

Review Essay

KENT CARTWRIGHT

Defining Tudor Drama

The gods are smiling upon the field of Tudor literature — perhaps to paradoxical effect, as we shall later see. In 2009 Oxford University Press published Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank's magnificent (and award-winning) collection of multi-authored essays *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature*.¹ For drama specialists, Oxford has now followed it with Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker's *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*.² This fresh attention to Tudor literature has surely received encouragement from scholarly interest in political history and in religious change during the sixteenth century in England, as illustrated in drama studies by the transformational influence of, for example, Paul Whitfield White's 1993 *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage and Playing in Tudor England*. The important Records of Early English Drama project, now almost four decades old, has bolstered such interests.³ More recently, Tudor literature has figured in the ongoing reconsideration of a reigning theory of literary periodization that segmented off what was 'medieval' from what was 'Renaissance'; that reconsideration, well under way, now tracks the long reach of medieval values and worldviews into the 1530s and beyond. Tudor literary studies has received impetus, too, from the tireless efforts of a number of eminent scholars. Greg Walker, the co-editor of the *Handbook*, for instance, has authored a series of books on Tudor drama (and most recently Tudor literature) that display a fine-grained, locally attuned, paradigm-setting political analysis at a level never before achieved. Equally, the field is indebted to Mike Pincombe and

Kent Cartwright (kcartwri@umd.edu) is a professor in the English department at the University of Maryland.

Kathy Shrank, the editors of *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature* and the conveners of the Tudor Symposium, for bringing international scholars together in periodic conferences under the Symposium's banner and for several resulting collections of essays with British, North American, and European contributors, conferences that have helped to make visible the work of scholars outside of Great Britain.⁴ In short, Walker, White, Pincombe, Shrank, and others have done much to make the world safe for Hilary Mantel, BBC's *The Tudors*, and students of Tudor drama.

The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama — comprising thirty-eight essays plus an introduction and running to more than 700 pages — represents a tremendous investment of resources and energy by its two editors, the contributing scholars, and the press. They all deserve to take enormous satisfaction in this expansive and splendid achievement; Tudor drama scholars will consult the volume for many decades, and rightly so. Before looking closely at the *Handbook*, however, it is worth recording some considerations, especially because of the influence that this collection will undoubtedly assert. What Oxford University Press means by 'handbook' remains misty. The *OED* defines handbook as a 'manual'; or as a 'compendious book or treatise for guidance in any art, occupation, or study; *spec.* a book containing concise information for the tourist'.⁵ The Tudor-drama tourist will find the *Handbook* compendious but a bit short on guidance and mapping. Its overall charting of the field comes in a brief, though valuable and suggestive, 'Introduction' and a grouping of chapters conceived roughly by genre, or sometimes thematic genre: 'Religious Drama', 'Interludes and Comedies', 'Entertainments, Masques, and Royal Entries', and 'Histories and Political Dramas'. These categories displace chronological divisions that might imply a teleological model — which Betteridge and Walker resist strongly in the 'Introduction' — although the reasoning behind the categorization goes unexplained. Only dubiously does the section on 'Entertainments, Masques, and Royal Entries' earn its place, for it seems somewhat detached from ideas of drama. A few of the placements feel arbitrary. Readers might wonder as well at the absence of a section on tragedy, that genre having been absorbed into 'Religious Drama' and 'Histories and Political Dramas'; tragedy, with its emphasis on the protagonist, implies a significantly different view of drama (and of the world) than does, say, 'political drama'. Here structure appears polemical.

Each chapter focuses on a specific play or entertainment, so that the volume is without any overarching purchases beyond the introduction or

the varied comments in individual chapters. For an overview from a single perspective, the tourist might turn to other works, such as Janette Dillon's *Cambridge Introduction to Early English Theatre*. Notwithstanding, the *Handbook's* chapters typically make fruitful efforts to put the play under discussion in comparative dramatic or cultural-historical context, a kaleidoscopic effect with its own riches. Chapters arrive in implicit chronological groupings within each section, with, say, three or four essays on Henrician drama, a few more on mid-century plays, and another group on Elizabethan drama, allowing a developmental (if not teleological) model to take shape and allowing, again, for comparisons by the itinerant reader. The *Handbook* regrettably lacks a bibliography (of the sort provided in *The Oxford Handbook to Tudor Literature*) and a synthesizing discussion of scholarly trends and points of contention or interest. (Similarly minimalist, the index refers only to authors and works mentioned in the text, not in the notes, so that the index will not provide a guide, for example, to the criticism with which contributors are in conversation.) Beyond the excellent close-up studies of individual plays placed in their literary-cultural environs (and occasionally broader contexts), readers will have to look elsewhere for the middle and long views of Tudor drama.

That result comes by design, partly because the term Tudor drama remains elusive. In their introduction, Betteridge and Walker reasonably reject 'any simple evolutionary model'⁶ and insist on Tudor drama's capacity to combine older and newer characteristics, such as the emblematic and the psychological. They argue interestingly for a major division in the sixteenth century not between protestant and Catholic but between the religiously zealous and those of looser orientation (although this important suggestion remains relatively unexplored in the volume). From an inevitably developmental perspective, however, they do argue that in cycle drama theatricality and seriousness of message flow together, that those two begin to diverge in a play such as Bale's *Three Laws*, and that, in the later example of *The Comedy of Errors*, theatrical complexity fully displaces devotional or doctrinal pronouncements. By the end of the century, 'a drama that had been a vehicle for authoritative moral and religious critique of worldly life ... became an unmistakably integral and compromised part of that same commercial culture'.⁷ Yet, thereby, the theatre also became a place of questioning and exploration. Here Betteridge and Walker nod toward humanism for bringing psychological interiority to the stage, although they also accuse it of 'fundamentalism',⁸ a rather dismissive position that undervalues the large contributions of humanism to

Elizabethan drama. Altogether, the editors wisely refuse to divide the Tudor era into medieval and Renaissance sections; rather they embrace Pincombe and Shrank's sweeping view of the Tudor period as it stretches from 1485 to 1603. The volume's coverage of 'Tudor drama' nevertheless ends in the early 1590s and not in 1603, suggesting that some implicit historical disciplining is at work.

No matter how expansive the view of the field, any concentration on 'Tudor drama', as most scholars would understand it, must contain a heavy dose of thinking about Henrician, Edwardian, Marian, and pre-playhouse Elizabethan drama, which the *Handbook* emphatically displays. It thus warms the specialist's heart to see essays on Rastell's *Gentleness and Nobility*, *Nice Wanton*, *Lusty Juventus*, Bale's *The Three Laws*, Jasper Heywood's translation of Seneca's *Thyestes*. The volume unfortunately lacks discussions of Lewis Wager's *Mary Magdalene*, William Wager's protestant moralities, and Preston's *Cambises*, among other significant plays; indeed, mid-century and early Elizabethan morality drama as a whole comes out as problematically under-represented given that it accounted for more than one-fifth of the new plays in the 1580s. The absence of a chapter on William Wager, whose work has drawn recent attention, seems especially unfortunate.⁹ Still, no volume can be expected to cover every base, and this one merits admiration for how many plays the editors have been able to bring into the tent. Playhouse drama still occupies a hefty part of the volume, some thirteen of the essays, a third of the total. While some of those happily treat of plays infrequently discussed, such as *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, others focus on familiar works by Lyly, Kyd, Marlowe, and Shakespeare. Many of those chapters (by Lawton, Dillon, Longstaffe, and others) create the impression that early Elizabethan playhouse drama represented a considerable break from its predecessors in treatments of religion, of aestheticism, and of medium as ascendant over message. The question of how medium and message interrelate, forecast in Betteridge and Walker's 'Introduction', makes for one of the few that bumps its way happily through a number of the essays, an important issue that the chapter synopses below attempt to acknowledge. How baggy should we ultimately make a baggy-monster term such as 'Tudor drama'? Since we do not yet know quite what we mean by it, perhaps the dizzying virtue of Betteridge and Walker's approach is exactly in putting a thousand balls in the air.

But another aspect of this volume seems, to me at least, disquieting. While the Tudor Symposium's published proceedings have showcased the

international flavour of Tudor studies, the *Oxford Handbook to Tudor Drama* remains a surprisingly insular affair. Among its thirty-eight contributors, only two are Europeans (from Germany and Hungary) and one possibly American, by my count. While some of the remaining contributors teach at European or Commonwealth universities, the *Handbook* is, when all is said and done, a distinctly and almost exclusively British affair. Why? Pincombe and Shrank's collection is far more international and inclusive in its assortment of contributors, as are most volumes of this type. While those represented in the *Handbook* are among the most distinguished of Tudor scholars in Great Britain and the Commonwealth, the volume represents overall a certain school of criticism. These essays are overwhelmingly historicist in their critical orientation, most of them offering the kind of close analysis of a play in terms of contemporary court-centered political events so brilliantly modeled by Walker. True, a few essays, such as those by Happé, Fletcher, and Longstaffe, push against that mold, but most take their form from it. What troubles me about this relentless approach, especially in a 'handbook', is that it becomes an insider's game. The *Handbook* has the virtue, not inconsiderable, of critical consistency — valuable especially because of the otherwise few guiding signposts. Yet a more ecumenical group of contributors — including some from other nations, other intellectual traditions, other critical orientations, and other stages in their careers — might have added surprise. Although the Tudor age saw a burgeoning of international trade and travel, of migration prompted by religious conflict, and, in some humanist and religious circles, of a kind of pan-European intellectualism, 'Tudor drama' in this volume seems *sui generis* and largely untouched by continental influences, from French farce to Dutch prodigal son plays to Italian cinquecento humanist drama. A more international body of contributors might have broken away from what sometimes seems to be the volume's nationalistic narrowness. Furthermore, if the tourist has not already become possessed by a whole-hearted fascination with how Tudor plays formulate the political issues immediately around them, then she will have to scratch to find other interests in this volume. Put differently, the collection's deep-drilling historicism provides, in the end, very little reason to read *drama* at all. Thus, we arrive at the paradox mentioned earlier: If interests in political and religious history have infused Tudor drama with yeasty visibility, will the thorough vetting of its politics cause attention to sink away? That dramatic literature participates in the political culture of its times constitutes old news, like a tape on rewind. Is the literature department a wholly owned subsidiary

of the history department? At the end of the day, why should undergraduates read these plays? Ironically, even at this highpoint in the study of Tudor drama, we need the fresh thinking that a more mixed group of contributors might have brought.¹⁰ These anxieties, however, are not meant to detract from the brilliant quality and high standards of analysis set by these essays which, in their own fashion, put in play numerous, intellectually provocative differences — as the opening chapters on religious drama demonstrate.

Part I: Religious Drama

This section begins with an impressively detailed chapter (1) by Sheila Christie on the sixteenth-century development of the Chester Cycle as it ‘changed in both content and reception in response to specific events and legal policies, to shifting religious affiliations, and to conflicts over jurisdictional authority’.¹¹ Steering between David Mills’s position that sees the cycle as continuous with medieval tradition and Lawrence Clopper’s that sees it as marking a break between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Christie portrays the cycle as undergoing steady revision and thus hybridization. (It would have been interesting to have Christie’s response to Paul Whitfield White’s recent argument that the cycle remains ‘conservative’.¹²) In the next chapter (2), Greg Walker pays homage to the rich and complex medieval dramaturgy of the York *Corpus Christi* opening pageant, as the playwright finds means to shadow forth the ineffable. The pageant, argues Walker, ‘effectively establishes the dramatic vocabulary and grammar that will underpin ... much of the drama of the Tudor century’ with its ‘depiction of true and false authority, tyrants and villains, order and chaos’,¹³ a bracing claim but one not easy to assess. In a rather different view of a medieval theatre-piece, Elizabeth Dutton (chapter 3) argues that the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament* ‘foregrounds, rather than conceal[s], its theatricality’¹⁴ by such means as speeches that call attention to the actor, transportable staging, and readerly stage directions. *Sacrament* may tell us about priestly power and the unity of host and community, but it nonetheless shows us Christian liturgy being recited ‘efficaciously’ by Jews, a ‘violently abused’ host, and a ‘fractured community’.¹⁵ Where Walker sees a complex accommodation of means and message, Dutton finds disjunction (putting her slightly at odds with the claims of the ‘Introduction’). With the interesting chapter title, ‘Venus in Sackcloth’ (4), Vincent Gillespie takes up the late-medieval cult of Mary in the Digby *Mary Magdalene* and the *Wisdom* fragment. Among other things, these plays

illustrate to their upper-class audiences, who were attracted to a *vita mixta* of contemplation and worldliness, just how precarious such a life might be. Endorsing Theresa Coletti's view of the theological ambitiousness and theatrical eclecticism of the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, Gillespie leaves us with medieval drama at its apogee but faith as an unrealizable ideal. Readers might wish that this deeply informed essay had gone a step further in making links to other works in the *Handbook*. In these first four essays, medieval plays are either undergoing hybridization or are presciently predictive of Tudor themes or are disjoined in means and message or are deeply linked to a spiritual community: this range makes it difficult to draw collective inferences from these individually engaging essays.

In a nuanced and refreshing meditation on *Everyman* (chapter 5), Andrew Hadfield draws out the play's enigmatic qualities. He argues that it emphasizes death but 'can also be read as an affirmation of life';¹⁶ it revels in moments of pure comedy; it confers on its hero an instantaneous transformation incompatible with its valorizing of good deeds; its introduction of Beauty resists the narrative's spiritual context. These confusions may reflect cultural and religious change, such as humanist attacks on the doctrine of *artes moriendi*. The play, furthermore, displays anxiety about Good Deeds and may or may not be religiously conservative. Hadfield brings *Everyman* to life as a conflicted play in an age in transition. Enigma gives way to paradox in James Simpson's high-spirited essay (chapter 6) on John Bale's *Three Laws*. Simpson describes three interlocking paradoxes: 'A play that promises popularity is at every turn elitist; a play that draws on the morality play undoes ethics; and, not least, a play that wants to be a play is ... designed to kill drama stone dead'.¹⁷ 'Why', he asks, 'read this anti-playful play?'.¹⁸ His answers, unfortunately, have nothing to do with drama; rather, the play's failures reveal 'the larger paradoxes that drive the early English evangelical movement'.¹⁹ We might conclude that if we could gain the historical insight we seek elsewhere, then there would be no reason to read *The Three Laws* at all. Simpson formulates exactly the problem that wends through the volume as a whole. Still, his beguilingly witty essay responds skillfully to Bale's dramaturgy and its redeployments of theatrical tradition for political purposes. (Readers might do well to juxtapose Simpson's essay with Philip Schwyzer's [chapter 29] on Bale's *King Johan*.) Andreas Höfele (chapter 7) finds John Foxe's *Christus Triumphans* 'of interest precisely because of its far from seamless welding of classical Latin and popular English forms of drama', which make 'its structural instabilities a fitting reflection of the

deeply unsettling historical pressures that shaped its apocalyptic vision'.²⁰ Acknowledging the play's 'tenuous' connection to subsequent drama, Höfele engagingly shows how Foxe 'pulls out all the stops to make theatrical presence overrun the boundaries of the stage and convert itself into genuine religious experience' (137)²¹ — ideas that recall both Walker's essay and the 'Introduction'.

Pursuing the problem of religious experience, chapter 8 by Anna Riehl Bertolet takes up Nathaniel Woodes's *The Conflict of Conscience*, whose protagonist regrets his Inquisition-induced renunciation of protestant beliefs and dies in despair of salvation. In the second version of the play, Philologus joyfully reconverts to protestantism before he dies of self-starvation. Why, Bertolet wonders, must the hero die? 'The answer lies in the play's deeper structures of the extremist body-soul dichotomy where ... the body is devalued completely because it is always defined only as an inferior counterpart to the soul',²² so that the play seems to criticize the protagonist's 'tendencies toward the extremes'.²³ Philologus's death becomes, then, Bertolet provocatively concludes, a 'non-confessional' matter detached from the issues of protestantism versus Catholicism.²⁴ Bertolet analyzes the text closely and compellingly in relation to Calvin's views about the body, the flesh, and the spirit; the logic of martyrdom; images of mirroring and impaired spiritual sight; and issues of religious fasting. David Lawton concludes this section with an essay (chapter 9) on Marlowe's *Faustus* as the last 'theological drama'.²⁵ Lawton thoughtfully sorts through the play's textual issues before suggesting its kinship with Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*. In that regard, Lawton sees Mephistopheles as an aspect of Faustus' own mind — an argument that sets Marlowe's play a world-view apart from morality drama. For Lawton, the drama of *Faustus* resides in 'the contractually deferred spectacle of [the hero's] damnation',²⁶ while its connection to medieval drama occurs mostly in minor elements such as the set piece of the seven deadly sins. Faustus's compact treats blood in anti-Eucharistic fashion; his voluptuousness deserves increased critical recognition; and Faustus may stand 'irrationally for the primacy of pleasure, rejecting both God and the devil for the incontrovertible reality of human pain'.²⁷ For Faustus, '[i]t is God himself who needs to be overthrown'.²⁸ Lawton concludes this exhilarating essay by aligning the protagonist not with Prospero but with Milton's Satan. *Pace* Walker, medieval drama does not anticipate Lawton's Faustus.

Part II: Interludes and Comedies

Because the *Handbook's* focus on individual plays precludes discussion of Tudor comedy as a genre (although it developed earlier than Tudor tragedy), it is difficult to come away with much sense of its through-line. Likewise, the chapters' engagement with the critical bibliography bounces spottily from cursory to substantial (a comment that could be extended to other essays in the volume), and, perhaps because of the format, important studies, such as Robert Hornback's on sixteenth-century clowns, go unmentioned.²⁹ Notwithstanding, all of the essays make productive forays into contemporary contexts and contiguous drama. Claire Wright, on Henry Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucrez* (chapter 10), presents a lively, invigorating sense of the occasion and place of its performance, as dinner entertainment during 1490s Christmas Revels in the great hall of Cardinal Henry Morton's Lambeth Palace. Seeing in the characters of the 'debauched Cornelius and the industrious Gayus' an implicit contrast between established nobles and humanist 'new men', Wright follows critical tradition in arguing that Medwall uses the comic characters A and B to 'separate audience and content, and so evade any latent offence' to members of the aristocratic audience that might be caused by the play's valorizing of parvenus.³⁰ Wright ruminates astutely about A and B as audience-figures and about 'fluctuations of the position of the audience in relation to the action'.³¹ But the traditional argument has always been a bit puzzling: Why would Medwall be bold enough to offer a politically charged play and then use the comic subplot (which occupies 70% of the lines) to undermine it, distance the audience from it, and generally make sure that it never reaches its target?³²

In the next chapter (11), Daniel Wakelin skillfully contextualizes Rastell's *Gentleness and Nobility* and provides a carefully reasoned argument that the play addressed the court and a readership beyond it, advancing the humanist case for the importance of commonwealth while realistically acknowledging doubts about the human capacity for civil, reasoned discourse (doubts that speak directly to our own times). Wakelin concludes by contrasting *Fulgens and Lucrez's* cautious ending to *Gentleness and Nobility's* closing willingness to expel noblemen who behave churlishly. Wakelin's superb essay greatly opens up this play and should bring new interest to it. Pamela M. King's chapter (12) on John Heywood's *The Play of the Weather* nicely places it in the Tudor great hall and revealingly addresses practical issues of the play's performance, including the problematic location of Jupiter's throne and the

nature of the actors. King favours the argument for boy actors because they represent a heightened opportunity for comic effects. The role of Merry Report, according to King, is to function as ‘a surrogate’ for Heywood as author (Heywood may have acted the part), ‘without any of the moral connotations that usually come with the role of “vice”’.³³ King closes by calling attention to the relationship of Heywood’s plays to late medieval traditions in drama and academic debate, which Heywood can draw upon to criticize, in Jupiter’s petitioners, the faction-ridden parliament and to showcase the salvific importance of Jupiter-Henry VIII. Meg Twycross begins her essay (chapter 13) on John Redford’s *Wit and Science* with helpful information on the play manuscript, on Redford as a professional musician, and on the boy choristers of St. Paul’s, who likely performed this musical play under Redford’s direction in the 1530s or 1540s (with their training in letters reflected humourously in the play). Twycross rightly stresses the importance of music: Wit is brought back to life by song, and the ending features two choruses and echoing songs. Redford’s play (superior to its adaptations) demonstrates his practicality about education, his recognition of the vices that boy choristers would have witnessed in the precincts of St. Paul’s, his thoughtfulness as an allegorizer, and his appreciation for the student’s point of view.

The next four essays constitute a subgroup on school plays that succeed *Wit and Science*. John J. McGavin’s essay (chapter 14) on *Nice Wanton* brings the reader to the mid-century interludes, written under changing monarchical and religious conditions. McGavin argues reasonably that *Nice Wanton* was a school play. Given its printing history and its association with *Impatient Poverty* (both plays were published in 1560), McGavin finds the two theologically compatible: ‘*Nice Wanton* assumes the doctrine of election while *Impatient Poverty* examines the relationship of conscience, patience, and poverty’,³⁴ each arguing for reform albeit in different ways — notwithstanding those critics who have contrasted the former as Calvinist to the latter as Catholic. *Nice Wanton* places responsibility for children’s education squarely on parents, is haunted by a sense of what is lost in the failure of that responsibility, and aims to move all affectingly, whether they be protestant or Catholic. Despite its debts to medieval morality drama, moreover, the play shows its Calvinist bones by leaving matters of salvation provisional and salvation after sin doubtful. Discussing the protestant ‘educational’ morality *Lusty Juventus*, Jane Griffiths surveys the arguments for its Henrician or Edwardian provenance and argues perceptively that a play written under one set of social conditions might have ‘gained an entirely new significance’ at

another time.³⁵ This valuable point helps generally to loosen the grip that the immediate conditions of a play's composition can hold over interpretations. Indeed, by the time of *Juventus's* printing (between 1547 and 1553), argues Griffiths, the play's specificity would have become 'social and cultural rather than religious'.³⁶ *Juventus's* youth is a negative factor but also a positive one because it gives him a redemption-ensuring 'willingness to listen to the word of God' (the Word being of overriding importance in the play).³⁷ In *Juventus* the Reformation thus becomes 'identified as a youth movement'.³⁸ Griffiths concludes by noting that some of *Juventus's* lines appear in *Sir Thomas More* but reinterpreted in a way that again shows how 'old forms might repeatedly be put to new uses'.³⁹

Alan J. Fletcher (in chapter 16) asks interestingly why *Gammer Gurton's Needle* was printed some twenty-five years (in 1575) after it was written. Its publication, he speculates, shows a rising market for drama and 'a (readerly) constituency willing to pay to enjoy pithy, pleasant, and merry consumables, that was literate beyond the requirements of immediate pragmatism, and cultivated, or at least, fancied itself so'.⁴⁰ More about Fletcher's claim for a sophisticated readership for comedy would have been welcome. The play, Fletcher argues, associates Hodge with Catholicism, and thus the invitation to laugh at his oaths, 'actions, stupidities, and temperaments' provides occasion to 'laugh at the Old Religion itself' although, strikingly, Fletcher sees this laughter as good-natured, a matter of 'affectionately condescending comedy'.⁴¹ *Gammer Gurton's Needle* recruits 'the audience as active collaborators in creating the illusion' and places it in an 'implicitly contestatory stance' toward college institutional authority⁴² — although 'contestatory' along with the language of subversion, containment, and alternative politics feel overly insistent. Fletcher nonetheless focuses keenly and convincingly on the play's 'ludic drive', its 'festive, conceptual indeterminacy', and its 'polysemous density', which disables any 'settled account of its meaning'.⁴³ Although Fletcher does not go this far, readers might here infer the emergence of comedy as an aesthetic phenomenon.

Chapter 17, by Jennifer Richards on Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pythias* begins a set of essays on comedy in the Elizabethan era. Richards appropriately locates the play deep in the tradition of friendship literature, notably Cicero's *De amicitia*, and she defends it against some critics by suggesting that it reflects 'the process by which Shakespeare and his contemporaries came to challenge platitudes about male friendship'.⁴⁴ She finds evidence in the play's ludicrous sentiments about friendship, its over-the-top, take-me-no-take-me

ending, and its perspective on friendship as provided by secondary characters that the message can be both serious and a little bit ridiculous. Richards makes a refreshing and important point. She also deepens our sense of Edwards's debt to Elyot's *The Governour* by showing how *Damon and Pythias* 'borrows its mode of argument' in troubling the relationship between precept and example.⁴⁵ Edwards uses moral sentences complexly, in a way that 'makes thinking about "sentences" part of its dramatic experience',⁴⁶ and that thus addresses the unchallenged (and sometimes disastrous) sententiousness in a play such as *Gorboduc*. Altogether, Richards has given us a significant new reading of this play and its importance. Next, Claire Jowitt takes up Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* (chapter 18). Jowitt argues that the play occupies 'an important place in the history of English drama' as one in 'a set of Elizabethan plays on the subject of Jews and usury' and as a play that addresses the pressing contemporary problems of people whose 'economic survival' is 'threatened by class and gender divisions, hostile financial and trade practices, and international relations'.⁴⁷ Gerontus, the Jewish usurer, receives more favourable treatment here than do Jews in some other plays, and he and the Turkish judge come out as ethically superior to the Christian (Catholic) merchant Mercadorus, perhaps expressions of a 'new, post-Reformation relativity' toward Judaism and Islam.⁴⁸ By contrast, the actions of the London vice-character Usury make him 'irredeemably villainous'⁴⁹ although the difference between good and bad usury remains a troubled matter. With the female Lucre as powerful and promiscuous, the play also 'reveals considerable anxieties about the control women and money can exert over men'.⁵⁰ The sequel to *The Three Ladies of London* and Marlowe and Shakespeare's indebtedness to it give evidence of 'the powerful cultural work that literature can perform'.⁵¹ The excellence of Jowitt's chapter notwithstanding, its concerns seem distinct from those of its fellow chapters, and one wonders if it might have been better placed in section four with 'Histories and Political Dramas'.

Leah Scragg begins her discussion (chapter 19) of John Lyly's *Endymion* by acknowledging that the play would feel unfamiliar to twenty-first century readers in its references to Latin grammar, its indebtedness to (and playing upon) Roman comedy, its Neoplatonic spiritualizing of love, and its debate features. The play, argues Scragg, is 'directed toward a type of spectator attuned, like his or her medieval forebears, to the decoding of allegory rather than one geared, like the twenty-first-century playgoer, to the notion of realism and expectant emotional involvement'.⁵² (On the other hand,

the allegorizing in *Endymion* surely differs from that in medieval drama.) Scragg's description varies remarkably from Fletcher's of the emerging cultured readership for drama. *Endymion*, according to her, is resolutely meant for Elizabeth and the court; Endymion's third dream, for example, points to 'factioneering and jockeying' at court.⁵³ Scragg comments interestingly on how the play, like other court entertainments, finally draws the monarch into the orbit of the fiction. She argues, too, that Lyly's ornate rhetorical language of 'antithetical balance and paradoxical fusion of opposites' complements the fact of 'mutually exclusive states' illustrated in the distance between Endymion and Cynthia.⁵⁴ The picture here is the familiar one, perhaps overly so, of Lyly's non-naturalistic, 'static' court drama, although Scragg does point to Lyly's 'repeated dramatization of the unstable boundary between the human and the natural worlds, and the celebration of a universal potentiality for change'.⁵⁵

In a winning essay on Shakespeare's *The Comedy of Errors* (chapter 20), Alison Findlay offers the fresh argument that the play 'is almost obsessively concerned with the minutiae of social decorum in the [Elizabethan] present'.⁵⁶ Matters of hospitality affect the Ephesian economy, and individuals go to great lengths to ignore aberrant behaviour. The 'compelling power of social decorum' thus helps to account for many of the play's 'errors of perception'.⁵⁷ While much of the criticism of *The Comedy of Errors* has focused on 'crises over personal identity', Findlay shifts that focus 'to the erosion of social order'.⁵⁸ With such issues in mind, she sets the play in the context of religious change and post-Reformation subjectivity, where '[t]he failure to maintain ceremonial propriety on a personal level of interaction exposes the fragility of the social order in the marketplace of Ephesus and late Tudor England'.⁵⁹ With its doubled identities, furthermore, *The Comedy of Errors* undoes tight-knit polemics and allows 'the coexistence of different, sometimes radically opposed, viewpoints'.⁶⁰ Findlay concludes with a memorable insight that derives from the play but reaches beyond it, perhaps to reflect on the function of comedy generally: 'Ritualized interactions which endow the self with proper respect — make the self a sacred thing — are the essence of a social order that is founded on difference but, paradoxically, dedicated to community'.⁶¹

Sarah Knight concludes the section on 'Interludes and Comedies' with a chapter (21) on Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. The play was one of the most successful at the Rose Theatre and among several pieces featuring scholar-protagonists. (How far we have come from mid-century

school plays!) Greene, argues Knight, 'works hard to show how academic, urban, and rural Englands shift and intermingle with each other'.⁶² The play creates comedy by irreverently depicting 'scholarly and royal dignity ... undermined and interrupted'.⁶³ Knight emphasizes Greene's concern not only with the world of academics but also with the rural world of East Anglia. The 'comedic collision of worlds' further undercuts 'academic pomposity'⁶⁴ and even leads to a moment of tragedy in the deaths of the college mates, illustrating that presumably separate domains (academic and domestic) can have consequences for each other. Further, in this play of 'colliding theatrical worlds, identities and localities are not stable'.⁶⁵ Greene's interest in 'fluid social identity' leads Knight into a fine discussion of Miles, whose 'singular combination of bodily indulgence and intellectual dexterity make him a disruptive presence'.⁶⁶ The different worlds of the play finally balance and overlap, as Greene 'challenges ... potentially reductive dichotomies'.⁶⁷ Common to these last three essays is a sense of insecure or unstable boundaries in Elizabethan comedy.

Part III: Entertainments, Masques, and Royal Entries

These five essays are included in the volume with some boldness, for one might wonder whether the category is more about performance and spectacle than it is about drama. Sam Wood shows that the funeral of Henry VII (chapter 22), from a modern point of view, curiously depersonalizes Henry and subsumes the individual who was king, including his royal successes or failures, into self-affirming aristocratic and religious ritual. Tracey Sowerby (chapter 23) offers a detailed discussion of the coronation of Anne Boleyn, with special attention to the contributions of Nicholas Udall. The lavish coronation wishfully implied international acceptance of Anne as queen and likewise asserted her legitimacy, suitability, and popularity as well as the divine ordination of the marriage and its promise of a new golden age. Kent Rawlinson (chapter 24) closely traces Henry VIII's extensive and magnificent Triumphs at Greenwich to celebrate an Anglo-French alliance and to counterbalance the power of Emperor Charles V. These rather astonishing triumphs involved elaborate plays, jousts, disguisings, banquets, processions, music, Latin interludes, and more, a political 'mixture of fantasy and reality' 'by which the royal court might reflect upon its communal identity and policy, and in turn, communicate these to the wider world' (421).⁶⁸

From 1527, this section leaps to 1575, with Erzsébet Stróbl's account of the entertainment for Elizabeth at Woodstock. Stróbl interestingly demonstrates the importance of this entertainment in initiating the cult of the Fairy Queen, associated with myth, allegory, and wondrous power; in linking service to the queen with romantic love for her; and in mythologizing the queen's sacrifice of love for the benefit of the state (the Woodstock entertainment here rebutting Dudley's at Kenilworth). Such private entertainments provided 'good occasion for the direct address of the monarch and her prompting to respond'.⁶⁹ George Gascoigne's involvement in the entertainments marked a 'turning point' in his career,⁷⁰ and showed how the cult of the queen could make an opening for literary talent. Allyna Ward concludes this section with a fine close discussion of the 1582 *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*. This essay, however, has no obvious connection with the others in this section since *Rare Triumphs* was not an expression of court power and mystique but a product of a commercial playhouse company, the Derby's Men, performed at court during Christmas entertainments. As a romance comedy with popular but also strongly humanistic elements, it would seem to belong in the *Handbook's* previous section. Ward nicely relates the play to its antecedent traditions with an especially detailed discussion of the dumb show that readers might want to compare to that in the *Gorboduc* chapter. The play's descent toward tragedy before its recuperation of the action in the manner of romance not only illustrates generic knowingness and complexity but also showcases female character, elements that pull it towards comparisons with the works of Lyly and Greene. Despite the excellence of these chapters, it is difficult to understand how the section as a whole advances an understanding of Tudor drama.

Part IV: Histories and Political Dramas

The twelve essays in this section follow an organizational scheme similar to those on interludes and comedies, with three on Henrician plays, three on mid-century drama, and six on late Elizabethan drama — creating, in comparison to the rest of the groupings in the volume, a comparatively heavy emphasis on the latter. (The top-heaviness confers a prominence on Elizabethan drama that the volume elsewhere avoids.) The opening three essays cover *Youth*, *Hickscorner*, *Magnificence*, and *King Johan*. In the first of these (chapter 27), Eleanor Rycroft argues that *Youth*, emanating from a northern aristocratic household, took critical aim at the youthful Henry VIII's

arrogance, vanity, self-indulgence, and recklessness and that the slightly later *Hickscorner*, from a Suffolk aristocratic household, joins and echoes that criticism, although it sees England's problems in a broader social context and also allows for some self-recognition by the king. If so, then these intertextually linked interludes show political debate in operation. Rycroft discusses the figure of Hickscorner as associated with scoffing, debased speech, and eventually Catholicism, all pointing toward broad criticism of society rather than of the monarch exclusively and opening up the boundaries of the moral interlude. She concludes suggestively by discussing *Youth*, England's first prodigal-son comedy, as a disquisition into the moral and social failings attendant on youthful masculinity, thus further extending the reach of the play. In chapter 28, the eminent Peter Happé acknowledges the insights of political historicist criticism but argues that such studies would benefit 'by taking into account the complexities of the artistic achievement of these plays', which he illustrates with a discussion of Skelton's *Magnificence* in terms of structure, language, and theatricality.⁷¹ Regarding structure, Happé emphasizes the secularization of the morality, apparent in *Magnificence*'s worldly reform; the organization of the allegory according to the proverb 'Measure is Treasure'; and the play's lengthy exploration of 'the differing nature of the court vices'.⁷² On language, Happé argues that *Magnificence* shows Skelton's 'self-conscious use of language' and his enriching of 'levels of meaning' by his linguistic versatility with various styles.⁷³ Happé also argues for Skelton's theatrical savvy, and he illustrates Skelton's 'sense of how to intrigue an audience'⁷⁴ with strategically placed soliloquy, silence, and stage business. These features argue for the 'portrayal of madness' in the Vice's delusions and the protagonist's breakdown as 'a principal feature of the play'.⁷⁵ Happé's movement into critical areas beyond the strictly political makes for a welcome exception to the general caste of essays in this volume.

Philip Schwyzer's delightfully conceived essay (chapter 29) approaches Bale's 'paranoid' *King Johan* by wondering, 'what if everything you thought you knew about your country's past was wrong? ... What if King John, the arch-villain of medieval English history, were in fact a hero?'.⁷⁶ Since historians traditionally reviled John for murder, loss of French territories, conflict with the Pope, as well as cruelty, lustfulness, and treachery, a major task of *King Johan* is overcoming received opinion, particularly that of the church. Bale does this by turning John anachronistically into an ardent English nationalist, with a related commitment to English royal prerogative. In this guise, Bale advocates provocatively reformist religious positions; the

'paranoia' arises in Bale's implicit insistence that Rome will lie about everything. Like Happé on Skelton, Schwyzer sees Bale's 'self-conscious theatricality' as part of 'active training' of the audience in 'how to read the play's events and personae correctly'.⁷⁷ Revised over a period of twenty years, *King Johan*, according to Schwyzer, is not only the first English but also the first Elizabethan history play, close in some ways to Shakespeare's *Richard III*.

Sarah Carpenter (in chapter 30) sees the allegorical interlude *Respublica* as strongly 'rooted in the particularity of its own time', Christmas, 1553.⁷⁸ The play shows understanding of England's fiscal and political difficulties at the outset of Mary's reign. Its performance at court by boys would tend to reinforce the allegorical qualities of the play. Carpenter's essay generally takes an interest in how the play 'manages[s] the reception'⁷⁹ of its political critique by manipulating the resources of the theatre, especially the laughter provoked by the Vices (helpfully discussed), the representation of the commonwealth as female (Carpenter resists identifying *Respublica* with Mary), the deftly modulated Catholicism of the Four Daughters of God, and the dramatization of Mary by means of the sensible righteousness of Nemesis. Mike Pincombe (chapter 31) sees Jasper Heywood's translation of Seneca's *Thyestes* as firm evidence for 'the existence of an early (as opposed to late) Elizabethan Renaissance', one whose medieval elements are 'constitutive of its transitional character'.⁸⁰ Pincombe frames his essay with the question, 'What — or who — is the source of tragic inspiration?', and he finds Heywood's answer hesitating between the fury Megaera and the muse Melpomene, figures that instantiate 'the transition from medieval [Megaera] to Renaissance [Melpomene]'.⁸¹ In essence, Heywood wants to make Seneca's tragedy over into something humanist while he is held back by the recognition that it is hardly humane. Pincombe proceeds with a stylish discussion afire with ideas and often bold insights (including on "'sadistic spectatorship'", invoking Artaud).⁸² In closing, Pincombe explores the perhaps irresolvably paradoxical term 'humanist tragedy', insisting, as he has elsewhere, that Renaissance 'humanism' entails a sense of the humane. This essay deserves additional praise as one of the few in the volume to grapple directly with issues of literary periodization.

In chapter 32, Alice Hunt focuses on 'the political power of [*Gorboduc*'s] mostly neglected dumb shows'.⁸³ Hunt, following critical tradition, sees the play as about the problem of succession and a need for certainty, but she notes the differences in what critics see as proffered solutions. Turning to the dumb shows (and the play's famous eye-witness account), Hunt emphasizes

the occasional nature of Tudor drama and the rootedness of this play in the Inner Temple's Christmas revels of 1561–2. She sees the theme of unity in *Gorboduc*'s dumb shows as deeply embodied in the orderly and ritualized revels, which attempted to create 'a mirror-image of a real royal household'.⁸⁴ The ceremonial quality of the dumb show 'sanctions', Hunt argues, 'the image of a gentleman-counselor', as epitomized in Robert Dudley.⁸⁵ She concludes with the significant point that the revels 'remind us ... of the tenacious power of ritual and ceremony in early modern culture'.⁸⁶ Hunt's impressive essay, so different in perspective from Pincombe's, illustrates historicist criticism's power to illuminate, but this methodology can also leave a work as a museum piece.

Richard Hillman's essay (chapter 33) on Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* launches the long subsection on Elizabethan drama that includes essays on *Tamburlaine*, *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, *Henry VI, Part 2*, *Arden of Feversham*, and *Titus Andronicus*. Since these plays and the critical issues that they raise will be familiar to most readers, I will concentrate on how they look in the context of Tudor drama. Hillman's interest in the representation and ethics of madness in *The Spanish Tragedy* puts his essay in implicit conversation with Happé's on *Magnificence*, and his discussion of the ethics and doubtful efficacy of revenge in tragedy will recall Pincombe on *Thyestes*. Hillman's major contribution is to contextualize Kyd's play in relation to international debates about dynastic collapse and English heretical protestantism in which the Portuguese bishop Jerónimo Osório figured prominently as an antagonist, becoming presumably a kind of inspiration for Kyd's Jeronimo. (Osório was accused by his opponents of 'madness'.) Hillman's fine discussion (one of the few to invoke a European context) ends on the insight, albeit perhaps as much modern as Tudor, that for Jeronimo 'truth is a linguistic construction'.⁸⁷ In her engaging chapter (34) on *Tamburlaine*, Janette Dillon observes that 'the play's all-conquering hero seems to stand as a figure for theatre itself in these early years: risen from rags to riches, bold, defiant, powerful, and ready to dominate all his opponents by force of ambition and pure will'.⁸⁸ The public theatres and the public audiences set the conditions for moments such as *Tamburlaine*'s first scene with Zenocrate, in which '[t]he stage picture is one that memorably seizes and takes control of audiences' imaginations'.⁸⁹ Indeed, Dillon's claim that drama can strike, seize, control, and dominate an audience seems alien to the volume's discussions of pre-playhouse plays. We might wonder whether with *Tamburlaine* we abandon the qualities that had previously distinguished Tudor drama. Dillon demonstrates how here,

as elsewhere, Marlowe evokes the formal expectations associated with medieval drama only blasphemously to toy with them. In an unusually winning and witty essay (chapter 35), Stephen Longstaffe argues convincingly that *The Troublesome Reign* is hardly the simplistic anti-Catholic propaganda that criticism typically makes of it. Instead, Longstaffe applies 'a performance-oriented reading'⁹⁰ that emphasizes comedy as the signature quality of the Queen's Men (who performed the play) and medium as opposed to message in determining a play's impact and effect. Again, such a claim measures the considerable distance between Elizabethan and earlier drama, where message always dominates (as discussed in the 'Introduction'). Longstaffe's excellent essay is especially good at puncturing some of the critical assumptions that we bring to comedy, such as the belief that laughter always makes the audience feel superior. The chapter offers more succinct comments on comedy *per se* than almost all of those in the section on comedies and should be considered in relation to them.

Focused on message and hardly at all on medium, Dermott Cavanagh's chapter (36) on Shakespeare's *Henry VI, Part 2* assesses Shakespeare as a political thinker, concerned with concepts of sovereignty as they forward the humanist project of the commonwealth. (Readers might compare those concerns with the interest in the commonwealth that Wakelin sees in *Gentleness and Nobility* [chapter 11].) As the volume's attention returns to politics, Cavanagh neatly relates *Henry VI, Part 2* to Skelton's *Magnificence* and to *A Mirror for Magistrates*. Cavanagh shows Cade as a complex figure whose thoughts and actions provide a distorted mirror of the nobles. Some criticism notwithstanding, the play's commonwealth politics shows that it was not dominated by an 'obsessive, if equivocal, fascination with royal authority'.⁹¹ In a far less thesis-driven essay (chapter 37), Ros King investigates *Arden of Faversham* against its Edwardian history, as recorded in Holinshed with the suggestion that the story's attractiveness derived from the providentialism that commentators deduced from the apparent happenstance of its events. King also looks into the life of the real Arden and notes how his dramatic representation varies from it (eg, higher in class, more jealous) and how the play, unlike the life, interweaves 'aspirations for land with hopeless sexual desire'.⁹² Readers may be especially interested in King's endorsement of the argument that Shakespeare was a partial author of *Arden*. The volume concludes with Thomas Betteridge's superb chapter (38) on Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* in relation to Tudor theatre. Betteridge captures beautifully the idea of Tudor drama as transitional, with *Titus* 'summing up and transforming many of

the key theatrical traditions⁹³ but also looking forward to the unfolding of a sometimes disturbing and sensationalist later drama. Betteridge links *Titus* to numerous of the plays treated in the *Handbook* — *Sacrament*, *Everyman*, *Weather*, *Magnificence*, *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and others. He focuses especially on Aaron as a Vice figure, the creator of mayhem who now stands in for the playwright, ‘more human and therefore more evil’ than his Tudor predecessors.⁹⁴ Likewise *Titus*’s stage violence disturbs more than, say, that of *Sacrament*, the difference perhaps expressing the ‘horrific violence’ inflicted by Christians in his own world. The picture here veers far from the brash, ambitious, energized theatre of *Tamburlaine* or the fecund playhouse comedy of *The Troublesome Reign*. One senses in this essay some recoil from the world, both real and theatrical, that looms ahead.

The essays in this collection impress for their genuine insight and even originality, their excellent scholarship, and their probing of the relationship between drama and its political and cultural context. Still, one might leave the volume feeling some lingering tension in Betteridge and Walker’s rejection of ‘evolution’ but their acceptance, explicit and implicit, of a model of chronological development in Tudor drama. We are caught, perhaps, between the laudable desire to see Tudor drama as locally contingent, emergent, and culturally dynamic, on the one hand, and, on the other, the undeniable recognition that Tudor drama at the end of the century looks much different from the drama at the beginning. The editors wish to value the doctrine-dominated early drama equally with the more theatrically liberated later drama, for the former can have an immediate cultural valence that the latter lacks. Yet this split focus forces us back upon the historicist’s dilemma, that the minutiae of court politics at a given moment might draw only polite interest from the literary tourist centuries later. It will betray nothing at this point to acknowledge that, for this reviewer, the plays that emerge as most interesting from this volume are those whose aesthetic, dramatic, and theatrical dimensions are made as compelling as their ideological ones (and especially as those dimensions relate to each other). And it will also betray nothing to suggest that a different range of contributors might have brought to the volume a productive divergence in points of view. The *Handbook*’s essays nevertheless reveal many valuable and provocative differences, even when they share methodologies. These essays altogether bring depth and dignity to the subject of Tudor drama, demonstrate a richness and range of discussion unsurpassed in any other collection, and set the highest standards for scholarship and critical acumen. All of us in the field owe admiration and

gratitude to Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker for conceiving and producing this excellent volume.

Notes

- 1 Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature* (Oxford, 2009). Other recent books, with varying foci, include Janette Dillon's important survey *The Cambridge Introduction to Early English Theatre* (Cambridge, 2006); Peter Happé and Wim Hüskén (eds), *Interludes and Early Modern Society: Studies in Gender, Power and Theatricality* (Amsterdam, 2007); Teresa Grant and Barbara Ravelhofer (eds), *English Historical Drama, 1500–1660* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2008); Fred Shurinck (ed.), *Tudor Translations* (New York, 2012); and my own edited collection, *A Companion to Tudor Literature* (London, 2010).
- 2 Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp xx, 688. Publication of Betteridge and Walker's volume provides the occasion for this review essay.
- 3 On the impact of REED, which receives only passing attention in the *Handbook*, see Audrey Douglas and Sally-Beth MacLean (eds), *REED in Review: Essays in Celebration of the First Twenty-Five Years* (Toronto, 2006).
- 4 Indeed, the essay by a fine young Hungarian scholar in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama* was preceded by that scholar's contribution to Mike Pincombe and Zsolt Almási (eds), *New Perspectives on Tudor Cultures* (Newcastle, 2012) deriving from an International Conference of the Tudor Symposium.
- 5 *OED Online*, s.v. 'handbook, n. a, b', last modified March 2013.
- 6 Betteridge and Walker, 'Introduction', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 4.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 10.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 9 See, for example, Ineke Murakami, *Moral Play and Counterpublic: Transformations in Moral Drama, 1465–1599* (New York, 2011), which argues that moral drama in the sixteenth century 'developed as a public forum — soliciting and honing the judicative skills of emergent, politically active publics and counterpublics' (3) and that such drama focused not on the 'high politics' emphasised by Walker but rather on the political agency of popular forces (4), becoming a public forum for the populace. Murakami includes a chapter on William Wager (45–72) arguing that 'Wager wants to convey that ... the power to save or spill the godly commonwealth lies in the hands of middling Protestant citizens' (46). On Wager, see also, among others, David Bevington, 'Staging the Reformation: Power and Theatricality in the Plays

- of William Wager', Happé and Hüsken (eds), *Interludes and Early Modern Society*, 353–80; and my 'Humanist Reading and Interpretation in Early Elizabethan Morality Drama', *Allegorica* 28 (2012), 9–31.
- 10 Betteridge and Walker offer one promising example in their comments on the relation of doctrine to theatricality; another can be found in Pincombe and Shrank's discussion of the slippery multiplicity of meanings in Coverdale woodcut in their 'Prologue' to their *Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature* (see 8–10); others occur in the *Handbook* itself in essays such as those by Hadfield and Griffiths.
 - 11 Sheila Christie, 'The Chester Cycle', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 22.
 - 12 Paul Whitfield White, *Drama and Religion in English Provincial Society, 1485–1660* (Cambridge, 2008), 89; see 89–99.
 - 13 Greg Walker, "'In the beginning": Performing the Creation in the York *Corpus Christi* Play', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 52.
 - 14 Elizabeth Dutton, 'The Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 68.
 - 15 *Ibid.*, 69.
 - 16 Andrew Hadfield, 'The Summoning of Everyman', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 94.
 - 17 James Simpson, 'John Bale', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 109.
 - 18 *Ibid.*
 - 19 *Ibid.*
 - 20 Andreas Höfele, 'Christus Triumphans, John Foxe, 1556', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 129.
 - 21 *Ibid.*, 139, 137.
 - 22 Anna Rhiel Bertolet, 'The 'blindnesse of the flesh' in Nathaniel Woodes' *The Conflict of Conscience*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 144–5.
 - 23 *Ibid.*, 145.
 - 24 *Ibid.*
 - 25 David Lawton, 'Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 165.
 - 26 *Ibid.*, 167.
 - 27 *Ibid.*, 170.
 - 28 *Ibid.*, 171.
 - 29 See Robert Hornback, *The English Clown Tradition from the Middle Ages to Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 2009).
 - 30 Clare Wright, 'Henry Medwell, *Fulgens and Lucrece*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 184, 188.
 - 31 *Ibid.*, 189.

- 32 The wary reader should know that the reviewer has a vested interest: See 'Dramatic Theory and Lucres' 'Discretion': The Plays of Henry Medwall', in Pincombe and Shrank, *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature*, 37–52.
- 33 Pamela M. King, 'John Heywood, *The Play of the Weather*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 215.
- 34 John J McGavin, '*Nice Wanton*, c1550', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 249.
- 35 Jane Griffiths, '*Lusty Juventus*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 263
- 36 Ibid, 264.
- 37 Ibid, 267.
- 38 Ibid, 269.
- 39 Ibid, 273.
- 40 Alan J Fletcher, '*Gammer Gurton's Needle*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 277.
- 41 Ibid, 279. For a contrasting view of the play as harshly and aggressively anti-Catholic, see Robert Hornback, 'Reformation Satire, Scatology, and Iconoclastic Aesthetics in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*', Cartwright (ed.), *Companion to Tudor Literature*, 309–23.
- 42 Ibid, 284.
- 43 Ibid, 286, 287.
- 44 Jennifer Richards, 'Male Friendship and Counsel in Richard Edwards' *Damon and Pythias*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 295.
- 45 Ibid, 299.
- 46 Ibid, 303.
- 47 Claire Jowitt, 'Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* and its Theatrical and Cultural Contexts', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 310, 311.
- 48 Ibid, 313.
- 49 Ibid, 315.
- 50 Ibid, 318.
- 51 Ibid, 320.
- 52 Leah Scragg, 'John Lyly, *Endymion*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 326.
- 53 Ibid, 328.
- 54 Ibid, 331.
- 55 Ibid, 335.
- 56 Alison Findlay, 'Ceremony and Selfhood in *The Comedy of Errors* (c1592)', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 338.
- 57 Ibid, 341, 342.
- 58 Ibid, 342.
- 59 Ibid, 347.
- 60 Ibid, 352.
- 61 Ibid.

- 62 Sarah Knight, 'The Niniversity at the Bankside: Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 358.
- 63 Ibid, 359.
- 64 Ibid, 361.
- 65 Ibid, 363.
- 66 Ibid, 364, 365.
- 67 Ibid, 368.
- 68 Kent Rawlinson, 'Hall's *Chronicle* and the Greenwich Triumphs of 1527', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 421.
- 69 Erzsébet Stróbl, 'Entertaining the Queen at Woodstock, 1575', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 438.
- 70 Ibid, 442.
- 71 Peter Happé: "'Pullyshyd and fresshe is your ornacy": Madness and the Fall of Skelton's *Magnyfycence*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 482. This essay can be read as a companion piece to Happé's 'Skelton's *Magnyfycence*: Theatre, Poetry, Influence' in Happé and Hüsken (eds), *Interludes and Early Modern Society*, 71–94.
- 72 Ibid, 486.
- 73 Ibid, 490.
- 74 Ibid, 494.
- 75 Ibid, 496.
- 76 Philip Schwyzer, 'Paranoid History: John Bale's *King Johan*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 500.
- 77 Ibid, 520, 519.
- 78 Sarah Carpenter, '*Respublica*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 514.
- 79 Ibid, 520.
- 80 Mike Pincombe, 'Tragic Inspiration in Jasper Heywood's Translation of Seneca's *Thyestes*: Melpomene or Megaera?', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 531.
- 81 Ibid, 532.
- 82 Ibid, 542.
- 83 Alice Hunt, 'Dumb Politics in *Gorboduc*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 542.
- 84 Ibid, 555.
- 85 Ibid, 561.
- 86 Ibid.
- 87 Richard Hillman, 'Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 579.
- 88 Janette Dillon, '*Tamburlaine*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 585.
- 89 Ibid, 586.

- 90 Stephen Longstaffe, 'The Troublesome Reign of King John', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 600.
- 91 Dermot Cavanagh, 'Sovereignty and the Commonwealth in Shakespeare's *Henry VI Part 2*', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 632.
- 92 Ros King, 'Arden of Faversham: The Moral of History and the Thrill of Performance', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 644.
- 93 Thomas Betteridge, 'The Most Lamentable Roman Tragedy of *Titus Andronicus*: Shakespeare and Tudor Theatre', *Handbook of Tudor Drama*, 653.
- 94 *Ibid*, 667.