

ANDREW BRETZ

---

## Sung Silence: Complicity, Dramaturgy, and Song in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*

*The songs of Valerius in Thomas Heywood's 1607 The Rape of Lucrece negotiate the line between ironic distance and genuine compassion for the victim of sexual violence. Valerius sings them as a traumatized response to his own complicity in the rise of the Tarquin regime, a trauma that effectively silences his participation in politics. His final song, 'Did he take faire Lucrece by the toe man?' acts as a metatheatrical return of the rape, which forces the audience to verbally re-enact the occluded violence, but also allows for Valerius to rediscover his voice and ability to act politically.*

Heywood's play, *The Rape of Lucrece*, which was possibly the first play performed at the new Red Bull theatre in 1607,<sup>1</sup> dramatizes the story of the rise of the Roman republic, drawing from classical sources like Pliny and Livy as much as from contemporary sources such as Shakespeare's far more famous poem of the same name. Many scholars have dismissed *The Rape of Lucrece* as either deriving from Shakespeare's poem or treating its titular event with a shocking lack of care, yet recent critics such as Richard Rowland in *Thomas Heywood's Theatre 1599–1639* have argued that elements of the play provide 'eloquent testimony to some of the distinct characteristics of Heywood's dramaturgy'.<sup>2</sup> The structure of the play encloses the narrative of rape within the political movement between monarchy and republicanism, domesticating the feminine experience within a masculine world of combat and honour. Easily one of the most difficult aspects of this already difficult play is the character of Valerius, whose bursts of song throughout the most horrific events in Roman history are described by Paulina Kewes as 'merely a mask like the pretended madness of Brutus, both being the product of frustration and discontent with the Tarquin dynasty'.<sup>3</sup> From almost the beginning of the play, Valerius is silenced through song. This article suggests that Valerius's participation and complicity in the rise of the Tarquin regime traumatizes him such that the only way that he can express himself within the

---

Andrew Bretz (abretz@wlu.ca) is an adjunct instructor in the department of English and Film Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University.

disordered world of the play is to bring order through song. Further, both the character and the audience's participation in the song 'Did he take him by the toe man?' replays the act of sexual violence on stage as what Kim Solga calls an in/visible act.

As Jocelyn Catty notes, rape was never displayed on the early modern stage, but disappeared into the tiring house,<sup>4</sup> becoming what Solga, in *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Performance*, calls an in/visible act on the stage. As Solga states, performance and 'theories of performance are always, on a deep level, concerned with the fact that mimesis conceals more than it reveals, stages the lost and missing within the image of plenitude it presents sometimes as truth and sometimes as the failure of human access to truth.'<sup>5</sup> The always-occluded rape on the early modern stage was supplied by the metatheatrical return of the body of the rape victim following the disappearance into the tiring house. In this sense, the rape on the early modern stage is an in/visible act; it is

both/and: it enters representation as invisible, as elided within representation, but quickly becomes palpable as such, and a missed and missing story of loss *within the frame of the very performance that would complete the process of its effacement*. The in/visible act is a guerrilla performance gesture that erupts from within the spectacle of violence's elision at its most critical moment — that interrupts, messily, violence's own forgetting.<sup>6</sup>

The rape of Lucrece is occluded, but her bodily return to the stage is not the only metatheatrical return consonant with Solga's argument. The first is the return and suicide of Lucrece, which re-establishes the nobles of Rome within the patriarchal order insofar as it serves as the impetus for virile, honourable, masculine activity. The second return of the traumatized body of the victim is metatheatrical, in the form of the song sung by Valerius and Horatius, 'Did he take fair Lucrece by the toe man?' The rape, which is the final act of a tyrannical regime that has emasculated the Roman nobility, is witnessed through the song — a song that was sung as a catch, thus shared among the audience generally. In this case, the act of witnessing becomes politically inflected as the audience remembers the effaced violence through enacting the violence in song.

### **Why Does Valerius Sing?**

Valerius, who in the Roman histories was one of the first generals and greatest consuls of the Republic, is unable through the first half of the play to speak more

than a line or two of dialogue without breaking into a bawdy song. Twentieth-century critics have repeatedly described the songs in the least complimentary of terms. From A.W. Ward who described most of them as ‘doggerel, and one or two are something worse’<sup>7</sup> to John R. Moore who called them ‘almost incredibly bad’,<sup>8</sup> the consensus has been, they do not add to the aesthetics of the piece. Richard Rowland’s discussion of the songs of Heywood in *Thomas Heywood’s Theatre* complicates this aesthetic prejudice, but the impression endures today, in the work of critics like Solga.<sup>9</sup> Asking ‘Why does Valerius sing?’ bypasses the tradition of criticism that sees the songs as totally out of place in a tragedy and instead situates it in terms of Heywood’s unique dramaturgical method. Once aesthetic expectations of unity of tone are put aside, one can approach the songs in terms of the ways they construct Valerius’s character. As a masculine subject, he is neurotic; his own speech rambles beyond his ability to control it and it is only through verbally performing the rape that he is able to regain linguistic self-governance. In the audience’s verbal performance of the rape with Valerius, however, their own implied position as well-governed subjects comes under scrutiny.

As in Livy’s *Ab urbe conditia*, much of the initial blame for the rise of the tyranny of the Tarquins is laid at the feet of Tullia, the daughter of the reigning king, Servius Tullius. In the first scene, Tullia draws Tarquin into a conspiracy to kill Servius and thereby take his throne. Whereas, as Nancy Vickers argues, ‘Shakespeare locates the ultimate cause of Tarquin’s crime, and Lucrece’s subsequent suicide in an evening’s entertainment’,<sup>10</sup> Heywood locates the genesis of the crime in the masculine pride of Tullia, who berates Tarquin for his lack of ambition (*Rape of Lucrece* 96–103).<sup>11</sup> When Tarquin is convinced, the pair verbally bathe themselves in the blood of Servius (113–16); a macabre interruption of natural affection and inheritance that signals the horrors of the scenes to come.

The action of the play set, the scene shifts to the Senate house and the audience is introduced to the nobles of Rome. When the stage has cleared, Collatine and Valerius are left to discuss the plot:

COLLATINE If there be any differences among the Princes and Senate,  
whose faction will *Valerius* follow?

VALERIUS Oh, *Collatine*, I am a true Citizen, and in this will I best shew  
myself to be one, to take part with the strongest. If *Servius* overcome,  
I am Liegeman to *Servius*, and if *Tarquin* subdue, I am for *vive*  
*Tarquinius*. (162–6)

In explicitly linking Valerius through ‘I am a true Citizen’ with the weathercock stance of the public mob, a stock image of protean political exigency in the early

modern period, Heywood is inviting the audience to judge Valerius's apathy in terms of the tyranny that is to come. Further, the explicit association of Valerius with the citizenry metatheatrically associates him with the 'uneducated audiences' of the Red Bull theatre.<sup>12</sup>

In the following scene, Tarquin seizes the throne of Rome in a violent coup d'état in the senate house. Throughout the battle and the subsequent pardons, Valerius takes a position of neutrality. Valerius refuses to explicitly take a side in the battle for the throne but by doing so only becomes complicit in whatever system of governance falls out after the bloodshed has ceased. From this moment on, Valerius rarely speaks and primarily communicates through song.

Only some three hundred lines into the play there have been four calls for a flourish and a battle scene. If this was the first play performed at the Red Bull theatre, as is commonly argued, then the theatre was clearly well supplied to provide both spectacle and music from the very start. Alexander Leggatt notes in *Jacobean Public Theatre* how the Red Bull was later on well-known for its emphasis on spectacle: 'Its resources included pillars supporting a canopy, flying machinery, a large trap — and perhaps more than one — with some form of lift for ascents and descents, three doors, and, by 1608, a music room over the stage'.<sup>13</sup> This early emphasis on pageantry is significant if only because spectacle and music both cease until the entrance of Valerius some two hundred and forty lines later. This shift in tone only serves to highlight the re-entry of music into the piece, when it takes the radically different form of a single voice singing renditions of popular tunes. Whereas the flourishes and sennets of the early part of the piece were bombastic, polyphonic eruptions, Valerius's songs were probably sung either *solo voce* or as a lute air. By 1607, the lute air had gained popularity on the stage, first through the children's companies and then on the adult stage, as Lucy Munro argues 'perhaps in part because it demands only one singer and one accompanist (potentially the same actor actor-musician) and would presumably have demanded less preparation and rehearsal'.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the Red Bull theatre became known in later years partially for the sophisticated manner in which it used music to further characterization and dramatic effect.<sup>15</sup>

### Singing Impotence

Soon after the usurping Tarquins gain power, the Roman nobles gather together to discuss the tyranny under which they now find themselves (460 ff), and despite their complaints about the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, they are unable to offer any resistance. The reign both facilitates and makes necessary a number

of pathological visions of masculinity, as both nobles and king are declared or rendered impotent. Horatius predicts that the continued poor governance of Tarquin will 'Beget a weake unable impotence' (474) as the allies and dominions of Rome rise up in rebellion against the crown. He goes on to associate that lack of governance with two things, the arrogance that pushes out all other voices, and the queen.

HORATIUS His golden feathers  
 Are of such vastnes, that they spread like sayles  
 And so becalme us that wee haue not aire  
 Able to raise our plumes, to taste the pleasures of our own Elements.

SCAEVOLA Wee are one heart, our thoughts and our desires are sutable.

HORATIUS Since he was King he beares him like a God,  
 His wife like *Pallas*: or the wife of *Iove*.  
 Will not be spoke to without sacrifice  
 And homage sole due to the Dieties. (482–6)

Lucretius's entrance provides further evidence of the characteristics of tyranny; he suggests that the best solution is to retire from public life altogether to focus on household governance as 'home breeds safety' (506). Only at that moment, when the debate has turned to the governance of the household, does Collatine enter and the dialogue points to the inability of the men to govern themselves now that the Tarquins have pushed them out of the governance of the state.

Only one Roman noble at this point shows any ability to govern himself — Collatine. Horatius asks Collatine where Valerius is and how he feels about 'these times'. Collatine responds by cataloguing the neurotic responses to tyranny that the Roman nobles have taken on:

Not giddily like Brutus, passionately  
 Like old Lucretius with his teare swolne eies,  
 Not laughingly like Mutius Scævola  
 Nor bluntly like Horatius Cocles here.  
 He has usurpt a stranger garbe of humour,  
 Distinct from these in every way ...  
 Strangely, he is all song, hee's ditty all. (514–19, 527)

Collatine is the only one not affected by the tyranny of the Tarquins; this allows him to serve later as the straight man for several comic routines. As he later reproves the other nobles,

You are madmen all that yield so much to passion.  
 You lay your selves too open to your enemies  
 That would be glad to pry into your deedes,  
 And catch advantage to ensnare our lives. (979–83)

Although Collatine identifies the symptoms of failed masculinity in each of the other Roman nobles, he is not himself an example of ideal masculinity in the play, governed instead by a tyrannical woman. Though each of the responses of the Roman nobles is interesting in and of itself, the most prominent (and apparently most popular with the audiences of the time) was that of Valerius.<sup>16</sup>

The popularity of Valerius's songs is particularly problematic for theatre historians. Identifying the tunes to which early modern songs were played poses an almost insurmountable difficulty for historians of performance, because tunes were very rarely set down on paper. As Ross Duffin puts it in his introduction to *Shakespeare's Songbook*,

everyone knew the tune titles. Printed ballads were issued on broadsides — single sheets of paper printed on one side — and in almost no case does music appear on the page. Instead, the title of the ballad is followed by 'to the tune of *Greensleeves*,' or some such directive. The tunes and their titles were so well known that it was not necessary to use precious space on the broadsides to print the music. The same tunes, furthermore, were the musical currency of the stage jigs, which were the halftime shows of Elizabethan theater: farcical song and dance playlets in which the entire dialogue was sung to one or more ballad tunes. There is no question that Shakespeare's audience, from the lowliest groundling to the highest noble, knew these tunes and the ballads that were set to them.<sup>17</sup>

This ubiquity of song, combined with a lack of textual evidence, leaves the modern performance researcher with the conundrum of having to translate the cultural location of the music without having access to the common knowledge of Elizabethan and Jacobean London. Just to give a sense of the unspoken cultural currency of these songs and tunes, not a single setting survives prior to ca 1650 of one of the most popular tunes from the period, known alternately as 'Chevy Chase' or 'Flying Fame', when it was copied into what is now Edinburgh University Library ms Cc.I.69.<sup>18</sup> Often the attribution of tunes to lyrics, and thereby the affective connection among multiple lyrics that share the same tune, is a game of educated guesswork.

Apart from the difficulties in attributing a given lyric to a given tune, scholars of performance history have to situate the playhouse song within a culture of musical theory, consumption, and production that saw music as analogically indicative of the harmonies of the material and spiritual world. That is, performances such as Valerius's, which so notably jar with the genre of the piece, embody and perform the political dissonance of the Tarquin tyranny. In the period, musical theory was commonly based on analogical thinking. The harmonies observed in music both reflect and embody the natural harmony of the universe, which was also reflected and embodied in the harmony of the state, which was also reflected and instantiated in bodily health. The relationship among the different elements (earth, air, fire, and water), which in Tullia was so out of joint, had a cosmic significance as well as a political one. Boethius, whose *De institutione musica* David Lindley identifies as a standard university textbook in the period, describes the relationship among the elements, the individual, and the seasons: 'Unless a certain harmony united the differences and contrary powers of the four elements, how could they form a single body and mechanism? But all this diversity produces the variety of seasons and fruits, yet thereby makes the year a unity'.<sup>19</sup> The harmonies of the universe, the state, and the individual mind were revealed in the melodiousness of music; likewise, discord in the state and the individual could be identified through disharmonious music. A well-governed state and a well-governed mind were compared to a harmonious piece of music, a commonplace that Shakespeare exploits to ironic purpose in *Richard II* when Richard, imprisoned, is able to identify the faults of a lute player, but was earlier unable to identify the faults in his own government (5.5.41–60).<sup>20</sup> The quality of estrangement that characterizes Valerius's songs in the play, so remarked on by critics, can be seen not as a sign of poor craftsmanship on Heywood's part, but as part of a strategy Heywood used to indicate the disjointure of the whole dramatic universe of *The Rape of Lucrece*.

The first song Valerius sings sets the ironic and out of place tone for the songs throughout the piece until the totally grotesque 'Did he take faire Lucrece by the toe man?' shifts the tone of both the song and the play, enabling the traumatized Valerius to heal enough to begin, at last, to speak. The first song is an adaptation of a popular ballad, 'The Noble Acts Newly Found, of Arthur of the Table Round', notable to most early modern drama scholars as the song Falstaff sings in *2 Henry IV*. The song was set to the tune of 'Flying Fame'.<sup>21</sup> The tune, under various incarnations, remained very popular throughout the early modern period, and appears in a number of plays and poems.<sup>22</sup> Heywood's version subverts the triumphant nationalism of 'Arthur of the Table Round':

When Tarquin first in Court began  
 And was approved King  
 Some men for sudden joy gan weep,  
 But I for sorrow sing. (545–9)

When Arthur first in court began  
 And was approved king,  
 By force of arms great victories won  
 And conquest home did bring.<sup>23</sup>

Heywood ironically reverses the jingoism of the original piece and presents Valerius's self-isolation through an eminently popular medium. The song employs the popularity of 'Arthur of the Table Round' to twist its meaning through relocation onto Valerius's impotence to change the order of the Tarquin regime. It has been long noted that the play's songs relocate the references in a somewhat crude manner — 'Lament Ladies Lament', which is a Scottish ballad, presented in a Scottish dialect, is placed in 'the Roman land', while 'The Cries of London', depicting street sellers' calls in early modern London, becomes 'The Cryes of Rome'. Heywood's overall effect is not to provide a miscellany of popular music, but to lift that music out of its original context and allow the audience to hear the lyrics anew. The sheer breadth of musical styles and genres sung by Valerius indicates the popularity and endurance of the character. Immediately upon singing a Scottish lament, Valerius switches gears and sings a song in praise of love, 'Why Since We Cannot Soldiers Prove'. The tone of his songs vary from the bawdy ('Shall I Woe the Lovely Molly') to bitter ('Now What is Love I Will Thee Tell') to the burlesque ('Pompie, I will shew thee, the way to know'), and many of these songs were added in performances and editions in the decades that followed the initial Red Bull performance.

It has been suggested that the song beginning 'Did he take faire Lucrece by the toe man?' bears some resemblance to the tune 'A-Rovin', the tune for 'The Fair Maid of Amsterdam'.<sup>24</sup> Although this suggestion is strongly disputed by Stan Hugill in his book *Shanties from the Seven Seas*, the tune has an ancestry that goes back at least to the Elizabethan period.<sup>25</sup> 'The Fair Maid of Amsterdam' tells of a sailor who meets a girl in Amsterdam, fondles different portions of her body and then contracts the pox, which at least suggests a possible connection through the erotic categorization of the female body.<sup>26</sup> Admittedly, the tune as it exists today could not easily be wrenched into the form necessary to fit the lyrics presented in Heywood, but it is possible that Heywood's lyrics were set to a variation on the tune such as is found in 'Yo Ho, Yo Ho'. For instance, Heywood's song was sung as a catch, or type of round, while 'A-Rovin' is typically not. As a catch, the song calls on, and requires for 'successful' performance, audience participation in the description of the graphic rape they had just witnessed. As described



in Christopher Wilson and Michela Calore's *Music in Shakespeare: A Dictionary*, 'Catches were not meant to be sophisticated formal songs. They were about having fun as performers, not listeners, and could be just as effective if performed crudely. They were the preserve of male society of all social groups'.<sup>27</sup> The largely male social group of the audience of the Red Bull theatre would, by their participation in the song, have been coerced into a grotesque reenactment of the violence of the rape of Lucrece. This metatheatrical return of the rape, this re-witnessing of the occluded event, implicates the audience in the immorality of the act. Through witnessing, the violence returns to be understood, but through the audience's participation in a kind of verbal re-enactment, they become participants in a system of governance that culminates in the rape itself. Lucrece's silence when she returns to the stage immediately following the rape only lends greater importance to this moment of metatheatrical re-enactment. Her silence keeps rape invisible, only to be rendered visible through the song.

### Why is Lucrece Silent?

Whereas Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece* investigates the subjective experience of the rape victim, Heywood's play is wholly interested in the relations between men and the (de)formation of masculine subjectivity that is reflected in rape. The complicity of the Roman nobles in the rise of the Tarquins is a darkling reflection of Lucrece's silence in the rape. The epistemic ambiguity mapped onto the female body in early modern rape discourse through the ever-present and paradoxical possibility of consenting — even unwillingly consenting — to be raped, reflects the Roman lords' complicity in the rise of the Tarquin regime. Early modern concepts of consent were remarkably malleable and were based on the external evidence of resistance. A woman's silence during the rape — even if she had been threatened with other forms of violence — was seen as a tacit approval to participate in the sex act. Early modern playwrights often used silence to signal a kind of consent that was marked with epistemic ambiguity. For instance, Theobald's 1727 play *The Double Falsehood* (drawn from Shakespeare and Fletcher's 1613 *Cardenio*) presents the rake Henriquez immediately after he has ravished Violante. Henriquez debates whether or not what he has just done is, in fact, a case of rape. At first, he judges that it was rape because it was a clear-cut case of sexual forcing:

Th'unpractised maid trembled to meet my love.  
By force alone I snatch'd th'imperfect joy,

Which now torments my memory. Not love,  
But brutal violence prevail'd ... (2.1.25–8)<sup>28</sup>

Yet only a few lines later, he excuses himself by pointing to *Violante's* silence as a form of non-positive consent: 'Hold, let me be severe to myself, but not just. Was it a rape then? No. Her shrieks, her exclamations then had drove me from her. True, she did not consent: as true she did resist; but still in silence all' (2.1.35–9). Although this comes from the mouth of an unabashedly rakish character, the epistemic ambiguity of a woman's silence during rape was a repeated note struck in early modern drama.

Valerius's complicity with the Tarquin regime (and by extension the complicity of the Roman nobles in general) echoes the problem of *Lucrece's* consent. That is, even knowing that they are being ruled by a tyrant who is perversely beholden unto his wife, the Romans do nothing to resist. Their consent to be subjugated to the rule of the Tarquins results in neurotic singing, carousing, and melancholy, all of which serve to render invisible their own participation in the administration of the Tarquins. Only with the return of the rape through Valerius's song does the invisible suffering become visible and the trauma addressed.

The rape was not performed on stage; rather, Sextus 'beares [*Lucrece*] out' (sd 2062). This discretion echoes the Latin source material, for neither Livy nor Ovid provide detailed descriptions of the rape. It is at odds with Shakespeare, however, who does describe the assault (673–746). Shakespeare entangles the audience with the rape through positioning the audience as witness: 'Look as the full-fed hound or gorged hawk, / ... Make slow pursuit / ... So surfeit taking Tarquin fares this night' (695–8). Similarly, although Heywood does not present the rape on stage, in the scenes between the rape and the revelation of the rape, he implicates the audience in the rape by presenting it in stages through various songs sung by Valerius.

'Pack Clouds Away', the first of these songs, and originally part of an epithalamion, presents a romantic vision of pastoral love. Metatheatrically, the audience would read this song's tone as an ironic commentary on the scene that had just ended, where Sextus left the raped *Lucrece* behind. The song hails the audience through its situation in the text as alert listeners, able to read behind the primary meaning of the words. It contrasts the violence and tragedy of the rape with courtly romance, maintaining the metatheatrical irony that characterized Valerius's songs throughout the piece. 'Pack Clouds Away' has posed a problem for scholars for at least the past century, because its aesthetic quality is so utterly out of place given that it is surrounded by crowd-pleasing burlesque catches. As

John Moore points out, the song was a relatively late insertion into the text, only appearing for the first time in the fourth quarto edition of the play (1630), and it seems ‘unlikely’ that it was a part of the play as it originally was performed on the stage ca 1607.<sup>29</sup> The text of ‘Pack Clouds Away’ appears in Heywood’s 1637 collection *Pleasant Dialogues and Drammas* as a part of a epithalamion on the marriage of James and Anna Waade, whose names appear as an acrostic in the first verse, a verse that doesn’t appear in *The Rape of Lucrece*.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, the text does not require Valerius to sing a song at this point and this particular song is not attributed to any character in any of the quarto editions. It erupts into the dialogue. Even if the song is a late addition to the play, there is no reason to suppose that the play was a static entity over the course of its thirty-year popularity. New songs were added to later editions of the play after the fourth quarto as an attempt to refurbish a stale performance but their novelty does not necessitate that they be ignored in an analysis of the presentation of the rape. Indeed, the late appearance of ‘Pack Clouds Away’ may indicate that Heywood or the actor playing Valerius inserted it as a means to clarify a thematic movement that was already implicit in the existing performance text.

Once the audience is made mindful of the songs through the elegance of ‘Pack Clouds Away’, Scaevola asks Valerius to sing a song in praise of Lucrece, which takes the form of a blazon. The sexual violence inherent in the particularization of the female body in a blazon has been long noted, yet here the imaginative violence is directed against a body that, in a case of dramatic irony, has already been violated. The song Valerius sings ‘in the praise of Lucrece’ (sd 2153) figures her body as a site of violence, both as being subject to violence through the blazon, and also threatening violence against the gazer/audience. The next song, ‘Come list and harke’, heralds the entrance of Lucrece’s clown, Pompey, who brings news of Lucrece’s rape to Valerius and the other Roman nobles. The tune of ‘Packington’s Pound’ seems to fit the rhythm of the lyrics of this song. Highly popular at the time (‘Packington’s Pound’ survives in three different early sources), the first surviving setting for the tune was to a ballad that told of the demise of ‘flaunting Philip, the Devil of the west’,<sup>31</sup> and was the tune to which the song ‘Black Spirits’ was sung by the three witches in *Macbeth*. As Ross Duffin demonstrates, ‘Packington’s Pound’ was roughly contemporaneous with *The Rape of Lucrece* and was known as ‘A Tune of Damnation’. If these two unabashedly supernatural songs were sung to the same tune, then it seems certainly possible that they were establishing a similar effect in the audience. If so, then it is unusual that Heywood, after so meticulously setting up an ironic register for Valerius’s songs should suddenly shift gears and present them with a tune that reflects the tragic elements of

the play so clearly. Such a shift must come from a dramaturgical choice, rather than mere coincidence. 'I'de thinke my selfe as proud in Shackles' — the next song sung by Valerius — is similarly in consonance with the tragic tone of the drama.

'Did he take faire Lucrece by the toe man?' suddenly shifts the tone back into the ironic register, while aurally playing out the rape for the audience. The catch recapitulates the violence enacted against the body of Lucrece that was last heard in the song 'in the praise of Lucrece'. It is a kind of blazon, a display of the female body, but it lacks the descriptive potency usually associated with the blazon. Instead of the bravura categorization and particularization of the female body by the individual male poet, the song's form encourages participation by as many singers as wish to join in the catch. The description of the female body is a display not of individual mastery, but of inter-masculine currency — it establishes a group identity as well as an identity for Lucrece, collapsing the epistemic rupture that the rape-*qua-stuprum* had established. She is no longer the pure Roman matron, but through the performance of the song by the combination of the audience and the actors, Lucrece is figured as a 'common woman'. This mutual participation in the rhetorical sexual assault on Lucrece renders her body as knowable. The song slips back into the ironic register that most of Valerius's songs have been in all along; it demands that the humour of the bawdy lyrics be filtered through the silent horror of the rape, and, moreover, because of that dissonance between the silent horror of Lucrece and the raucous bawdiness of this song, the song emphasizes the disharmoniousness of this Roman world.

In the following scene, Lucrece reveals her rape to Collatine, Brutus, and the other gathered Roman nobles. The reveal acts as a doubled return of the occluded act of rape, reinforcing the visibility of the invisible act. Lucrece's suicide, which critics like Stephanie Jed and Ian Donaldson have noted, provides necessary closure to the possibilities opened up by Lucrece's silence, allows her to perform masculine values.<sup>32</sup> The system of honour required different actions from different genders. As a raped woman, her honour has been assaulted and to restore it within a patriarchal order, she resists the rape unto death, even after the assault has ended. Lucrece's performance unto death reminds the assembled nobility of their own failure to perform in accordance with the codes of masculine honour. Through the mechanism of witnessing Lucrece's performance of the codes of honour, the noblemen are recovered into 'proper' patriarchal order. If the men can be reclaimed into patriarchal systems of governance and thereby re-establish them, it is because the men are able to witness and to sympathize with the female victim of rape. Indeed, the (re-)establishment of a 'just' patriarchal order — one

in which men are able to exercise manly virtue — is wholly dependent on their ability to recognize and sympathize with Lucrece's suffering and her performance of masculine values.

Lucrece's suicide is an attempt to contain the meaning of the rape, yet is ultimately unsuccessful. It is prompted in Heywood by her concern for the epistemic conundrum that her rape has opened. She describes the concern in dualistic terms, fearing that her body may have consented, even if her mind did not. In the following speech, she begins by addressing the reformation of the Roman nobles' humours:

Then with your humours here my grief ends too,  
 My staine I thus wipe off, call in my sighes,  
 And in the hope of this revenge, forbear  
 Even to my death to fall one passionate teare,  
 Yet Lords, that you may crowne my innocence  
 With your best thoughts, that you may henceforth know  
 We are the same in heart we seeme to show. (2480–6)<sup>33</sup>

At this point, the stage direction '*The Lords whisper*' indicates that Lucrece is isolated, both aurally and visually on the stage. She has the sense of isolation earlier seen in Valerius and the other Roman nobles.

And though I quit my soule of all such sin,  
 Ile not debare my body punishment:  
 Let all the world, learn of a Roman dame,  
 To prise her life less then her honor'd fame. (2487–90)

Lucrece's suicide is the only option left to a woman under the gendered honour codes of the early modern period that always suspected any female rape victim of complicity — in either mind or body — with the assault. As seen earlier, the law spilled a great deal of ink trying to police the boundaries of a woman's consent after the fact of the crime, but that was not the only possible structure by which a woman could 'consent' to be raped in the early modern mind. The female body, viewed as untrustworthy and a site of anxiety, needed to be disciplined in order for the woman's lack of consent to be genuine. In this case, Lucrece's body had to be punished for whatever consent it may (or may not — Heywood doesn't explore this) have taken in the sexual assault.

Brutus, who in accordance with the story told in Ovid and Livy until now has pretended to be mentally incompetent, reveals himself as an astute leader in this

scene. The discordant universe of the Tarquins' tyranny can only be set right, Brutus claims, through resistance:

Lay your resolute hands upon the sword of *Brutus*,  
 Vow and swear, as you hope meed for merit from the Gods,  
 Or feare reward for sinne, from devils below:  
 As you are Romans, and esteeme your fame  
 More then your lives, all humorous toyes set off.  
 Of madding, singing, smiling, and what else,  
 Receive your native valours, be your selves,  
 And joyne with *Brutus* in the just revenge  
 Of this chaste ravisht Lady, swear. (2470–8)

Whereas Valerius's particular 'humorous toy' was for singing, and this imbalance was caused by his complicity with Tullia and Servius's rise to power, Brutus claims that the Romans must become themselves again to avenge this ultimate act of tyranny; they must throw off the cloak of poor self-governance and enact virtue which will restore good governance to the state. This recuperation of self implies a recuperation of the state. Whereas such a transformation may be possible for the characters of the play, for the audience members who have represented the rape through their participation in the song, no such easy transformation is possible. For the Romans, by re-establishing a unity of self through proper harmony of the humours within themselves, they will be able to fold back into a 'just' patriarchal order, symbolized here by Brutus's sword. For the audience, however, there is no such order possible as they can only witness, from a distance as it were, the virtuous deeds of the final act, rather than participate in those deeds themselves. Whereas the characters can regain their masculine honour by proving it in theatrical battles, the audience can only watch with sympathy. The violence of the rape as an in/visible act lingers, unable to be contained into a single meaning.

Nevertheless, despite the attempts to contain the meaning of the rape within the image of the broken body of Lucrece, the in/visible act can never be recuperated. As Solga states, 'the in/visible act [is] a discombobulating practice that provokes uncertainty in spectators of the otherworldly feeling of not-quite-knowing, of radical uncertainty about one's own historical base-line'.<sup>34</sup> Lucrece's suicide is, ultimately, inconclusive. The unknowing is central to the critique of patriarchal governance as it is presented in *The Rape of Lucrece*, for the lingering sense of masculine anxiety hovers over the final few acts, when the new, more 'just' patriarchal order is established. As the great patriarchs of republican Rome play out their oft-told tales of virtue, they do so as the audience is wholly unable to reduce

the central act of violence in the play to a simple single meaning, historically past and static. Instead, the audience's collusion in the return of Lucrece's rape remains insistently present and dangerously close even as the patriarchs of the Roman republic express their exemplary virtue. Heywood's metatheatrical critique is as surprising as it is unique.

## Conclusion

In the early modern world, political transformation was often framed in terms of sexual assault, for the possibility of the rehabilitation of the man who raped provided the groundwork to understand the renovation of a patriarchal order that had broken down. In the Jacobean period, however, the staged representation of rape as catalyst for political transformation or critique was a particularly fraught trope. The failed patriarchal order of the state and the failure of masculine self-governance of the rapist were mutually implicated and reinforced at both theatrical and metatheatrical levels. The rape is a citation that signifies tyranny and becomes the impetus for political renovation, yet by implicating the audience in the rape of Lucrece through the catch, Heywood smuggles a politically incendiary suggestion into what has all too often been dismissed as merely spectacular entertainment. If audience members are aligned with rapists and rapists are aligned with a tyranny in need of overthrow to recuperate the rapists into 'good' patriarchal order, then the real-world patriarch whose perverse rule requires renovation becomes the unspoken and unspeakable James I. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, the last two acts of the play show the renovation of the Roman political order from tyrannical monarchy to virtuous republic. Indeed, those two acts following the revelation of the rape offer a series of scenes that repeatedly underscore the masculine virtues of the formerly cowed Roman nobles. The rape and suicide of Lucrece become transformative events for the Roman nobility, whose recuperation renovates the state itself. Heywood directly links the success of the republican political order to the bravura displays of Roman virtue by the nobles: courage (Horatius), stoic endurance (Scaevola), and cunning (Brutus). The men recover their masculine virtue only because they are able to bear witness to and sympathize with the victim of ungoverned desire. It is here, in the transformative potential of sympathy when presented with the rape's metatheatrical return, that the audience too can participate in the enacting of masculine virtue. That is, like the Roman nobles, the audience is asked in *The Rape of Lucrece* to sympathize with Lucrece's suffering. Her suicide, which performs masculine values, enables a transformation on the part of the Roman nobles such that her attempt to recover her honour, in a sense, infects

the collected Romans. Both the Roman nobles and the audience, however, share the acts of witnessing and sympathizing with Lucrece's shame and suicide. Thus, in the final two acts, the audience witnesses a representation of renovation of the state in which they are proxy participants. The play ends by reinforcing virtuous patriarchal masculine order within both Rome and the Red Bull.

## Notes

---

- 1 Mark Bayer, 'The Red Bull Playhouse', Richard Dutton (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre* (Oxford, 2009), 230, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697861.001.0001>.
- 2 Richard Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre 1599–1639* (Farnham, UK, 2010), 11.
- 3 Paulina Kewes, 'Roman History and Early Stuart Drama: Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece*', *English Literary Renaissance* 32.2 (March 2002), 257, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1475-6757.00010>.
- 4 Jocelyn Catty, *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England* (New York, 2010), 108, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230309074>.
- 5 Kim Solga, *Violence Against Women in Early Modern Performance: Invisible Acts* (New York, 2009), 12, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230274051>.
- 6 Ibid, 16–17.
- 7 A.W. Ward, *A History of Dramatic Literature*, 3 vols (London, 1899), 2:581.
- 8 John R. Moore, 'Thomas Heywood's "Pack Clouds Away" and *The Rape of Lucrece*', *Studies in Philology* 25.2 (April, 1928), 171.
- 9 Solga, *Violence Against Women*, 4–17, 140, 206.
- 10 Nancy Vickers, "'The Blazon of Sweet Beauty's Best": Shakespeare's *Lucrece*', *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory* (London, 1985), 99.
- 11 Thomas Heywood, *Rape of Lucrece*, ed. Allan Holaday, (Urbana, IL, 1950). All further references to this play will be cited by line number in parentheses in the text.
- 12 B.J. Baines, *Thomas Heywood* (Boston, 1984), 139.
- 13 Alexander Leggatt, *Jacobean Public Theatre* (London, 1992), 20, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203169162>.
- 14 Lucy Munro, 'Music and Sound', *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre* (Oxford, 2009), 552, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697891.001.0001>.
- 15 Ibid, 554.
- 16 Heywood, 'To the Reader', 2991–7.
- 17 Ross Duffin, *Shakespeare's Songbook* (New York, 2004), 16.
- 18 Ibid, 62.



- 19 David Lindley, *Shakespeare and Music* (London, 2006), 18–19.
- 20 William Shakespeare, *Richard II*, ed. Charles Forker, (London, 2002).
- 21 Duffin, *Shakespeare's Songbook*, 61.
- 22 William Chappell, *Popular Music of the Olden Time: The Whole of the Airs Harmonized* (London, 1859), 198–9. Google Books. Web.
- 23 Duffin, *Shakespeare's Songbook*, 16.
- 24 Bruce O., 'Re: Lyr help req: Maid from Amsterdam', *The Mudcat Café* (online forum), 19 May 1998, <http://mudcat.org/thread.cfm?threadid=5070>.
- 25 Stan Hugill, *Shanties from the Seven Seas: Shipboard Work Songs and Songs Used as Work* (London, 1961), 46, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/895546>.
- 26 'A-Rovin', *The Traditional Ballad Index*, eds Robert Waltz and David G. Engle. Folklore Department, California State University, Fresno, nd. Web.
- 27 Christopher Wilson and Michela Calore, *Music in Shakespeare: A Dictionary* (New York, 2005), 83, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472555045>.
- 28 Lewis Theobald, *The Double Falsehood or the Distressed Lovers*, ed. Brean Hammond, (London 2010).
- 29 Moore, "Pack Clouds Away" and *The Rape of Lucrece*'.
- 30 Thomas Heywood, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's* (London, 1637), 260.
- 31 Duffin, *Shakespeare's Songbook*, 66.
- 32 Stephanie Jed, *Chaste Thinking: The Rape of Lucretia and the Birth of Humanism* (Bloomington, 1989) and Ian Donaldson, *The Rapes of Lucretia: A Myth and its Transformations* (Oxford, 1982).
- 33 Lucrece uses her own body as an index to guide the assembled lords to act virtuously in the same way other early modern playwrights used the bodies of traumatized women as didactic tools, eg Lear's lament over Cordelia's body in 5.3.
- 34 Solga, *Violence Against Women*, 18.

