism, 2, 165
Arlington, Earl of, Henry Bennet, 67

Bamford, Karen, 12
A barbarous and inhumane Speech Spoken by the Lord Wentworth, Sonne to the late Earle of Straford, 10

Bancroft, John: *King Edward the Third, With the Fall of Mortimer, Earl of March*, 209
Barry, Elizabeth, 29n78
Bartolomé de las Casas: *The Spanish Colonie*, 74
Beaulieu, Luke: *Take heed of Both Extremes*, 14
Behn, Aphra, 22; *The Rover, Part I*, 23, 70, 100–102
Belling, Catherine, 131
Berglund, Jeff, 172
Black Legend of Spain, 74, 75–76, 104n32–104n33
blood drinking. *See* anti-Catholicism
blood purge, 49, 129–131, 139–140, 143, 174, 180, 181, 212
A Bloody Tragedie, Or Romish Maske, 1–3, 18
Blount, Charles, 11, 198; *An Appeal From The Country To the City, For the Preservation of His Majesties Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion*, 11
Bohun, Edmund: preface to Filmer's *Patriarcha*, 156–157, 165
Bowers, Fredson, 93
Bowers, Toni, 153, 184n52
Boyne, Battle of the, 194, 210
Boutell, Elizabeth, 29n78
Bracegirdle, Anne, 29n78
Brady, Nicholas: *The Rape: Or, The Innocent Imposters*, 25, 191, 214–216
Braganza, Catherine of. *See* Catherine of Braganza
Brown, Laura, 108n107, 140
Brown, Richard, 145n55, 155
Brownmiller, Susan, 11
Burks, Deborah, 32, 59n15

cannibalism. *See* anti-Catholicism
Carew, Thomas: "A Rapture", 98–99
carpe diem ideology, 17, 18, 44
Casas, Bartolomé de las. *See* Bartolomé de las Casas
Catherine de Medici, 81, 88, 90, 91, 92, 156
Catherine of Braganza, 19, 56, 58
Cavalier, 7–8, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 31–37, 44, 45, 48–49, 52, 70, 72, 76, 98, 100–102; anti-Cavalier propaganda, 10, 18, 31–37, 48, 73; debauched Cavaliers, 7, 12, 16, 19, 21, 23, 31–37, 43, 44, 45, 51–52, 55, 58, 59, 69, 84, 88, 154, 168; defenses of the Cavaliers, 22, 44–45, 48–49
Cavendish, Margaret, 68
Cavendish, William, Duke of Newcastle, 94
Charles I, King of England, 13, 18, 26n9, 37, 38, 40, 52–54, 56, 66, 72, 83, 90, 114, 198
Charles II, King of England, 13, 22, 24, 38–39, 40, 41, 48, 51, 55, 65–68, 69, 70–71, 71–72, 76, 83, 88, 90, 92, 94, 100, 105n55, 112, 116, 144n21, 155, 174, 182n26, 185n85, 191–192, 195, 199
Church of England, 15, 22, 52, 147, 148, 152, 153, 198; *A Second Remonstrance by way of Address From The Church of England*, 153
Cibber, Colley: *Xerxes: A Tragedy*, 191, 207–210, 220n83
Circe: as embodiment of Catholic Rome, 17–19, 30n90
civil war, fear of renewed outbreak, 24, 66, 113, 115, 142, 153, 163
Clark, Constance, 211
Claydon, Tony, 196
Cleveland, Duchess of, Barbara Villiers Palmer, 67, 79, 154
confession, Sacrament of, 1, 26n3, 62n100, 199, 200
contagion, 14–15, 17, 21, 23, 54, 116, 118, 120–121, 125, 127, 129–131, 139, 180
contract theory, 11, 21, 23, 111, 113, 114, 115, 124, 128, 183n40, 207, 209–210, 216
Cooke, Alexander: *A Present for a Papist: Or The Life and Death of Pope Joan*, 82
coverture, 8
Crashaw, Richard, 141
Cromwell, Oliver, 32, 38, 40–41, 45, 46, 47–49, 58, 59, 71, 72, 194
Crowne, John, 185n87; *Caligula*, 25, 191, 208, 210–211; *Daeneids*, 192; *The*

Misery of Civil War, a Tragedy, 185n79; *Thyestes. A Tragedy*, 24, 151, 165–174, 181, 206, 208, 220n83
cuckoldry. *See* adultery

Declaration of Indulgence, 70, 71, 103n14
Defoe, Daniel, 195
demonic Dutchman, 7, 12, 16, 69, 73, 74, 75, 194–195
demonic Irishman, 4–5, 7, 16, 21, 36, 51, 69
Dennis, John, 6
Detmer-Goebel, Emily, 8
disease, 14–15, 24, 50, 54, 91, 113, 118, 129, 130, 138, 141, 151, 154, 159, 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 178, 180, 181, 200, 206, 216
dissenters, 147, 148
divine right, 40, 41, 113, 115, 116, 123, 127, 144n32, 146n64, 153, 158
Dolan, Frances, 16, 19
Donna Olimpia. *See* Maidalchini, Donna Olimpia
Dorset and Middlesex, Earl of, Charles Sackville, 214
Dover, Treaty of, 70
Dryden, John: *Absalom and Achitophel*, 162, 184n52; *Albion and Albanius*, 13–14, 197; *Amboyna, or the Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants*, 20, 22, 69, 70–76, 105n41; *Astraea Redux*, 191; *Notes and Observations on the Empress of Morocco*, 108n99
Duke's Company, 94
Dutch Revolt, 74
Dutch United Provinces, 7, 11, 54, 70, 72, 73, 194

East India Company: British, 71, 194; Dutch Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC), 71
Edward II, King of England, 4
Elizabeth I, Queen of England, 10, 27n21, 73
Ellison, Julie, 140
English Civil Wars, 3, 7–8, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21–22, 24, 32–33, 38, 42, 43, 48, 51, 53, 54, 59, 66, 69, 71, 74, 76, 84, 92, 128, 148, 163, 164, 185n87, 194, 197, 216
The English Pope, 18, 53, 54, 55
Erskine-Hill, Howard, 197
Exclusion Crisis, 3, 6, 8, 16, 24, 43, 69, 90, 102, 115, 116, 128, 143, 152, 153, 182n26, 198; Exclusion Bill, 19

familial disruptions, 24, 147–149, 151, 152, 175, 193
fatherhood. *See* parent/child relationships
Ferguson, Robert, 11, 194–195, 197–198
Filmer, Sir Robert: *Patriarcha: Or The Natural Power of Kings*, 23, 111, 113, 115, 124, 138, 143, 153, 156, 158, 165, 183n40, 184n70
flesh eating. *See* anti-Catholicism
Fletcher, John: *Bonduca: Or The British Heroine*, 210; *The Tragedy of Valentinian*, 93, 116, 121, 125, 126, 127, 131, 136, 144n35
Foxe, John: *Acts and Monuments*, 3–4, 16, 26n14, 51
Foxe's Book of Martyrs. *See* Foxe, John, *Acts and Monuments*
France and French influence, 22, 23, 39, 54, 69, 70–71, 73, 75, 76, 79, 90, 112, 155, 192

Gascoigne, George: *The Spoyle of Antwerp*, 74–75
ghosts, 40, 47, 66–67, 69, 86–88, 95, 97, 99, 112, 114, 137, 152, 167, 201
Gildon, Charles: *The Roman Brides Revenge*, 209
Glorious Revolution, 3, 5, 10, 11, 19, 21, 23–24, 25, 43, 112, 148, 150, 151, 174, 181, 190, 191, 194, 197, 203, 207, 217n8
Goodwin, John: *Anti-Cavalierisme*, 36
Great Fire of London, 11, 28n49, 70
Gunpowder Plot, 2, 3, 4, 19, 189
Gwyn, Nell, 79

Harris, Tim, 150, 182n26
Hayne, Victoria, 135, 137, 145n43
Heminge, William: *The Fatal Contract*, 85, 88, 91–92, 93, 106n86, 107n94
Henrietta Maria, 7, 18–19, 33, 37, 40, 51–56, 58, 62n100, 62n117, 66, 79, 83,

90, 92, 105n56, 154
Hermanson, Anne, 90, 107n90
Heywood, Jasper: *The Seconde Tragedie of Seneca entituled Thyestes faithfully Englished*, 165, 186n88
Heywood, Thomas: *The Rape of Lucrece*, 130–131, 154
Higgins, Lynn A., 25
Hila, Marina, 121, 127, 136
Hobbes, Thomas, 96, 97, 108n102
Hopkins, Charles: *Boadicea Queen of Britain*, 221n98
Howard, Edward: *The Usurper*, 22, 33, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50–51, 56–59, 69, 71, 100, 175, 176, 181
Howe, Elizabeth, 6, 59n16
H. P., 113–114, 127
Hughes, Derek, 6, 112, 115, 160, 183n27, 191, 214, 218n12
Hume, Robert, 108n105, 204, 214
Hyde, Anne, 68

idolatry, 2, 18, 36, 81, 158, 192
illegitimacy: in government, 12, 22, 143, 190; in pregnancy, 16, 18, 130, 140, 176–177
incest, 78, 81, 83, 149, 150–151, 159, 160, 167, 168, 169, 169–170, 172, 210, 211
infanticide, 4, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21, 37, 65, 73, 74, 75, 148, 156, 158, 159, 164, 180–181, 187n112, 193, 194
infection, 14–15, 18, 49–50, 54, 76, 77, 90, 117–118, 120, 121, 124, 125, 129–131, 137, 147, 159, 163, 164, 168, 176, 177, 178, 180, 186n99, 202, 207, 210, 216
inheritance, 9, 84, 95, 158, 194, 209
Innocent X, Pope (Gianbattista Pamphili), 81–82
Interregnum, 21, 38, 39, 43
Irish Rebellion, 3–5, 10–11, 26n10, 36–37, 73, 162, 194; contemporary depositions, 3

Jacobites and Jacobitism, 7–8, 11, 25, 190–192, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 203, 207, 210, 211, 214, 216
James I, King of England, 174
James II, King of England, 22, 24, 68, 71, 80, 90, 153, 190, 217n8, 217n9, 219n65; in pamphlet literature, 5, 7, 11, 20, 25, 181, 189, 190–191, 194, 196, 198, 206, 214, 220n67; treatment in drama, 25, 116, 152, 174, 206, 214
Jesuits, 1–3, 5, 14, 54, 80, 114–115

Keach, Benjamin: *Sion in Distress: Or The Groans Of The Protestant Church*, 15–16, 148–149, 169
Kilgour, Maggie, 19
King's Company, 39
Kirby, John, 153; *The Popes Down-fall, At Abergaveny*, 152, 156
Knoppers, Laura Lunger, 41

Lawrence, George: *The Debauched Cavalier*, 34–35, 36
Lawton, Charlwood, 196
Lee, Nathaniel, 24, 165, 170, 171, 175; *Lucius Junius Brutus*, 16, 23–24, 84, 115–116, 128–143, 145n56, 146n62, 146n64, 145n50–145n51, 145n55, 146n62, 146n64, 146n72, 147, 150–151, 154, 155–156, 159, 160, 169, 170, 171, 175, 180, 184n54, 197, 209; *Mithridates, King of Pontus*, 24, 150, 163–164, 165, 169, 170, 171, 175
Leti, Gregorio, 83–84
libertines and libertinism, 22–23, 44, 68–70, 77, 79, 84, 88, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100–102, 113, 128, 134, 168, 216
licensing restrictions, 70, 80, 106n62; Licensing of the Press Act, 116
Livy: *Ab Urbe Condita*, 128, 132, 145n52, 145n56, 146n63, 184n54
Locke, John, 21, 25, 96, 158–159, 165, 173, 183n40
Louis XIV, King of France, 70, 79
Lovelace, Richard, 44–45, 70
Lowenthal, Cynthia, 97
Loyola, Ignatius, 3
Lucrece narrative, 12–13, 15, 23, 93, 98, 112, 113, 114–115, 196, 198; in Carew's "A Rapture", 98–99; in Crowne's *Thyestes*, 167; in Filmer's *Patriarcha: Or the Natural Power of Kings*, 23, 111, 113, 143; in H. P.'s *A Satyr Against Common-wealths*, 113–114, 127; in Heywood's *The Rape*

of Lucrece, 130–131; in Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*, 23–24, 115, 129–143; in Otway's *Venice Preserv'd*, 160, 161; in Pix's *Ibrahim*, 214; in Rochester's *The Tragedy of Valentinian*, 12, 23–24, 115, 122–128; in Settle's *Distress'd Innocence*, 205, 214; in Settle's *The Female Prelate*, 191, 201–202, 203; in Shadwell's *The Libertine*, 98, 99; in Sidney's *Discourses concerning Government*, 23, 111, 112, 112–113, 128, 143. *See also* Livy; Shakespeare, William

MacDonald, Joyce, 134, 141
Maguire, Nancy Klein, 38, 42, 45
Maidalchini, Donna Olimpia, 81–84, 88, 89, 91, 92, 154. *See also* Cooke, Alexander; Leti, Gregorio
Mainwaring, Arthur: *Tarquin and Tullia*, 196–197
Markley, Robert, 73
marriage, dangers of exogamy, 7, 51, 57, 58, 62n100, 68, 80, 129, 159, 160, 175, 177, 186n96, 186n98
Marsden, Jean, 6, 59n16, 216, 221n91
Marshall, Rebecca, 29n78
Marvell, Andrew: *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, 80, 105n56; *The Last Instructions to a Painter*, 65–68, 69, 84, 85, 88, 99, 103n5, 112, 195
Mary II, Queen of England, 25, 181, 190–192, 193–194, 195–197, 198, 210, 216
Mary of Modena, 19, 80, 90, 92, 193, 196
Medici, Catherine de. *See* Catherine de Medici
Middleton, John: *The Revenger's Tragedy*, 85, 86
Milton, John: *Comus*, 17, 18, 29n86
Monmouth, Duke of, James Scott, 24, 150, 153–154, 156, 184n52
Mordaunt, Viscount, John Mordaunt, 65
Morley, Carol A., 93
motherhood and maternity, 17, 19, 55, 89, 141, 147, 184n50, 205, 206; monstrous births, 16, 24, 54, 148, 163, 168, 169; monstrous mothers, 16, 18–19, 53, 54, 67, 68, 81, 83–84, 88, 89, 92, 149, 156, 168, 193, 196, 200, 205; violence against mothers, 4, 5, 16, 37, 75, 78, 149, 162, 193. *See also* parent/child relationships
Mountfort, William: *The Injur'd Lovers: Or, The Ambitious Father*, 209
mutilation, 10, 46, 58

A Nest of Nunnes Egges, 16
Newcastle, Duke of. *See* Cavendish, William
nonconformists, 15, 114, 147, 182n26

Orr, Bridget, 76
Orrery, Earl of, Roger Boyle, 22, 38–39, 47, 48, 49, 51, 59, 101; *The Generall*, 22, 32, 39–40, 41–45, 45–46, 69, 70, 71, 76, 100, 109n116
othering, 19, 21, 22, 38, 73, 76, 166, 169, 170, 171–172, 178, 180–181
Otway, Thomas: *Venice Preserv'd*, 24, 150, 159–163, 165
Owen, Sue, 132, 133, 138, 145n55, 146n62, 200
Owen, Susan J., 6–7, 100

parent/child relationships, 24, 58, 66–67, 69, 86–89, 95, 153, 160, 162–163, 170, 171–172, 173, 193, 199, 201, 212–213; cannibal fathers, 7–8, 11, 12, 20–21, 24, 25, 141, 143, 147, 150, 151, 154, 156–157, 158–159, 160, 163–164, 165, 166, 167–168, 169, 171, 173, 174, 180–181, 204–205; positive familial relationships, 33, 153, 156, 157, 164; toxic children, 86, 95, 147–152, 153–154, 155–156, 161, 163, 164, 196–197
patriarchy and patriarchalism, 8, 93, 97, 101, 153, 156; disruptions to patriarchy, 9, 12, 22, 69, 84, 85, 88, 95, 97, 156, 173
Pepys, Samuel, 39, 56
Peru, depictions of, 21, 158
Peters, Hugh: portrayed in *A Third Conference Between O. Cromwell And Hugh Peters In Saint James's Park*, 40,

49, 62n98; portrayed in *The Usurper* 46
Philomel, 12, 93, 98, 99, 173, 201, 202, 206
Pincus, Steven C. A., 70–71, 189–190, 217n8
Pix, Mary: *Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks: A Tragedy*, 25, 191, 211–214, 221n92
poisonous Catholic bride. *See* anti-Catholicism
poisonous Catholic mistress. *See* anti-Catholicism
Pope Joan, 25, 82, 191, 199. *See also* Cooke, Alexander; Settle, Elkanah
popes and popery. *See* anti-Catholicism
Popish Plot, 3, 4–5, 6, 10, 23, 24, 69–70, 90, 100, 102, 115, 116, 148, 150, 151, 162, 182n26, 183n27
A Popish Political Catechism, 115
Porter, Thomas: *The Villain*, 22, 33, 45
Portsmouth, Duchess of, Louise de Keroualle, 79, 90, 106n59, 112, 154–155, 199
Post, J. B., 9
Powell, George: adaptation of Fletcher's *Bonduca*, 210; *Alphonso King of Naples*, 209
Powell, Philip Wayne, 74, 104n33
propaganda, 1, 2, 3, 5–6, 7–8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20–21, 22, 24, 32–33, 35, 38, 42, 46, 47–48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 59, 65, 68–69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 84, 100, 102, 115–116, 118, 124, 127, 128, 129, 131, 143, 148, 150, 152, 162–163, 169, 172, 181, 190, 192–207, 216

racism: blackface, use of, 93, 97; in *Titus Andronicus*, 177–178, 180–181; miscegenation, fears of, 151, 177–178, 178–179, 180
rape: as property crime, 8–11, 17, 35, 74, 76, 163, 166, 206, 215; blots and blotting, 13, 14, 15, 16, 50, 125, 139–140, 176, 186n99, 198, 202; male rape, 7, 25, 181, 190–192, 194–195, 198, 203, 203–204, 206–207, 210, 211, 214–216; sodomitical rape, 4, 195. *See also* rape laws
rape laws: *3 Henry 7*, 9; *4 & 5 Phi. & Mary*, 9; *6 Richard 2*, 9; *18 Eliz. 1*, 10; Westminster, First and Second Statutes of 9
Ravenscroft, Edward: *Titus Andronicus, or The Rape of Lavinia*, 16, 24–25, 84, 151–152, 165, 171, 174–181, 187n102
ravished monarch, 7–8, 25, 190, 198, 206, 211, 214
revenge, 57, 85, 86, 86, 88, 93–94, 95–96, 97–98, 132, 133, 137, 152, 160, 166, 167, 173, 176, 178, 179, 194, 199, 201, 202, 205, 206, 209, 211, 213, 214
revenge tragedy, 93, 107n96, 109n109
Riebling, Barbara, 67, 103n7
Rochester, Earl of, John Wilmot, 67; *The Tragedy of Valentinian*, 12–13, 14, 23–24, 115–128, 130, 131–132, 134, 135, 136, 138, 143, 144n20, 144n23, 144n36, 171–172, 208, 210, 211, 214, 221n93
Rose, Craig, 189, 194
Roundheads, 7–8, 10, 22, 32, 33, 34–35, 38, 42, 46, 48–49, 52, 55, 69, 71, 76, 114; anti-Roundhead plays, 21, 100–101; debauched usurper, 43, 45, 58, 69
royalists, 7–8, 19, 22, 32, 33, 34–36, 36–37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 47–48, 50, 51, 55, 58, 59, 65, 69–70, 77, 94, 100, 128, 128–129, 134, 138, 139, 141, 143, 146n62, 154, 156, 216; antiroyalists, 36, 42, 68, 75, 128, 184n53
Ruyter, Admiral Michiel Adriaenszoom de: in Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter*, 65, 68
Rye House Plot, 23, 24, 111, 154, 184n52

St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, 81
Salmon, James: *Bloudy Newes from Ireland*, 4
Schochet, Gordon, 153, 183n40
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus: *Thyestes*, 165, 166, 167
Settle, Elkanah, 16, 94, 168, 199; *Distress'd Innocence*, 25, 191, 203–207, 216; *The Empress of Morocco*, 90–91; *The Female Prelate*,

25, 191, 198, 199–203, 211, 214; *Love and Revenge: A Tragedy*, 22, 69, 84–95, 96, 97–98, 99, 121, 123–124, 134, 167, 168, 173, 176, 213
Shadwell, Thomas: *The Libertine*, 22–23, 69–70, 84, 94–99, 101, 108n99, 108n101, 168, 202
Shaftesbury, Earl of, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 162
Shakespeare, William, 14, 165; *Hamlet*, 85, 86, 88, 66, 94–95, 201; *King Lear*, 196–197; *The Rape of Lucrece*, 14, 15, 130, 131, 137; *Titus Andronicus*, 9–10, 56–57, 58, 93, 176–177, 178, 179, 187n110, 187n112, 200, 216
Shell, Allison, 16
Sidney, Algernon, 25, 111, 113, 143n1, 163, 210; *Discourses concerning Government*, 23, 111–112, 113, 115, 124, 125, 127, 128, 143
Silver, Brenda R., 25
Sion. *See* Keach, Benjamin
"Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's Ghost", 112
sodomy, 4, 27n19, 159, 192, 195
Spanish Armada, 4, 189
Spanish match, 3, 54
state of nature, 96–97, 99, 156, 173
Staves, Susan, 43, 139, 146n63, 209
Stuart, Frances, 68, 144n21
Suckling, Sir John, 44, 45, 70, 101; "Out upon It!", 44
suicide, 12, 41, 92–93, 98, 113, 116, 125–127, 130–131, 132, 134, 136, 137, 139, 140, 171–172, 173, 202, 203, 214

Tarquin: in "The Female Parricide", 196; in Filmer, 113; in H. P., 114; in Jacobite propaganda, 196; in Lee, 129–131, 132–134, 137, 140, 143, 154–155, 155–156; in Mainwaring, 196; in Otway, 161, 162; in *A Popish Political Catechism*, 115; in Tory propaganda, 114, 115; in Rochester, 125; in Shakespeare, 14; in Sidney, 111–112, 125; in "Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's Ghost", 112
T. E.: *The Lawes Resolutions of Womens Rights*, 9
Tories, depictions in propaganda, 6, 8, 12, 20, 24, 25, 100, 113, 114, 150–152, 152–153, 156, 161, 162, 164, 165, 172, 173, 174, 181, 190, 204
A True Son of the Catholick Apostolic Church: *A Catholick Pill to Purge Popery*, 14, 78
Tullia, 197; in "The Female Parricide", 196; in Lee, 16, 24, 84, 134, 154–156, 159, 184n53; in Mainwaring, 196–197; in portrayals of James II, 197, 198
Turkey, depictions of, 6, 19, 38, 191, 211–214
Tyrrell, James, 11, 157–158, 159, 165

vampirism. *See* anti-Catholicism
Vaughan, Virginia Mason, 178
Virgil, 186n100
Virginia, 93

warming pan scandal, 193, 218n27
Weil, Rachel, 152, 157, 184n61, 218n27, 219n50
Whigs, depictions in propaganda, 6–8, 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, 69, 100, 128, 140, 149, 150, 152, 153, 156, 157, 162, 164, 165, 173, 181, 182n26, 184n70, 189–190, 194, 198, 204, 207, 210, 214
Whore of Babylon. *See* anti-Catholicism
William III, King of England, 5, 25, 181, 189–192, 193–194, 195, 197, 198, 210, 216, 217n2
Williamite propaganda, 8, 25, 189–190, 192, 193–194, 195–196, 197, 214
Winn, James, 13, 28n61
Wright, John: *Mock-Thyestes, in Burlesque*, 165; *Thyestes A Tragedy, Translated out of Seneca*, 165
Wycherley, William: *The Plain Dealer*, 208

About the Author

Jennifer L. Airey graduated summa cum laude from Brandeis University with a degree in English and American literature and subsequently earned her PhD from Boston University. She is currently assistant professor of English at the University of Tulsa, where she specializes in Restoration and eighteenth-century British drama. She has previously published articles on Wycherley and Dryden, and her article on the 1768 rape trial of Frederick Calvert, Lord Baltimore is forthcoming. Her scholarly interests include long eighteenth-century treatments of gender and sexuality, playhouse performance practice, and the relationship between British politics and the stage.