

GEORGINA LUCAS

Rape, Massacre, the Lucrece Tradition, and *Alarum for London*

This article explores the conflation of rhetorical and physical acts of rape and massacre in a range of early modern drama, culminating in a case study of the two phenomena in Alarum for London (1599). Rooting its analysis in the Lucrece myth, the essay demonstrates how prominent traditions of reading rape — as an attack on the soul, and as an attack on a city — provide a rubric through which Alarum can be understood. When enacted concomitantly, rape and massacre have the propensity to destroy body and soul, individual, and the wider society to which they belong.

What does it mean when Thomas Heywood's raped Lucrece upbraids the gods for permitting the 'inhuman massacre' of her 'harmless virtue'? 'Wherefore take you charge', she asks, 'On sinless souls to see them wounded thus / With rape or violence?' (H1v).¹ The association is apposite: rape and massacre are frequently understood as masculine enterprises in which perpetrators capitalize upon their structural capabilities to exploit the structural vulnerabilities of their victims.² Lucrece does not primarily refer to the gendered nature of the violence she has suffered, however. What is most striking about her pronouncement is that while acts of rape often accompany acts of massacre, Heywood's heroine synonymizes the two: to perceive the one is to understand the other.

The rhetorical force of Lucrece's declaration is devastatingly emphatic. Less certain are the semantic and phenomenological implications of this interchange. The terms *rape* and *massacre* give rise to problems of definition. Both can comprise a broad category, as well as specific forms, of violence. And contrary to, or perhaps because of, this semantic capaciousness, each act can be understood as such without employing *rape* or *massacre*. Indeed, forced coition has a long history of being described indirectly. The Latin, *stuprum*, memorably inscribed into the ground by Shakespeare's Lavinia to alert her male relatives to the sexual violence inflicted upon her, denotes illicit or immoral sexual intercourse, encompassing a wide range of offences including incest and adultery as well as forced intercourse.

Georgie Lucas (Georgina.Lucas@Nottingham.ac.uk) is a teaching associate in early modern English literature in the school of English at the University of Nottingham.

The Ancient Greek *hybris*, a variant of *hubris*, followed similar moral codings, sometimes referring to acts of rape, but also to any act that damaged the sexual honour of a person or family.³ *Rape*, from the Latin *raptus*, also designates a variety of meanings: abduction, forced coition, sexual assault, and assault more generally upon a woman. The term's ambiguous etymology reinforces this variety: its root, *rapere*, denotes abduction, and more broadly, the action of carrying, dragging, or plucking off. By 1155, a shift in usage saw these actions become more explicitly associated with forced coition; the acknowledged purpose of this kind of abduction was sexual assault.⁴ But this meaning was not immediately adopted by legal definitions: medieval rape laws like the Westminster statutes of 1275 and 1285 continued to define rape as a property crime or abduction of male property.⁵ By 1576, Elizabethan law books and statutes defined rape as unlawfully and carnally to know and abuse women; but, following earlier attitudes, the word still retained a secondary denotation of abduction. This semantic slippage reflected competing rape cultures: the female body could be viewed both as male property and human agent.⁶ For Carolyn D. Williams, 'the former view typifies the values of a shame culture, the latter a guilt culture'. The guilt standard defined rape by lack of consent, focusing on the attacker's culpability. By contrast, the 'shame code' considered the rape victim's refusal of consent irrelevant; rape contaminated her entire family and her shame redoubled if the attack was made public.⁷

Like *rape*, *massacre* — a French word which became embedded into English after the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in Paris (1572), the sacks, sieges and slaughters of the Dutch Revolt (1566–1648), and the domestic terror posed by the Gunpowder Plot (1605) — encompassed a range of denotations. Phonologically, 'mass' suggests greatness in size and scale; an implication that English intensifies through the connotations of 'acre' as a unit or space of land. Unlike these quantitative associations, however, the early French word is thought to have the same root as 'mace', the spiked club used in battle, or an ornamental version of the same used as a sceptre or staff of office carried by some officials — including monarchs — as an outward sign of their station and authority.⁸ Early spellings of the French word *massacre* retain this etymon under the forms *macacre*, *macecre*, *maçacle*, and *macelcer*, and are recorded in post-classical Latin as *mazacrium* and *masacrium*. Such understandings conjure ideas of weaponry and mortal peril, but also evoke official or sovereign authority, and the means through which it is symbolized and safeguarded.

Even so, scholars do not consider the heady mix of authority and fatality connoted by the mace to be *massacre's* sole etymon. The thirteenth-century philologist, John of Garland, glosses *macacre* with the neo-Latin *macella*, meaning

‘shambles’, a stall for the sale of meat, or the action of butchering meat for sale; the same root is observed in *macellarious*, which also pertains to the meat market.⁹ This denotation has parallels with another Anglo-Norman word that takes ‘mace’ at its root: *macegreff*, meaning ‘butcher’, ‘slaughterer’, or ‘executioner’.¹⁰ These concepts interact in interesting ways with *massacre*. As Maarten Lemmens observes, ‘whereas *slaughter* can be paraphrased as “killing animals, esp[ecially] for food”, *butcher* ‘more prominently evokes the image of wounded bodies and blood’. *Slaughter* ‘tends to emphasize the large-scale effect’ of human violence, ‘whereas *butcher* tends to emphasize the destruction’.¹¹

In keeping with these associations, the earliest extant texts often record *massacre* in its archaic sense of butchery. As Mark Greengrass notes, up until the 1540s, *massacre* frequently denoted a butcher’s chopping block; the butcher’s knife was the *massacreur*.¹² The term’s association with animal dismemberment intensified in the early 1500s when it began to assume several technical denotations in hunting, metonymically designating the decapitated head of a deer placed on top of the animal skin after the quarry, or the ornamental mounting of their antlers. The image of a deer’s *massacre* was also used intermittently on blazons and coats of arms.¹³

John Docker argues that as a concept, ‘*massacre* suggests, in the metaphor of the butcher’s block, a swift and terrible action’.¹⁴ Although the connotation noted by Docker is important to keep in mind, the materiality of the butcher’s block can also illuminate *massacre*’s proximity to the practice of butchery. Butchery is a technical, even surgical, process that is inescapably gory in its enactment; the gore, along with the assumption that the action is impetuous, and not the precision whereby it is generated, endures. To butcher an animal relies on treating them as such: denying them the equality, dignity, and compassion that ordinarily prevents humans from killing humans in an industrialized way. As the block and knife’s functions suggest, butchery dismembers and transforms the animal into foodstuffs; the butchered animal is sectioned off, dressed as meat, and sold in isolation. It is no longer recognized as a creature, but as the dead creature’s carcass and flesh. When applied to human violence, these de-animalizing processes serve as a post-mortem means of objectification; victims’ bodies are separated and carved in such a way that, their provenance obscured, they appear as discrete objects. For humans, this action — of hewing the body into parts — could hold eschatological ramifications. While pre-Reformation religious devotion often depicted corporeal fragmentation within the framework of Christ’s suffering and sacred body, it could also form a kind of desecration. Indeed, according to traditional

Christian belief, dismemberment could preclude the possibility of resurrection at the Judgment Day.¹⁵

When *massacre* was first used to refer to human violence, therefore, it primarily evoked ideas of mass killing, bodily destruction, and dismemberment (or, indeed, mass killing so ferocious that it left its victims in parts). It referred to humans killed like animals on a large scale and in such way that the immortal life might be imperilled along with the temporal body. It was an act that emphasized the brutality of this kind of killing, and which held latent connections to political action and to the hunt. Two of these connotations — of corporeal destruction and political action — persisted in the development of a tertiary denotation that, surprisingly, shed the term's overt links with mass killing. In the 1580s, pamphlets hyperbolically described the assassination of key players in the French Wars of Religion as *massacres*.¹⁶ This usage enjoyed a vogue, indicating particularly bloody or opprobrious lone murders, before the introduction of the word *assassination* in the early seventeenth century.

So, while senses of forced coition and mass killing predominate, Lucrece's impassioned speech might incorporate and evoke a far greater range of violence than is initially inferred. To the primary image of Lucrece's virtue — an abstraction hardened into actuality and bloodied as if murdered in multiple — we might add the impression of a mutilation or dismemberment redolent of butchery. Conversely, if we take Lucrece as a lone victim, a metaphorical understanding of her rape as a kind of assassination conforms to the idea of massacre as a particularly degrading murder; in this case, the assault is metonymic for a greater number of deaths: of her virtue, and even her soul. When coupled with the sense of rape as abduction, notions of the hunt inherent in *massacre's* earliest denotations emphasize the reduction of Lucrece from human subject into dehumanized quarry. Thus conceived, the wounds Lucrece feels done to her body and soul are injuries not only to the 'sinless', but also to one utterly defenceless in the face of Sextus Tarquin's chase: his violation has pursued, snared, and massacred her.

Taking its cue from Lucrece's declaration, this essay explores the lexical and physical interchange of rape and massacre in a range of early modern plays, culminating in a case study of the anonymous Lord Chamberlain's Men play *Alarum for London* (1599), a topical drama depicting the devastating sack of Antwerp by Spanish troops in 1576.¹⁷ Scholars have done much fine work on the representation of rape in early modern drama. Such studies have tended to focus primarily upon the semiotic, discursive, and performative dimensions of this kind of violence.¹⁸ The proximal relationship between rape and mass killing is a relatively understudied area, however: scholars tend to explore the two

in isolation. Criticism has yet to comment explicitly upon rape's relationship to the kinds of violence indicated by *massacre*; and no full-length studies of early modern massacre, either as cultural or literary phenomenon, are currently available. We must attest to the relationship between the two. Without doing so, our understanding of massacre as a form of violence that underwent sustained semantic, political, and ethical theorization in the early modern period becomes subsumed, or elided, by other forms of violence. Massacre is easy to de-particularize. The weaponizing of rape as form of combat has been recognized only recently by global organizations, but its practice in martial formations stretches back to antiquity.¹⁹ So too, while *The Rape of Lucrece* (1607) and *Alarum for London* (1599) have recently received a welcome increase in critical attention, this work tends to be more focussed on the 'shocking lack of care' shown to its heroine in the former, and the discourses and materiality of disability in the latter, than on the relationship and consequences of combining rape and massacre, whether rhetorically or physically.²⁰

To flesh out this relationship, this essay contends that prominent traditions of reading rape — as an attack on the soul, and as an attack on a city or state — illuminate the implications of rhetorical and physical acts of rape and massacre in *Alarum for London*. I argue that when enacted concomitantly, rape and massacre have the propensity to destroy both body and soul, individual and the wider society to which they belong. In such instances, massacre's killing ranges from material to immaterial, corporeal to psychic, metaphorical to actualized. Twinning rape and massacre implies a comprehensiveness of attack that the one cannot easily achieve without the other: even abstract entities come under threat. This argument develops across three sections. The first two — roughly equal in length — are guided by the Lucrece myth, and consider the effects sexual assault is said to have on the psychic and spiritual life of its victims, and the use of rape as a trope to theorize and lay siege to cities. These traditions of body, soul, and siege, serve as a rubric through which the third section — the sum of the previous two in length — examines the rhetorical and physical operation of rape and massacre in *Alarum for London*. Unless otherwise specified, the article observes the now normative understandings of *massacre* as mass killing and *rape* as sexual assault.

Massacre: Body and Soul

The conflation of *rape* and *massacre* is not unique to Heywood; no more is Lucrece's assertion that rape has wounded her soul. This section situates these ideas

in a wider dramatic context, first exploring other locutions that exchange *rape* for *massacre*, before examining the spiritual implications of this kind of violence.

Heywood's source material likely influenced his phrasing: Philemon Holland's seminal translation of Livy's *The Roman History* (1600). While Holland and Heywood occupy the same rhetorical grid, however, they put *rape* and *massacre* to slightly different use. *The Roman History* describes how Tarquin swore to take Lucrece by force and 'pretend[ed] that after he had massacred her, he would lay by her side in naked bed, her own manservant with his throat cut; that it might be voiced abroad, that she was taken and killed in filthy adultery' (E4r).²¹ These actions promised 'a torment worse than death'; having 'murdered her' with sexual violence, Tarquin swore to make Lucrece 'hated' of 'husband, father, friends / Of Rome and all the world' and then 'ravished and killed [Lucrece] at once' (H2v). In this account, *massacre* functions both as the act of rape and, in a hyperbolic extension of its primary meaning, as the irreparable damage to her reputation foreboded by Tarquin's threat.

Holland and Heywood were not the only writers to exchange *rape* for *massacre*. Thomas Middleton's poetic iteration of the Lucrece story, *The Ghost of Lucrece* (1600), riffs on a similar theme to Heywood's tragedy, bemoaning 'Rape-slaughtered Lucrece's all martyred graces' (39–40).²² Moreover, in Nathaniel Richards's *Messalina* (1635), the iniquitous Empress's plan to rape Vestal Virgins is condemned as 'the bloody massacre of those Roman dames' (E7v).²³ John Fletcher's *The Chances* (1617) offers a semantically similar, but tonally distinct, example: the lothario Don John boasts of having been the cause of 'the dire massacre of a million / ... maidenheads' (1.5.18–19).²⁴ Conversely, when Aaron tells Lucius that he 'must talk of murders, rapes and massacres' (5.1.63) in *Titus Andronicus* (1592), he makes *massacre* the inextricable context of, and associated action to, Lavinia's brutal sexual assault. Aaron's *massacre* — yoked together hendiadstyically with *rape* — offers the impression that the two are experienced and understood concurrently. Here *massacre* instead of denoting mass killing might more aptly signify the dismemberment and mutilation so resonant in the French usage of the term — and so widespread in *Titus*. Rather than a repetition of the play's multiple murders, Aaron's *massacre* speaks more evocatively to Lavinia's hands, 'lopp'd and hew'd' (2.3.17), her tongue 'cut away' (5.1.56) by Chiron and Demetrius; to the villainous deceit that saw Titus depart with his own 'warlike hand (3.1.256); and to the 'hew[ing]' of Alarbus in propitiation to the Andronici's 'sacrificing fire' (1.1.147). Thus, as the slippery semantics of the terms suggests, the coordination of *rape* and *massacre* included a wide range of referents.

Equally capacious were the consequences of such violence on one's soul. In 1589, the religious controversialist John Penry's work, *A View of Some Part of Such Public Want*, bemoaned the 'massacred souls' of those who incline themselves to the devil.²⁵ Here, the mass-killing and dismemberment is incorporeal and, perhaps, eternal. Likewise, six years later, Christopher Bagshaw's *A True Relation of the Faction* denounced Jesuitical influences which he argued made 'an infinite slaughter and massacre of souls' in 'wretched England'.²⁶

While this rhetoric was familiar in religious polemic, the specific association with massacre as a killer or injurer of souls was relatively rare in the drama of the period. The locution is employed just once, albeit in the most (in)famous extant massacre play of the period: Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris* (1593). When the princess Margaret sees her mother-in-law poisoned 'before [her] face' (3.21), she thus assuages her husband's grief:

Let not this heavy chance, my dearest lord,
 (For whose effects my soul is massacred)
 Infect thy gracious breast with fresh supply,
 To aggravate our sudden misery. (3.25–8)

Margaret employs a metaphor whereby her soul is subjected to the brutality implied by the word massacre. The tone of this hyperbole is tricky to register. Perhaps Margaret's compassion is so empathetic that Navarre's present distress induces in her an equivalent physical, or psychic, pain. A more cynical reading points to the disingenuous nature of her parenthetical address; it is perhaps more sardonic than sympathetic, a heavily ironized rhetorical flourish designed to bait the audience with the blood yet shed.

While Margaret's declaration is enigmatic and idiosyncratic, the assertion by Heywood's Lucrece that her massacre-like rape has wounded her soul is not an uncommon response to sexual assault. Medico-philosophical and theological beliefs often observed a causal influence between body and soul. As Emily Michael states:

the human soul, or psyche, from ancient times to the early modern period played a double role in relation to the body. First, it was believed to be integrally linked to the human body as the locus or cause of its vital and cognitive activities; and, second, it was believed to be the vehicle, as separate from the human body, of personal immortality.²⁷

Indeed, while what was constituted by the soul and whether it might be materially or immaterially located, cognitive or immortal, were matters of scholarly debate, 'most early moderns understood their bodies to be very permeable to environmental influences', and the attitude that these influences might affect their soul was prevalent.²⁸

So, when Heywood's Lucrece bemoans the wounding of her 'sinless soul', the pain she describes could indicate mental anguish and immortal injury; it has the capacity to be registered both psychically and spiritually. Conversely, in Middleton's verse, the incorporeal, immortal part of the spectral matron's being is said to have been wounded: her soul is 'seal[ed] with Rape and Murder's stamp' (86), indelibly cast and impressed by violence that has caused her ghost to 'reel to hell' (508) and burn there in perpetuity. The relationship in Shakespeare's poem is similarly fraught. Lucrece distinguishes between her violated body, chaste soul, and 'immaculate ... mind' (1656); her body and blood have been 'polluted' by rape but her divine soul remains pure and chaste because her mind was never 'inclined / To accessary yieldings' (1658).²⁹ But Lucrece consistently belies this separation. Figuring her body as 'bark' — an outer layer — peeled away from her soul by rape, she observes a mutuality between material and immaterial existence: 'My body or my soul, which was the dearer, / When the one pure, the other made divine?' (1163–4). The body's purity made the soul worthy of heaven; now defiled, the 'leaves' of her tree-like body 'will wither' and her 'sap decay / So must [her] soul, her bark being pilled away' (1168–9). In *Measure for Measure* (1603), the postulant rape-target, Isabella, appeals to this logic when she rejects Angelo's predatory advances: 'Sir, believe this, I had rather give my body than my soul' (2.4.56–7).³⁰ On the one hand, her body and soul are declaredly separate entities, and yet Isabella tacitly acknowledges their inseparability: the death of her temporal body would secure the everlasting health of a soul imperilled by Angelo's lust. Isabella is prepared to throw down her life for Claudio's 'deliverance' (3.1.106), but is loath to 'die forever' (2.4.109).

As with Lucrece and the heroines of related myths like Philomela and Virginia, the response to the injury or pollution perceived to be caused by rape is often suicide or death. This tradition is widely represented in drama. For example, when Vindice meditates on the suicide of Antonio's 'harried' and raped wife in *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), he determines that 'her honour forced', the lady 'Deemed it a nobler dowry for her name / To die with poison than to live with shame' (1.4.46–8).³¹ As Sarah E. Johnson observes, Vindice's 'treatment of the female soul's virtue as inextricable from the honour of chastity of her body' is a 'conventional' response to sexual assault: he figures rape as shame evaded only by

death.³² This is the same reasoning employed in *Titus Andronicus*, when societal expectations encourage Titus to kill his daughter because she, like the Virginian precedent to which he alludes, was ‘enforced, stain’d, and deflower’d’ (5.3.38). The rape of Lavinia is ‘worse than killing’ (2.2.175); it damages her body, her soul, and the Andronici’s honour. Likewise, appealing to the Lucrece precedent, Maximus correspondingly urges Lucina to suicide following her rape by the titular tyrant in John Fletcher’s *Valentinian* (1614):

when they read, she lived
 Must they not ask how often she was ravished,
 And make a doubt she lov’d that more than wedlock?
 Therefore she must not live. (3.1.156–61)³³

Maximus’s perverted, patriarchal rationale holds that Lucina must die, lest news of her rape invite suspicion that she enjoyed her forced union more than her marriage bed. She must die, in short, because her reputation, so closely correlated with his own, is thought to have been irreparably damaged. Conversely, Clara’s accusation in the collaborative tragicomedy, *The Spanish Gypsy* (1626), that she is ‘infected’ with Roderigo’s ‘soul staining lust’ (1.3.12) might unsettle this paradigm.³⁴ As Suzanne Gossett points out, Clara’s cry is ambiguous: the soul of her rapist, Roderigo, is ‘stained by lust as well’.³⁵

But, Clara’s is a minority view. The misogynistic attitudes that compelled women to kill themselves, or be killed by male family members, are not hard to account for. In the medieval and Renaissance periods, rape tended ‘to be seen as a *pollution* of the female body, regardless of the victim’s volition’.³⁶ As Helen Hackett observes, the Augustinian notion that chastity — that is, virginal purity or marital fidelity — ‘could achieve spiritual purity’ was widespread.³⁷ Thus, as Jocelyn Catty argues, the ‘iconography of female martyrdom plays a significant role in the representation of rape’ because it ‘provides a precedent for the complex relation of mind and body, whereby the true self is located in the mind or soul, but is marked by the endurance of pain’.³⁸ Indeed, a prominent strand of thought saw rape as a test of female virtue, in which rape was characterized by a ‘failure’ of a woman’s ‘eloquence’. If she could effectively appeal for her virtue, it would be safeguarded; if not, she would be dishonoured. And yet, as Catty also maintains, ‘the forcefulness of arguments for an opposition between mind or soul and body following rape, perhaps paradoxically, would seem to confirm that the basic definition of chastity is as a physical state’.³⁹

Moreover, as Christine Rose reminds us, ‘the comparable word to the Latin “raptus” in Old French, “*ravir*” spawned “*ravissement*” and the English ‘ravish’

became used as a synonym for rape, or for the spiritual action of a soul's being carried to heaven, transported by enthusiasm'.⁴⁰ To this uncomfortable slippage of sexual assault and spiritual enrapture we can add post-Classical understandings of the body and soul. As Johnson rightly acknowledges, Renaissance thought frequently inherited Platonic and Aristotelian ideas about the body-soul dynamic. According to this binary, the soul was often gendered masculine, the body feminine. Consequently, 'the theological ideas that God ordained the soul to govern the body, and man to govern woman, were naturalized through cross-reference or analogy'.⁴¹ While Johnson demonstrates the ways in which dramatic literature disrupts, collapses, or inverts this ideology, rape seen according to this dichotomy has the propensity to damage not only the female body but also its masculine soul and the patriarchal dominance to which this idea is tied. Metonymically, rape could affect a victim's body and soul just as it could be seen to constitute an attack on her family and a wider social body ordained by men. Rape, then, incites a suite of social, physical, and spiritual effects. It disrupts the idea of body, mind, and soul as discrete categories: even when a rhetorical separation is imposed, a causal relationship between an attack on the one and the pollution of the other is confirmed.

Massacre: Body and Siege

In Heywood's play, the corporeal and spiritual dimensions of Lucrece's attack and suicide are juxtaposed with these actions' socio-political consequences. This section explores further these ramifications, suggesting ways in which rape and massacre intersect with ideas of the city or state, and the relationship between the two when these institutions are besieged or sacked.

Heywood's Brutus commands the grieving Collatine and Lucretius to 'stir the wrath of Rome' and bear Lucrece's 'chaste body / Into the market place' so that the 'whorred object' might 'kindle' Rome's citizens 'with a most just revenge' (H3r). The false separation of these two bodies — one chaste, the other chased, raped, and defiled — reveals Lucrece's altered and ambiguous sexual status. Whether 'virginal or marital', rape victims could be viewed as 'unchaste' and no longer 'containable within the tripartite definition of the "good" woman: as virgin, wife, or widow'.⁴² Lucrece's antithetical position is harnessed by Brutus to inflame the commons and prompt a regime change. The rape of Lucrece famously impelled the reconstitution of the state: it expelled the royal Tarquin's 'viperous brood' (H3v), leading to the foundation of the Roman Republic.

By contrast, Shakespeare's poem conceptualizes Lucrece to no small extent as a city. As Tarquin advances on Lucrece, his hand, figured as a 'rude ram', is said to 'batter' the 'ivory walls' of her 'breast' (463–4). Stirred to 'more rage and lesser pity' by Lucrece's resistance, the rapist moves 'To make the break and enter this sweet city' (648–9). Lucrece continues the analogy, describing herself as having been 'robb'd and ransack'd by injurious theft' (838). The metaphor is compounded in the assault's aftermath when Lucrece 'calls to mind where hangs a piece / Of skilful painting, made for Priam's Troy' (1367). Detailing the fates of individuals, Lucrece's description of the picture's 'thousand lamentable objects' (1373) gives way to scenes of general massacre: 'Here friend by friend in universal channel lies / And friend to friend gives unadvised wounds' (1487–8). Making explicit the connection, Lucrece compares herself to the ruined, massacred city:

To me came Tarquin armed; so beguiled
 With outward honesty, but yet defiled
 With inward vice: as Priam [Sinon] did cherish,
 So did I Tarquin; so my Troy did perish. (1544–7)

Imagining another version of Troy constituted by her body and chastity, Lucrece establishes an ironic parallel between her fate and the city's: both are synonymous with a kind of rape. Indeed, the stealing away of Helen by Paris was often described in this way.⁴³ Lucrece's imagistic verse reinscribes Troy's ruin, linking its fate unequivocally to the abduction, or rape, of Helen, and to her own sexual assault.

The conceptualization of Lucrece as a city, or 'house' that has been 'sacked' and 'battered by the enemy' (1170–1), inversely correlates to the personification of a besieged or sacked city as a woman. This well-worn conceit is memorably recalled by Shakespeare's *Henry V*, a play whose representations of atrocity scholars frequently examine in relation to Just War theory, but which is less frequently analyzed outside of these discourses.⁴⁴ When the bellicose king declares he will not leave Harfleur 'half-achieved' (3.3.8), he employs the familiar trope of characterizing a city as female: 'Till in her ashes she lie buried', Henry declares, 'The gates of mercy shall be all shut up' (3.3.9–10).⁴⁵ This feminization establishes a framework whereby the siege and sack of Harfleur is figured as rape, both of the city and its citizens. Henry warns that his 'flesh'd soldier[s], rough and hard of heart' shall begin 'mowing' the town's 'fresh-faced virgins' and 'flowering infants' (3.3.13–15), promising that his 'blind and bloody soldier[s] with foul' hands will 'Defile the locks of' Harfleur's 'shrill-shrieking daughters' (35). Simultaneous with these rape threats are visions of massacre: Henry swears that the 'fathers'

will be 'taken by' their 'silver beards / And their most reverend heads dash'd to the walls' (37), that the town's 'naked infants' will be 'spitted upon pikes / Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confused / Do break the clouds' (38–40). Thus, the breach where Henry exhorted his men to battle at the beginning of the scene becomes metonymic for the city walls and the bodies he threatens with 'hot and forcing violation' (21) should Harfleur refuse voluntarily to yield.

Such discourses are limited neither to drama nor to the early modern period. Brian Sandberg argues that, perhaps drawing on the 'allegories of the siege of the castle of love, a medieval theme that was incorporated into many early modern artworks', early modern 'besiegers used sexual metaphors of rape to discuss their intended besieged victims, and massive physical and sexual assault could be unleashed by victorious besiegers when besieged cities were actually taken by assault'.⁴⁶ Catty also examines this tendency, noting that the 'imagery of female chastity as a fort and attempted rape/seduction as a siege' common to medieval narratives was 'still prevalent' in the Renaissance, but that its 'use no longer function[ed] to glorify rape'; rather, this imagery drew attention to 'a parallel between rape and war'.⁴⁷

These guiding metaphors were frequently actualized during the physical operation of siege and sack: 'rape and pillage were the expected norm'. The suffering of women was 'fundamental to siege warfare'.⁴⁸ More recently, following its widespread use in twentieth-century conflicts, international organizations have recognized rape as capable of constituting a systemized, weaponized form of combat. Here, too, its proximal relationship with massacre in, for example, the Bosnia War and the Rwandan Genocide of the 1990s, has been noted. Indeed, arguably the most prominent example of this relationship — the widespread massacres and rapes committed at Nanjing in 1937 — is commonly described interchangeably as the *rape* and *massacre* of the Chinese city.⁴⁹

Siege massacres, then, often figure women as both subjects and abstracts, bodies and metaphors. They stand in metonymically for cities and vice versa, and these processes of personification and abstraction participate in a wider conceit in which the siege and sack of a city is described as, and operated with, rape. Massacre is never far away from this kind of violence; it coordinates with sexual assault, pillage, and plunder.

Rape and Massacre / Massacre and Rape

Taken together, the previous two sections have demonstrated the ways in which combining or synonymizing rape and massacre intensifies the psychic and/or

spiritual ramifications of the attack on the individual, while also suggesting that these effects are not limited to the victim: in siege warfare, the rape of women serves to assault the socio-political institutions and cultural life of the cities which they both inhabit and represent. The rest of this essay draws these ideas together, examining the relationship and potential interchange between acts of rape and massacre in *Alarum for London*.

The play illustrates the siege's rapid descent into the general massacre of its citizens; 17000 are recorded slain after the initial attack. In retribution for the 300 Spanish who fell during the early hours of the siege, the Duke of Alva proposes that 'ten thousand more / Of this subjected city lose their lives' (828–9).⁵⁰ Criticism has tended to read the play as an extension of the exhortatory polemic of the 1580s and 90s that cautioned England against the military threat posed by Spain.⁵¹ Indeed, as its title suggests, Antwerp registers doubly as the Flemish garrison and as a cognate for England itself.⁵² But like Patricia Cahill, who argues that 'despite its obvious gestures towards didacticism' the play's narrative 'is far from ... straightforward', I make a case for its moral complexity, suggesting that part of its difficulty derives from how the play directs, or encourages, its audience to react to scenes of rape and massacre.⁵³ I consider three such instances: first, the personification of Antwerp as a woman to be raped; second, sexual violence as a component of the general massacre of Antwerp's citizens; and finally, the attempted rape and the murder of a postulant nun and her father, the Old Citizen. Considering these examples, I argue that the conflation of the two actions serves different but interrelated objectives: to reinforce the objectifying narratives intrinsic to acts of massacre; to foreground the ethical implications of watching these acts of violence; and finally, to suggest that the elision of rape and massacre implies that more than just temporal lives are being destroyed. Like Heywood's Lucrece, the play suggests that spiritual and civic, as well as earthly bodies are being obliterated.

The soldier and poet George Gascoigne's pamphlet *The Spoil of Antwerp* (1576), a probable source for *Alarum for London*, reports the massacres in detail: the Spanish spared neither 'age, nor sex: time nor place: person nor country: profession nor religion: young nor old: rich nor poor: strong nor feeble: but without any mercy, did tyrannously triumph when there was neither man nor mean to resist them'.⁵⁴ While it recounts the fates of numerous named victims alongside the nameless, faceless, numbered dead, the pamphlet is more cursory on the subject of rape, commenting generally upon the 'shameful rapes and outrageous forces presented unto sundry honest dames and virgins', noting the 'rapes, spoils,

incests, and sacrileges committed' by the Spanish, and briefly relating the rape of a novice nun.⁵⁵

Alarum for London never uses the word *rape*; *massacre* is used only twice (566, 1520). And yet, the play radically accentuates the relationship cursorily described in its source material. At the start of the play, the Spanish general, Sancho d'Avila, surveys the city:

Antwerp is wealthy, but withal secure,
Soldiers want the crowns they surfeit with
And therefore she must spare from forth her store,
To help her neighbours; nay she shall be forced,
To strip her of her pouches, and on the backs
Of Spanish soldiers, hang her costliest robes. (12–17)

Later, d'Avila will blame the attack variously on Antwerp's tacit support for William of Orange, with whom the Spanish have been battling (131, 229, 314), and for the death of the duke of Alva (2554), but these are pretexts: Alva's death is faked, and d'Avila and his soldiers have not been paid by Spain and are attacking the city for its renowned wealth (22). Indeed, d'Avila's rationale for the siege is couched in commercial terms: a rich city and port, Antwerp has a 'surfeit' of wealth with which the Spanish can trade. But, the commerce articulated by d'Avila is predicated on a series of involuntary exchanges. The consent implied by the money Antwerp might 'spare' is quickly replaced by the personification of Antwerp as a feminine body to be forced. The anaphoric insistence of 'To help' and 'To strip' likewise shifts the tenor from Antwerp's willing aid to her assault at Spanish hands, insisting on the force with which the city will be physically and metaphysically denuded, and the Spanish clothed in her riches. Thus expressed, the sack of Antwerp plays on the dual notion of rape as a crime of property and sex.

Later in the scene, d'Avila's description of the city embellishes this conceit in a perverted blazon:

What patient eye can look upon yond turrets,
And see the beauty of that flower of Europe
And in't be ravished with the sight of her?
Oh she is amorous as the wanton air
And must be courted; from her nostrils comes
A breath, as sweet as the Arabian spice.
Her garments are embroidered with pure gold;

And every part so rich and sumptuous,
 As India's not to be compar'd to her;
 She must be courted, marry herself invites
 And beckons us unto her sportful bed. (74–84)

This sketch of Antwerp's body incorporates the city's physical structures. This metaphor is mixed with the sense of the city as a flower — as the pinnacle of Europe's wealth and beauty — before d'Avila's references to Antwerp's nostrils, breath, and clothes evoke a partial image of the female form. The description is cumulative, building with each 'and' to the conclusion that Antwerp is beckoning the Spaniards' sexual advances. D'Avila's is an overwhelmingly sensual Antwerp. In language reminiscent of the misogynistic argument that sex workers cannot be raped because their consent is always presumed, d'Avila employs the insidious defence familiar to sexual predators: Antwerp, he says, is asking for it.

While his speech goes some way towards personifying Antwerp, it does not humanize the city. Rather, it is indicative of other kinds of objectifying narratives employed by the perpetrators of the siege and ensuing massacre. Much of this speech relies on their equating the citizens with animals and animalistic behaviours: they are dismissed as 'silly mice' (56), 'foul bestial' gourmands (22), and 'Boozing Bacchanalian centaurs' (201). Added to these descriptions are victim-blaming accusations that Antwerp's citizens are so indulgent that they seemingly invite their rape and massacre. They are 'used to soft effeminate silks' (47), 'sit swilling in the pride of their excess' (178), and are 'remiss and negligent' (46) with their safety, making them 'fat for slaughter, fit for spoil' (49). Their imprudence blinds them to the Spanish threat outside of the city, and to the native threat within: the collusion of Antwerp's captain Van End, who, in betraying the town to the Spanish, 'ravished Antwerp of her Maiden joy' (1255), enables the massacre.

This metaphorical rape of Antwerp, however, is initially committed in terms of the massacre of its citizens. The sack is initiated with what were 'perhaps the loudest available [sound effects] in the playhouse': shots of ordnance.⁵⁶ Effected by discharging a cannon offstage, the volleys ensure 'that audience members cannot miss the magnitude of the violence unleashed upon the city'.⁵⁷ Those who survived the blasts still do not take the Spanish threat seriously, however, believing that the cost of paying an army to defend them is too dear. While they accept help from Antwerp's allies — the Marquis d'Havré and Count Egmont — the city is unable to muster an effective defence; its military power is co-opted by the traitor Van End, and the Swiss mercenary regiment hired to guard Antwerp is

intoxicated and massacred without resistance (538). The play goes on to represent the stabbing of the governor, Champagny, and the Marquis d'Havré, the torture and hanging of an English factor, the murder of the two children — Lenchy and Martin — and their parents; it also narrates the deaths of 'Old men, weak women, and poor wretched infants' (1108). Antwerp 'bathes herself' in the 'blood' (192, 311) of its citizens.

Amongst these scenes is the attempted rape of Champagny's wife. She enters 'hurried by two rascals' (730 SD); apprehended by her attackers, the lady pleads for her release, beseeching the men to do her 'no shame' (697). Ignoring her entreaties, the soldiers search and begin to strip the lady, swearing to 'turn her inside outward' (699) and 'ransack her, every part of her' (700). Here, the play's language conflates items of monetary value with the woman's body; rape is figured as a kind of pillage, her body a source of wealth to be robbed. The arrival of the English soldier, Stump, the play's unlikely, one-legged hero, sees her liberation. He enters without initially apprehending her predicament, offering a contemplation on the wider siege and his place within it (702–7).

Stump is only jolted out of his reverie when the soldiers start to strip their victim. Before the English soldier intervenes, however, he remarks on the sight before him:

How now, two soldiers ransacking a woman?
 O tis *Champagny's* wife that was the Governor,
 Here is she, that would not have been seen
 With a mouth upon her, for a thousand pound;
 That spent as much on monkeys, dogs and parrots,
 As would have kept ten soldiers all the year.
 ...
 O *Antwerp, Antwerp,*
 Now Madame *Marchpane*, minx, your blows
 And you are one. (716–28)

The speech has caused some consternation. Alexander Leggatt contends that Stump seems to be in a

different dramatic world from the women and her attackers. While there, the rape is suspended for as long as he needs to comment on it ... His speech has been in its own way an action ... It is not enough to act out the atrocity it must be put on display, and a moral must be drawn.⁵⁸

Conversely, Cahill argues that the speech prevents

the audience from interpreting the actions of the lame soldier as those of a heroic rescue, for the soldier's commentary on the rape of Madame Champagny ... might instead be understood as a sign of the lame soldier's participation in the attack' as 'he strikes out at the woman with misogynous invective and mockery' ...⁵⁹

The relish with which Stump rehearses the incident to his captain a couple of scenes later (1342–43) further supports Cahill's contention, as does his reiteration of the same kind of language employed by both her attackers and d'Avila. 'Ransacking a woman?' Stump asks, before settling into a heavily condemnatory speech that reproves the lady's haughtiness and inextricably implicates her in her own sorry predicament: 'minx, your blows / And you are one'. The apostrophes 'O Antwerp, Antwerp', alongside the stage picture of the assaulted woman, enacts the metaphor employed by d'Avila earlier in the play. The attack on the governor's wife becomes representative of the besieged Antwerp itself: she is reduced into a geographical site to be sacked and literally invaded.⁶⁰ In this sense, then, Leggatt is right: the speech does represent a kind of action; it does its own kind of ransacking, of the woman and of Antwerp's character. The moral inferred from Stump's musing delay justifies her assault, going some way towards establishing empathy with her attackers.

Though less sustained, this aspect of the play offers a tonal affinity with the reception of Lucrece's rape in Heywood's play in which, as Richard Rowland writes, 'scenes of visceral suffering are ... set alongside passages containing elements of almost slapstick comedy'.⁶¹ Together with Lucrece's refusals to acquiesce to Sextus and her mournful declarations of woe are ribald and crudely misogynistic declarations of Lucrece's bodily openness and sensual appetite from the play's clown and its singing fool, Valerius. Innuendos describing the 'way into her' (C3r) are accompanied with bawdy songs making light of the sexual violence central to the play, all of which seem to contradict the typically tragic tone of accounts of the Roman matron.⁶² As Rowland notes, this unseemly incongruity has often prompted critics and theatre practitioners to attempt to rehabilitate the play's ethics, reading the drama as a political allegory or as indebted to Ovidian narrative techniques.⁶³ For Rowland's part, the play's comedic elements are rarely left 'to stand contextualized by either the serious business of constitutional change or the play's inexorable progress towards personal tragedy'.⁶⁴ In this way, the comedy serves to highlight the play's tragedy. More recently, Andrew Bretz has trenchantly argued that Valerius's songs 'indicate the disjointure of the whole

dramatic universe of *The Rape of Lucrece*.⁶⁵ He sings, Bretz argues, as a ‘traumatized response’ to his ‘participation and complicity in the rise of the Tarquin regime’; by the end of the play, Valerius’s singing acts as a ‘metatheatrical return to the rape’, asking the audience to ‘sympathize with Lucrece’s suffering’.⁶⁶

Each of these perspectives is averse to reading the play’s scenes of levity serving a comedic purpose: these scenes are not funny; they do not mean to elicit laughing approbation, but rather to emphasize sorrow and suffering. How much more unsettling, though, to acknowledge the foolish wit of these moments, to adopt the callous perspectives of careless misogyny that are fundamental to the culture and enactment of rape. How much more horrific to laugh and cry at rape in the course of the same play, to hold, in however small a measure, the outlook of both raped and rapist, and to acknowledge the incompatibility of these positions, and our own moral culpability for engaging with such scenes. Bridget Escolme argues that ‘it is in moments of morally dubious, improper and excessive laughter that spectators are asked to examine the community of laughers to which they belong, in a range of ambiguous and challenging ways’.⁶⁷ So too, when Stump, who excoriates Antwerp for its military unpreparedness, engages in the same rhetoric as Lady Champagny’s attackers, and repeatedly puns on her name — ‘Madame *March-pane*’ (or ‘marzipan’), ‘mince-pies’ (727, 746) — the distance between the Spanish *massacreurs* and the English saviour collapses. The English soldier, in an Antwerp that is both the Flemish city and a stand-in for London, here encourages the audience to laugh at and fear the violence that might befall them if they too ignore the Spanish threat. In mocking others, they mock themselves. Or rather, in scorning the lady, the audience laughs at a woman emblematic of their future selves, a future that will be realized if they do not stop laughing.

Thoroughly castigating Lady Champagny for her profligacy, Stump nonetheless determines that ‘it is inhuman to abuse a woman’ (735), and, after killing one of her attackers and forcing the other to flee, he reluctantly guides the lady to safety. Unlike the unnerving and rampantly misogynistic sense that the citizens of Antwerp might be reaping their just deserts for dissipated lives, the third example figures the victim as an innocent. It presents the audience with the Old Citizen, who, having been dispossessed of his home and wealth is forced by d’Avila to fetch his daughter, a novice nun, from a nearby cloister for the General and his men to ‘enjoy’ (898).⁶⁸ When the Citizen returns with his daughter, d’Avila welcomes the virgin as his ‘love’ (970):

mine arms shall be thy throne,
Where seated once, mock death, and laugh to scorn,

The boisterous threats, of blood besprinkled war,
 Who whilst he shows wild frescoes in the streets,
 And with his gambols, overthrows huge buildings,
 Mingle their tottered ruins, with the limbs
 And clotted blood of many thousand souls
 Shall as an antic in thy sight appear (970–7)

His speech evokes the sights of the massacre orchestrated by a personified and blood-stained war. War's grotesque pageant re-stages the ruin of the city: his spirited romps through Antwerp topple its building; their wreckage joins the dead bodies of its citizens. Their 'souls', registering here as both a synonym for lives and also for an afterlife materialized by the massacre that has jointed the limbs from their bodies, are reconstituted as a general, indistinguishable mass gelled together by the blood they have shed.

But these images are not intended to revolt. D'Avila does not frame his intended assault as rape, but as a seduction. He attempts to woo the votaress with the physical results of the massacre he has orchestrated, forcing her to see the conversion of buildings from homes and places of trade and worship, to mass graves awash with blood and body parts; to experience violence so far-reaching that the blood spilt comes from, and stains, the very souls of the slain.

The postulant's response insists upon the safeguarding of her honour:

Behold a virgin, whose distilling tears
 Turn the dry dust to paste, where she doth kneel,
 If me you touch with a lascivious hand,
 As from his eyes descends a flood of tears;
 So will you draw a river from his heart,
 Of his life's blood; both ways you shall obscure,
 The honour of your name: if virgin I,
 Or aged he, misdo by tyranny. (980–7)

Her father takes up her suit: 'only refrain', he implores, 'our conscience to wound, / With that, for which there is no physic found' (996). The citizen here rearticulates his former entreaty not to have his 'soul' whose 'spirit already stoops' from being 'molest[ed]' (890) by the Spanish to include his daughter in his plea; her 'conscience', popularly conceived as a 'faculty of man's soul' which 'opposeth itself unto sin', is imperilled by d'Avila's lust.⁶⁹ According to this reasoning, the nun's rape would represent an assault that endures beyond bodily pain; it would taint her immaterial, immortal self, and there would be no remedy.

But they do not just appeal for their spiritual lives. The novice conflates her rape with her father's temporal life: to rape her would be to murder him. In a departure from the other forms of rape in the play that are intended to shame the victim, however, the virgin nun places the onus upon d'Avila: it is his honour and not hers that will be undone by the sexual attack. Her moment of psychological control is soon revoked. The alarum sounds and Spanish soldiers enter, informing d'Avila of a fresh assault from 'a crew of straggling soldiers lately vanquished' (1002). The general commands that 'a troop of muskets guard this damsel hence', ordering his soldiers to 'environ her with shot' (1007–9) and take her to his quarters. The alarum tolls again as the novice is cloaked in the instruments, agents, and sounds of d'Avila's massacre. But the onslaught of 'the brainsick crew' is fast approaching and 'it is impossible' for the Spanish 'to pass the streets' to d'Avila's lodging (1012) and there deposit the nun. Faced with the possibility that 'another shall enjoy' the citizen's daughter, d'Avila shoots her and has her father stabbed in the next instant. The killing of the Old Citizen and his daughter seem to enact a moment of direct interchange between rape and massacre: rape is exchanged for massacre, and the daughter and Citizen join the ranks of the carcasses bestirred by death.

On the one hand, their murders chime with the idea of property and commerce inherent to one strand of Renaissance thinking on rape and to d'Avila's rationale for the city's sack: the citizen's daughter is a spoil of the conquered city of Antwerp, a property to be seized, guarded and discarded at will. On the other, d'Avila's actions might be seen implicitly to recall the culture of shame that characterize so many responses to rape. D'Avila, having been denied the opportunity to rape the novice himself, murders her to prevent her rape at the hand of another. By killing the novice, he might be seen to treat her almost as if she were already raped, and as a source of dishonour for him to expunge. It is this shame attributed to the victims, and not the guilt the novice ascribed to her would-be attackers, that triumphs as the dominant culture in the play; it is a disgrace suffered by the whole city.

Alarum for London concludes with more of d'Avila's aberrant moralizing. Of the citizens he has slain, he makes short shrift: 'they were wanton and lascivious / Too much addicted to their private lust' (1542–3), their 'martyrdom was just' (1544). Two of the 'slaughtered carcasses' that lie 'thwact' (1536) on Antwerp's streets receive greater reverence. Stump and the captain who helped the English soldier fight the Spanish are singled out by d'Avila; they alone, out of 'ten thousand others / Reft by [Spanish] swords' will be interred as 'honoured foes' (1574–9). This distinction, as the epilogue spoken by the allegorical Time makes

clear, underlines the essential difference between those fallen: the citizens of Antwerp would not be warned. They would not heed their alarum. They suffered a fate worse than massacre.

What does it mean, then, when Heywood's Lucrece declares herself massacred? This article has argued that it is not, or not only, hyperbole: massacre was deployed as a cognate of rape in major dramatic and non-dramatic texts. And yet, this usage is not securely indicative either: both rape and massacre are highly evocative and capacious terms. They denote particular, but wide-ranging, forms of violence; they connote a still greater variety. There are times when their physical operation seems closely elided or intermeshed. Indeed, this article has suggested that like Heywood's Lucrece, *Alarum for London* resists the interpretation of acts of rape or massacre as discrete, isolated actions. The one coordinates with the violence of the other. So close is their relationship in these texts that the two are conflated almost to the point of synonymy. And yet, while interchangeable, they are not directly equivalent. Acts of rape compound acts of massacre and vice versa. Their combination ensures that it is not just lives that are lost, or bodies that are hewn: they slaughter the soul and the city.

Notes

This work has benefitted greatly from the advice and encouragement of Helen Ostovich and Sarah E. Johnson, as well as the participants of the ‘Gender, Sexuality, and Militarism’ Seminar at the 2015 meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America conference in Vancouver. My thanks also go to the anonymous peer-reviewers of this article for their generous and constructive advice.

- 1 Thomas Heywood, *The Rape of Lucrece* (London, 1608; STC: 13360). All subsequent references are to this text.
- 2 For more on rape and theories of gender, see Philip Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan, ‘Introduction: The Massacre and History’, *Theatres of Violence: Massacre, Mass Killing and Atrocity Throughout History*, ed. Philip G. Dwyer and Lyndall Ryan (New York and Oxford, 2012), xv.
- 3 For more on *hybris* and shame, see N.R.E. Fisher, *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* (Warminster, 1992).
- 4 Christine M. Rose and Elizabeth Robertson (eds), *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature* (Basingstoke and New York, 2001), 15–18, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-10448-9>.
- 5 Earlier practices likewise emphasized both the proprietary rights of men over their female relatives and the latitude given to rapists. For example, the practice of *wergild*, first codified by King Æthelbert (560–1), specified the amount of money paid in compensation for raped widows. The law assumed that the rape of married women would be avenged by their husbands; similarly, the rapes of unmarried women were to be privately redressed by her male relatives. For more on this subject see Lee Ritscher, *The Semiotics of Rape in Renaissance English Literature* (New York, 2009), 1–22.
- 6 Pascale Aebischer, *Shakespeare’s Violated Bodies: Stage and Screen Performance* (Cambridge, 2004), 25.
- 7 Carolyn D. Williams, “‘Silence, like a Lucrece knife’: Shakespeare and the Meanings of Rape”, *Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993), 94, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3507975>. See also Jocelyn Catty, *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England: Unbridled Speech* (Basingstoke, 1999), 17, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230309074>. *Titus Andronicus* crystalizes this distinction, representing both forms of rape. Saturninus terms Lavinia’s abduction by Bassianus a rape (1.1.409) and Bassianus responds: ‘Rape, call you it, my lord to seize my own ... I am possess’ of that is mine’ (410). She is later unlawfully and carnally known by Chiron and Demetrius (2.3). William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate (London and New York,

- 1995), <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781408160121.00000031>. All references are to this edition.
- 8 'mace, n.2 and 2a', *Oxford English Dictionary Online (OED)*. For more on the etymology, see 'massacre' in E. Gamillscheg, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache* (Heidelberg, 1969).
 - 9 '† macellarious, adj.', *OED*.
 - 10 'mace-gref (n.)', *Middle English Dictionary*, <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>. As variants of this term, the *MED* includes *macecrof*, *macceref*, *mazere*, and, more curiously, *mascerer*, *massecrer*, *mascecren/kren*.
 - 11 Maarten Lemmens, *Lexical Perspectives on Transitivity and Ergativity: Causative Constructions in English* (Amsterdam, 1998), 114 (emphasis his), <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.166>.
 - 12 Mark Greengrass, 'Hidden Transcripts: Secret Histories and Personal Testimonies of Religious Violence in the French Wars of Religion', *The Massacre in History*, ed. Mark Levene and Penny Roberts (New York and Oxford, 1999), 69.
 - 13 See, 'Massacre 1', *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*, 7 vols, ed. Edmond Huguet (Paris, 1925–67); 'Massacrer v. tr', *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*, 2 vols, ed. Alain Rey (Paris, 1992); 'Massacre. n.m.', *Le Grand Robert de la langue française*, 6 vols, ed. Alain Rey (Paris, 2001); 'Massacre', *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IX^e au XV^e siècle*, 10 vols, ed. Frédéric Godefroy (Paris, 1881–1902).
 - 14 John Docker, 'The Origins of Massacres', in Dwyer and Ryan (eds), *Theatres of Violence*, 5.
 - 15 For more on the drama of dismemberment, see Margaret E. Owens, *Stages of Dismemberment* (Newark, 2006).
 - 16 See, for example, Anon., *Les cruautés sanguinaires* (Paris, 1589) and Jean Boucher, *La vie et faits notables* (Paris, 1589).
 - 17 Dates of plays refer to their composition, and are taken from Martin Wiggins with Catherine Richardson, *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, 10 vols (Oxford, 2012-).
 - 18 See, for example, Ritschter, *Semiotics of Rape*; Aebischer, *Shakespeare's Violated Bodies*; Catty, *Writing Rape, Writing Women*; Kim Solga, *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Performance: Invisible Acts* (Basingstoke, 2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230274051>.
 - 19 For more on this topic, see *Sexual Violence in Conflict Zones: From the Ancient World to the Era of Human Rights*, ed. Elizabeth D. Heineman (Philadelphia, 2011), <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812204346>.

- 20 Andrew Bretz, 'Sung Silence: Complicity, Dramaturgy, and Song in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*', *Early Theatre* 9.2 (2016), 101, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.19.2.2687>. See also Jean E. Howard, 'Interrupting the Lucrece Effect? The Performance of Rape on the Early Modern Stage', *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race* (Oxford, 2016), 657–72, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199663408.013.37>. For work on *Alarum for London* and disability, see Naomi Baker, 'Happy, and without a name': Prosthetic Identities on the Early Modern Stage', *Textual Practice* 30.7 (2016), 1309–26, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236x.2016.1229913>; Genevieve Love, 'Past, Present, Presence, Prosthesis in *Alarum for London*', *Upstart: A Journal of English Renaissance Studies*, 2013, https://upstart.sites.clemson.edu/Essays/prosthesis_larum/prosthesis_larum.xhtml; Vin Nardizzi, 'The Wooden Matter of Human Bodies: Prosthesis and Stump in *A Larum for London*', *The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature*, ed. Jean E. Feerick and Vin Nardizzi (London and New York, 2012), 119–36, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137015693_8.
- 21 Livy, *The Roman History*, trans. Philemon Holland (London, 1600; stc: 16613).
- 22 Thomas Middleton, 'The Ghost of Lucrece', ed. G.B. Shand, in Gary Taylor, John Lavagnino, and John Jowett (eds), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. (Oxford, 2007), 1985–98, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00012346>. All subsequent references are to this edition.
- 23 Nathaniel Richards, *Messalina* (London 1640; stc: 21011).
- 24 John Fletcher, *The Chances*, in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 10 vols (Cambridge, 1966–96), 4,541–643.
- 25 John Penry, *A View of Some Part of Such Public Wants* (London, 1589; stc: 19613), 65.
- 26 Christopher Bagshaw, *A True Relation of the Faction* (London, 1605; stc: 1188), 77.
- 27 Emily Michael, 'Renaissance Theories of Body, Soul, and Mind', *Psyche and Soma: Physicians and Metaphysicians of the Mind-Body Problem*, ed. John P. Wright and Paul Potter (Oxford, 2002), 147.
- 28 Sarah E. Johnson, *Staging Women and the Soul-Body Dynamic in Early Modern England* (Farnham, 2014), 13, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315610566>.
- 29 William Shakespeare, 'The Rape of Lucrece', *Shakespeare's Poems*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and H.R. Woudhuysen (London, 2007), 271–384. All subsequent references are to this edition.
- 30 William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. J.W. Lever (London, 1965).
- 31 Thomas Middleton, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, ed. Macdonald P. Jackson, in Taylor, Lavagnino, and Jowett (eds), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, 543–93, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00012295>.
- 32 Johnson, *Staging Women*, 44.

- 33 John Fletcher, *Valentinian*, in *Four Jacobean Sex Tragedies*, ed. Martin Wiggins (Oxford, 1998), 233–328.
- 34 Thomas Middleton, William Rowley, Thomas Dekker, and John Ford, *The Spanish Gypsy*, ed. Gary Taylor and introduced by Suzanne Gossett in Taylor, Lavagnino, and Jowett (eds), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works, 723–1765*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00012330>.
- 35 Gossett observes that various late-Jacobean plays, including Middleton's *Women Beware Women* (1621), along with Nathan Field, Fletcher, and Philip Massinger's *Queen of Corinth* (1617), 'initiate a dramatically different handling of the rape plot' by concluding with the heroine surviving rape and marrying her rapist. Gossett, "Best Men are Molded out of Faults": Marrying the Rapist in Jacobean Drama', *Renaissance Historicism: Selections from English Literary Renaissance*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney and Dan S. Collins (Amherst, 1987), 186.
- 36 Catty, *Writing Rape*, 15.
- 37 Hackett, *Virgin Mother, Maiden Queen: Elizabeth I and the Cult of the Virgin Mary* (Basingstoke, 1995), 178.
- 38 Catty, *Writing Rape*, 3.
- 39 Ibid, 15.
- 40 Christine Rose, 'Reading Chaucer, Reading Rape', Rose and Robertson (eds), *Representing Rape*, 28, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-10448-9_2.
- 41 Johnson, *Staging Women*, 33.
- 42 Catty, *Writing Rape*, 15.
- 43 For example, the title-page to *The Iron Age* lists 'the rape of Helen' alongside the 'siege of Troy'.
- 44 For an indicative example of this interpretative lens, see John Sutherland and Cedric Watts, *Henry V, War Criminal: And Other Shakespeare Puzzles* (Oxford, 2000).
- 45 For more on the use of this allegory outside of drama, see Paul H.D. Kaplan, 'Allegories of Place: Giorgione's Assault: War and Rape in Renaissance Venice', *Early Modern Visual Allegory: Embodying Meaning*, ed. Cristelle Baskins and Lisa Rosenthal (London, 2007), 81–2.
- 46 Brian Sandberg, "'To Have the Pleasure of This Siege": Envisioning Warfare During the European Wars of Religion', *Beholding Violence in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Allie Terry-Fritsch and Erin Felicia Labbie (Farnham, 2012), 156.
- 47 Catty, *Writing Rape*, 94.
- 48 Rachel Chrasti, *The Siege of Strasbourg* (Cambridge, 2014), 43, <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674416284>.
- 49 Resolution 1820 (2008), adopted by the Security Council at its 5916th meeting on 19 June 2008.

- 50 Anon., *Alarum for London*, ed. W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1913).
- 51 For example, Paulina Kewes argues that *Alarum for London* 'issues a forceful warning about the military threat of Spain; it urges the need for watchfulness and military preparedness. Unless the lessons of the past are learned, England will suffer as dreadful a fate as Antwerp, which the Spaniards had captured by means of treachery and open violation of diplomatic treaties'. Kewes, 'The Elizabethan History Play: A True Genre', *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volume 2: The Histories*, ed. R. Dutton and J.E. Howard (Oxford and Malden, 2003), 175, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996546.ch9>. See also Roslyn L. Knutson who considers how the play's indebtedness to the medieval morality play accentuates its didactic message: 'Playgoers must heed the warning, or London too may become a town like Antwerp'. Knutson, 'Filling Fare: The Appetite for Current Issues and Traditional Forms in the Repertory of the Chamberlain's Men', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 15 (2003), 64. Nick de Somogyi also discusses the play's morality, arguing that it articulates three 'morals': 'moral reform, military readiness, and the justice of a self-defensive war'. Somogyi, *Shakespeare's Theatre of War* (Aldershot, 1998), 32.
- 52 This is also the message of Greene and Thomas Lodge's 1589 play *A Looking Glass for London and England*, ed. W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1932), in which the epilogue makes explicit the biblical allegory of the play-proper: if England and its capital do not repent for their sins, for their 'contempt of God', and for their neglect 'of law, desire to wrong the poor / Corruption, whoredom, drunkenness, and pride' (14v), they will go the same way as the wretched city Ninevah. Indeed, the play cautions the audience to 'fear' the 'fire' burning their 'neighbors', to hear the 'alarum' and awake to see the 'looking glass' set 'before [their] eyes' (ibid.).
- 53 Patricia A. Cahill, *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford, 2008), 167–8, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199212057.001.0001>.
- 54 George Gascoigne, *The Spoil of Antwerp* (London, 1576; STC: 11644), B8r.
- 55 Ibid, C1v. Other contemporary accounts of the siege such as Thomas Churchyard's *A Lamentable and Pitiful Description of the Woeful Wars in Flanders* (London, 1578; STC: 5239) and Thomas Stocker's *A Tragical History of the Troubles and Civil Wars of the Low Countries* (London, 1583; STC: 17450.3), are more circumspect when it comes to acts of rape committed. Stocker describes the Spanish as 'usurping on [the citizens of Antwerp] all kind of cruelty, and warlike licence and liberty' (ibid, 103). Churchyard makes no reference to rape at all.
- 56 Ruth Lunney, 'The Bell, the Bodies, and the Bonking: *The Massacre at Paris* and its Early Playhouse Audiences', *Marlowe Studies* 4 (2014), 96.
- 57 Cahill, *Unto the Breach*, 179.

- 58 Alexander Leggatt, *Jacobean Public Theatre* (London, 1992), 115, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203169162>.
- 59 Cahill, *Unto the Breach*, 199.
- 60 Joe Stephenson has also commented on the conflation of the governor's wife with Antwerp in 'A Mirror for London: The Geopolitics of *Alarum for London* at the Globe in 1599', *Parergon* 30 (2013), 190, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pgn.2013.0047>.
- 61 Richard Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre, 1599–1639: Locations, Translations, and Conflict* (Farnham, 2010), 11.
- 62 For a comprehensive survey of these narratives, see Ian Donaldson, *The Rapes of Lucretia: A Myth and its Transformations* (Oxford, 1982).
- 63 See Paulina Kewes, 'Roman History and Early Stuart Drama: Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece*', *English Literary Renaissance* 32 (2002), 239–67, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1475-6757.00010>, and Clifford Ronan, "Antike Roman": *Power Symbolology and the Roman Play in Early Modern England, 1585–1635* (Athens, GA, 1995), 4–5.
- 64 Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre*, 11.
- 65 Bretz, 'Sung Silence', 1.
- 66 *Ibid.*, 110–15.
- 67 Bridget Escolme, *Emotional Excess on the Shakespearean Stage: Passion's Slaves* (London, 2014), 61, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781408179703>.
- 68 Gascoigne narrates a similar episode: 'It is a thing too horrible to rehearse, that the Father and Mother were forced to fetch their young daughter out of a cloister (who had thither fled as unto Sanctuary, to keep her body undefiled) & to bestow her in bed between two Spaniards, to work their wicked and detestable will with her' (*The Spoil of Antwerp*, Cv).
- 69 Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionary* (London, 1612; STC: 25786), E8v; Randle Cotgrave, *A Dictionary of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611; STC: 5830), T5r.

