A fabulis ad veritatem: Latin Tragedy, Truth and Education in Early Modern England
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At the start of his 1582 Ash Wednesday sermon delivered in St. Mary's church Apud Academicos Oxonienses (Before the University of Oxford) and entitled De fermento vitando (On Avoiding Leaven), the Magdalen President and Regius Professor of Divinity Lawrence Humphrey (1525/27–1589) put a stern end to dramatic entertainment:

Satis iam satis (Auditores) Theatricis spectaculis aures & oculos oblectauimus: satis laruarum ac lemurum, vidimus, audiuiimus: satis & risui Comico, & luctui Tragico indulsimus ...

Listeners, we have entertained our ears and eyes enough, enough by now, with theatrical spectacles: we have seen, we have heard enough of specters and ghosts; we have indulged enough both in comic laughter and tragic lamentation ...

By 1582 Humphrey had been one of Oxford's most prominent theologians for over two decades, who had returned to Oxford in 1560 after a seven-year visit to Zurich, Basel and Geneva during Mary I's reign. His sermon vividly illustrates a leading Puritan's perspective on early modern institutional plays, and shows how we can look to contemporary Latin tragedy to see how scholars used the genre to communicate ideas and impart pedagogical lessons. Humphrey turns towards Lenten austerity by rejecting the ephemeral pleasures of drama and arguing that 'hoc festi quasi Cineritium' ('this Ashen feast, as it were') 'asks of every single one of us other habits, another prescribed lifestyle, another...

1 Lawrence Humphrey, De fermento vitando (London: Henry Middleton for George Bishop, 1582), pp. 163–186, esp. p. 163; for the sections pertaining to drama, see also John H. Elliott, Jr. et al., eds., Records of Early English Drama (hereafter reed): Oxford (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press/British Library, 2004), vol. 1, pp. 177–179 (Latin) and vol. 2, pp. 991–993 (English). Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.
persona’ (‘alios mores, aliam dietam, aliam personam ab vnoquoque nostrûm postulat’). Making these changes will shift the auditories from ‘silly to serious things’:

vt à ludicris ad seria, à socco ad saccum, à Cothurno ad Cineres, à prophanis ad sacra, à fabulis ad ipsam veritatis investigationem & disciplinam transeamus: quandoquidem omni quantumuis² apparatissima scena nostra veritatis imago est illustrior, & Græcorum Helena pulchrior & amabilior est Christianorum veritas ...

(so we should pass from silly to serious things, from comedy to hairshirt, from tragedy to ashes, from the profane to the holy, from plays to that self-same examination and discipline of truth: for although our image of truth is more radiant than all stages, even the most lavishly equipped, Christian truth is both more beautiful and more loveable than the Helen of the Greeks ...)

However ‘laudably performed’ (‘laudabiliter actis’, p. 164), for Humphrey fabulae are fabulae tamen (‘plays are still plays’), and ‘certainly much more concentrated purpose’ (‘multo certè maius studium’) must be applied to ‘the understanding and contemplation of truth’ (‘in veritatis cognitione & contemplatione’) than to drama.

Humphrey’s sermon creates two interesting tensions: first, such a strenuous rejection suggests the power of theater even while it is being dismissed as trivial. Second, his description of the assumption of piety as ‘aliam personam’ (‘another persona’) is somewhat paradoxical: the artificiality and indulgence of drama must end, but with the putting-on of another ‘mask’ (an alternative meaning of the Latin persona). For men as drilled in the need to excel rhetorically as Humphrey’s auditory would have been, this exhortation to worship correctly would not necessarily have conveyed the idea of dissimulation since each listener would have known that successful oratory invariably meant performing different roles dependent on the persuasive task at hand. Nonetheless the possibility is still raised that one can outwardly adopt and perform piety, which becomes a specious and deceitful act if one does not also have a genuine interior faith. If Humphrey saw this tension, he did not pause on it, but went on, instead, to articulate a series of rhetorical antitheses—such as carefree laughter

---

2 The 1582 reading (p. 163) is quantumnis, reproduced in the reed: Oxford transcription (1, p. 177). This misprint has been corrected here to quantumvis (‘although’).
at a comedy versus uncomfortable itching in a hair shirt—to further establish the gap between *fabula* and *veritas*. It is enough, he argues, ‘spectasse tantum & intellexisse’ (‘only to have seen and understood’) plays, with the physical ‘ears and eyes’ he mentions in his opening clause, but one ‘ought to love and embrace’ (‘amare & amplecti oporteat’) truth with the heart and in the soul. As his Latinate *auditores* would instantly have grasped, Humphrey’s grammatical choices reflect the commitment truth demands: plays require a single completed action of spectatorship and comprehension (expressed by his use of the perfect infinitives *spectasse* and *intellexisse*) while loving and embracing truth are ongoing actions for which he chooses present infinitives (*amare*, *amplecti*). Surprisingly, and ignoring the moral seriousness which theorists from Aristotle onwards had accorded to tragedy, Humphrey lumps it together with comedy as diverting yet ultimately frivolous pastimes from which the Christian auditor must move on—*à Cothurno ad Cineres*—to arrive at an examination of religious truth.

The context of delivery for Humphrey’s sermon was also the most active site of composition and performance of drama, and so a study of Latin tragedy in early modern England must focus on the universities. Some examples taken both from Oxford and Cambridge, such as the work of Thomas Legge (ca. 1535–1607) and William Alabaster (1568–1640), and plays written by its graduates who wrote for continental Catholic institutions, particularly Edmund Campion (1540–1581), show how institutional drama evolved into an ideologically rich didactic medium. These plays suggest how the staging of such drama was not just an entertaining diversion (Humphrey’s *ludicra*) in this period, although collective enjoyment could be part of its appeal. The authors of these plays also express concern about impressionable young minds and the formative influence of curricular and other institutional activity in relation to dramatic performance. This suggestion of psychological flux on the part of the student spectators mirrors how Latin tragedy at the English universities repeatedly stages political instability, by representing a world in which, often, in the words of a pessimistic soothsayer in William Gager’s *Meleager*, ‘versus ordo est’ (‘the order of things has been reversed’, 11; l. 688).

‘The schoole, where so many abuses florish’: Attacks and Defenses of Institutional Drama

Ever since the Reformation had started to gather momentum many decades before Humphrey delivered his sermon, educators of various denominations had questioned drama’s moral value for the young, and some of the early
reformers, including Bucer, Calvin and Sturm, debated whether its ability to build rhetorical confidence and impart to students a deeper knowledge of biblical and classical narratives counterbalanced its potentially pernicious teaching of dissimulation and falsehood. Juggling theology, political theory and dramaturgy, Protestant scholars like John Bale (1495–1563) and John Foxe (1516/17–1587) used vernacular and Latin tragedy respectively to espouse Reformation thought. In his *King Johan* (1538), Bale, as Philip Schwyzer has argued, combined ‘explicitly and uncompromisingly reformist’ drama with the indigenous ‘traditional religious drama’ he had known in his youth, while Foxe’s ‘apocalyptic comedy’ *Christus triumphans* (1556) demonstrates, as Howard Norland has shown, a ‘particularly reformist perspective’ both in its use of biblical texts (especially Revelation) and in its fear-mongering about contemporary disasters. But a few decades later, several university Puritans chose to forbid drama altogether rather than harnessing plays to ideological purposes. Following co-religionists like Stephen Gosson (bap. 1554–1625), whose 1579 attack on poetry caused Philip Sidney famously to defend it, the Oxford scholar John Rainolds (1549–1607) argued in his *Th’Overthrow of Stage Playes* (1599) against the Christ Church dramatist William Gager’s defense of college drama. Rainolds had acted in Richard Edwards’s *Palamon and Arcite* when Elizabeth visited Oxford in 1566, but in later life decided that institutional theater made student actors appear ‘in most vnmodest guise, with vnseemely barbarous carousing songes and speeches’. This perceived immodesty was not just a concern for Protestants: despite their opponents’ accusations that the Mass was itself a

---

3 See, for example, William J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 177–188; for Sturm and contemporary drama, particularly that of his friend George Buchanan, see Carine Ferradou, ‘George Buchanan dans les Pays Réformés’, in Jan Bloemendal and Philip Ford (eds.), *Neo-Latin Drama: Forms, Functions, Receptions* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008), pp. 55–76, esp. pp. 56–69.

4 Philip Schwyzer, ‘Paranoid History: John Bale’s *King Johan*’, in Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 499–513, esp. p. 501.

5 Howard B. Norland, ‘Neo-Latin Drama in Britain’, in Jan Bloemendal and Howard B. Norland (eds.), *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013), pp. 471–544, esp. pp. 478–479.

6 John Rainolds, *Th’ Overthrow of Stage Playes* ([Middelburg: Printed by Richard Schilders], 1599), p. 122; facsimile reprint with a preface by Arthur Freeman (New York and London: Garland, 1974). On the attitudes of Puritans including Rainolds towards theater and ‘filthie books’—the phrase is that of the teacher and translator John Stockwood (d. 1610)—see also John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 157–159.
kind of theater, characterized by ritualized performance, Catholic pedagogues also pronounced on the question of student drama: Rule 87 of the Jesuit Ratio studiorum, printed in the same year at Rainolds’s Overthrow, makes clear that the plot (‘argumentum’) of any ‘tragœdiæ et comœdiæ’ performed should be ‘sacrum ... ac pium’ (‘holy and devotional’).⁷ Such thinking dated back to the earliest days of the church, manifest, for instance, in the writings of St. Augustine, whose critical attitude towards drama cast it, as Donnalee Dox has persuasively shown, as ‘a debauched social activity rooted in Roman polytheism’.⁸ Augustine had argued in De civitate Dei that the theater offered only a ‘mythical’ or ‘story-telling’ theology (‘theologia fabulosa’): in the same sentence he aligns this theologia with the ‘theatrica scaenica, indignitatis et turpitudinis plena’ (‘the theology of the theatre and the stage, with all its vulgarity and foulness’).⁹ By the late sixteenth century, anti-theatrical polemicists like Rainolds came to rely on this Augustinian critique, consolidating their own objections by invoking the early church. Near the start of his polemic, for example, positioning himself within this long-standing continuum of anti-theatricalism while bolstering his use of Augustine with even earlier classical authorities (Cicero, Livy), Rainolds explicitly equates stage-playing with a bad moral reputation and questionable legal status: ‘such as come vpon the stage without gaine, are prooved by S. Augustin and Livie to be infamous, because S. Austin and Livie doe shewe that all stage-players (free players not excepted) were branded with a marke of infamie & dishonestie, disfranchised in a sort’.¹⁰ Clearly drama was seen by some Puritans as forcefully pernicious, and not just as harmless bookish entertainment.

Alongside this Augustinian moral critique was positioned the Calvinist argument that plays reflected the fortunes of monarchs and the powerful. In Calvin’s commentaries on Jeremiah (originally lectures to Geneva students, first published in 1576), he suggests that kings (reges) ‘have been positioned, so to speak, in the theater’ (‘sunt quasi collocati in theatro’) where ‘everyone’s eyes have been turned towards them so that they have no freedom for themselves’ (‘et

---

⁷ The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education, transl. and ann. Claude Pavur, s.j. (St. Louis, MO: Institute for Jesuit Sources, 2005), p. 35.
⁸ Donnalee Dox, The Idea of the Theater in Latin Christian Thought (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press), p. 11.
⁹ See Saint Augustine, The City of God Against the Pagans, vii, 7, vol. 2 (Books iv–vii), translated by William M. Green (London and Cambridge: William Heinemann Ltd. and Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 322–323. The English translation cited here is Green’s, although the alternative translation of ‘fabulosa’ as ‘story-telling’ is my own.
¹⁰ Rainolds, Overthrow, p. 5.
Calvin’s idea of drama and monarchical representation would prove influential in England, where plays on religious and political subjects had existed since the early Reformation, as we have seen, but debates over such plays deepened as the century wore on, and as it became clearer to her subjects that the ageing Queen would be the last of the Tudors, and that Catholic threats from continental Europe, spearheaded by the Jesuit mission and Armada invasions of the 1580s, stemmed from several damaging sources. How the nation’s youth would be brought up right-minded and steady was a fundamental concern to both Catholic and Protestant pedagogues, which explains, to some extent, why debates over theater intensified and why Latin tragedy so often touched on contemporary anxieties. Institutional drama, like the theoretical disputations staged in the lecture-halls of both universities, might seem abstracted, even ideologically toothless, but the frequency with which political power is represented is striking, and such popularity suggests that university dramatists were thinking carefully about forms of government as they pushed the history of tragic play-writing in England in interesting new directions. If we examine formative philosophical influences on Latin drama, the tensions Augustine suggested are implicit in the moral slipperiness of convincing rhetorical performance (as opposed to heartfelt piety or moral purpose), and the power of a kind of drama Calvin argued can raise potentially disturbing political questions, start to seem central.

Humphrey’s sermon was printed under the title *Pharisaismus vetus et novus: sive de fermento Pharisaorum et Jesuitarum* (*Phariseeism Old and New: Or, on the Leaven of the Pharisees and the Jesuits*), reflecting both the play’s scriptural source—‘Matt. 16. Videte & caute à fermento Pharisaëorum & Sadducaeorum’ (‘Matthew 16: Witness and avoid the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees’), as the title-page has it—and its polemical goal. Although the sermon has a separate title-page, it was printed at the end of Humphrey’s *Iesuitismi Pars Prima (First Part of Jesuitism)*, also in 1582. Humphrey’s polemic was directed against the English Jesuit Edmund Campion, who had just published his *Rationes decem (Ten Reasons)* with an inflammatory preface ‘To the most learned scholars flourishing at Oxford and Cambridge’ (‘Doctissimis Academicis, Oxonii florentibus & Cantabrige’). We shall return later to Campion, who obviously posed a serious threat to notions of institutional orthodoxy and stability: a star,

---

11 Calvin, *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Baum, Cunitz and Reuss, vol. 39 (Brunswick: C.A. Schwetschke, 1889), col. 178; see also Bouwsma, *John Calvin*, pp. 177–178.
12 Edmund Campion, *Rationes decem* (Henley-on-Thames: S. Brinkley, 1581), n.p.
as Humphrey had also been, of the rhetorical performances before Elizabeth I on her visit to Oxford in 1566, only a few years later he threw aside a promising academic career for the uncertain life of a recusant abroad.

Humphrey goes on to identify drama with the dastardly wiles of the Jesuits as a group, and not just Campion, which reflects the institutional reality of the early 1580s when universities were paranoid about the Society’s influence on students. He equates the Jesuit and broader Catholic fixation on saints with pagan polytheism, an Augustinian rhetorical gambit, as well as with the naive belief that no altar should go un-laden with offerings (pp. 175–176):

Offerunt Iesuitæ non Deo soli sed Diuis aliiis cultu[m], inuocationem; A Pharisa[ei]s haustu[m] est, qui defunctos colueru[nt] ... Romanistæ ... Romæ Pantheon Ethicu[m] in horum omniu[m] memoriam verterunt: dêterriti, credo, miserando Oenei regis Exemplo, qui cúm omnibus Diis sacra fecisset, Dianam solam pr[a]eterisset, neglecti officii pœnas dedit ipse, vxor, liberi, vt vobis Scena Tragicè repr[a]esentauit.

(The Jesuits offer worship (and) prayer not to God alone but to other gods. (This) was derived from the Pharisees, who worshipped the dead ... The Romanists ... turned the pagan Pantheon at Rome into a memorial of all these (saints). (They were) terrified, I believe, by the pitiable example of King Oeneus, who when he had made sacrifices to all the gods omitted Diana alone. He, (his) wife, (and his) children paid the penalties of neglected duty as the stage has shown to you in tragedy.)

In the 1582 publication, in the margin to the left of this passage, a note reads ‘Sophocl’; but this obscures Humphrey’s point: the reference to ‘Oenei regis Exemplo’ (‘the example of King Oeneus’) is not to ancient Greek tragedy, but specifically to contemporary Latin tragedy. Only days before the sermon was delivered, many of his auditors would have seen William Gager’s play Meleager, a Latin tragedy which represents the Caledonian boar hunt, indebted to Book VIII of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and performed at Christ Church. Humph-

---

13 For Sophocles at the early modern universities, see my “Goodlie anticke apparrell”: Sophocles’ *Ajax* at early modern Oxford and Cambridge, *Shakespeare Studies* 37 (September 2009), 25–42.

14 See Martin Wiggins and Catherine Richardson, *British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), vol. 2: 1567–1589, pp. 291–294, who dates the play ‘probably in the week before Shrovetide (Wednesday 21 to Tuesday 27 February)’ (p. 293). *Meleager* was first staged in 1582, then revived in 1585 for a visit of the Earl of
re therefore develops an anti-theatrical argument into an argument which equates the behaviour of the Jesuits and other *Romanistæ* with the hubristic and neglectful Oeneus, and having dismissed the didactic potential of tragedy, he uses a tragic exemplar to reinforce his ideological point.

Although any reader of Renaissance drama is acclimatized to casual blending of the classical and the Christian, it is striking that Humphrey, like many Christian pedagogues in the period, uses the classical to define the Christian, even in negative distinction: Oeneus resembles the Jesuits, Helen of Troy should be loved less than Christian truth, and a classical analogy is clearly selected to drive home Christian doctrine. We see this tendency not only in early modern homiletics, but also in the drama, where the characters in the plays—and, by extension, of course, their authors—sometimes seem only to be able to assert their existence by reference to classical predecessors. In Thomas Legge’s *Richardus Tertius*, for instance, Richard of Gloucester compares his confederate Rivers to Electra, complimenting him on returning his nephew to England from Wales ‘just as Electra snatched her brother from her mother’s menace’ (‘qualis cruentae matris eripienis minis | Electra fratrem’, 1, 11, 1; ll. 157–158).

With this in mind, Humphrey’s rejection of *fabulae* in favor of *veritas* in the 1582 sermon starts to seem more complicated: he recognizes how fresh the tragedy would be in his audience’s minds, and uses the play to reinforce the point he wants to make about right worship. Not just *ludicra*, then: drama is used even by its detractor here to underline a serious theological point.

Other contemporaries were similarly apprehensive of the power drama had over student minds, such as the Oxford Puritan Stephen Gosson. Gosson, whose perspective as a ‘Stud. Oxon.’ (declared on the title-page) gave him particular clout, ‘because I haue bene matriculated my selfe in the schoole, where so many abuses flourishe’, luridly imagined students’ moral decline in *The Schoole of Abuse*. On the one hand, Gosson contrasts civic responsibility with academic abstraction:

---

Leicester, Philip Sidney and other courtiers, and printed at Oxford in 1593. See Frederick S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 165–178; J.W. Binns, ‘Introduction’, in William Gager “Meleager”, “Ulysses Redux”, “Panniculus Hippolyto Assutus” (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1982); Norland, ‘Neo-Latin Drama in Britain’, pp. 489–490.

15 Thomas Legge, *Richardus Tertius*, ed. and transl. Dana F. Sutton, in *Thomas Legge: The Complete Plays*, vol. 1 (New York etc.: Peter Lang, 1993), pp. 20–21.

16 Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1579), sig. 6v.
If it be the dutie of every man in a common wealth, one way or other to bestirre his stumpes, I ca[n]ot but blame those liter[...]

But if desiccated abstraction from responsibility is one temptation, another is the university’s potential for licentiousness because of its teaching of rhetoric, which Gosson exemplifies as ‘poetrie in the lowest forme’ or first year of the curriculum: ‘You are no sooner entred, but libertie loseth the reynes, and geues you head, placing you with poetrie in the lowest forme, when his skill is showne to make his Scholer as good as euer twangde’ (sigs. 6v–7r). Like Humphrey, Gosson trivialises fictional writing on the one hand while implying its potential power—that exciting association with ‘libertie’—on the other.

Gosson and Humphrey offer two related anti-theatrical perspectives, but not all of their co-religionists would have agreed that institutional plays were only for (at best) diversion, and (at worst) for giving ‘libertie’ full rein. Three decades before the Ash Wednesday sermon and Schoole of Abuse were published, the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer (1491–1551) had argued in his De Regno Christi (On Christ’s Kingdom), which he sent to Edward VI as a New Year’s gift in 1550, for the value of ‘honestis ludis’ (‘decent entertainments’). Bucer was an important thinker for Humphrey, who describes in his 1573 biography of John Jewel how (also in 1550) he had watched Bucer, then Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, preach at Christ Church on John 17 (‘Sanctificas nos ô pater in veritate’; ‘O Father, sanctify us in the truth’). Humphrey was particularly struck by Bucer’s identifications of the four best means of understanding Scripture and prophecy: ‘painstaking reading, very fervent prayer, public assemblies and private conversations’ (‘Lectionem assiduam, preationem ardentissam, conuentus publicos, & priuata colloquia’). By ‘conuentus publicos’ Bucer would have meant occasions like that of his preaching the sermon, but his account of drama, particularly tragedy, could be argued to describe a different kind of ‘conuentus publicus’. Play-going is, for Bucer, meaningfully communal: he writes how ‘the spectators’ can be collectively stimulated ‘by piety’ (‘pietate spectatores’), for instance. Bucer argues that plays are more

17 See Basil Hall, ‘Martin Bucer in England’, in D.F. Wright (ed.), Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 129–143.
18 Lawrence Humphrey, Ioannis Iuelli Angli ... vita & mors (London: John Day, 1573), pp. 42–43.
19 Martin Bucer, De Regno Christi (1550), in Opera Latina vol. 15, ed. François Wendel (Güter-
than *ludicra* and can in fact be *seria* (to use Humphrey’s terms): ‘these stories’ (‘hae historiae’), Bucer states, have ‘so wonderful a power of confirming faith in God’ (‘cum mirificam uim habeant fidem in Deum confirmandi’).\(^{20}\) Bucer stresses the importance of tragedy based on biblical rather than classical narratives, since ‘the Scriptures everywhere offer an abundant supply of material for tragedies’ (‘Tragoediis scripturae ubique perquam copiosam afferunt materiaem’).\(^{21}\) Humphrey, conversely, admits no real pedagogical space for drama, and does not distinguish between different forms of subject-matter. The Ash Wednesday sermon channels this experience into his discussion of drama in the contemporary institution. First, while underplaying its force, Humphrey nonetheless acknowledges drama’s didacticism, that plays written in the Latin of an intellectual and theological elite offered opportunities to indoctrinate correctly but also to corrupt, so their subject-matter needed to be chosen carefully and their ideological lessons were paramount. The second aspect of Humphrey’s sermon relevant here is the pervasiveness of the religious undercurrents in so much institutional Latin writing of the period.

**Tragedy and Tyranny**

In his sermon, Humphrey assumes that his *auditores* were as attentive to the nuances of tragedy as he hoped they would be to the argument of a sermon: he refers frequently to the play fresh in everyone’s minds, which we have already encountered as a depiction of civic chaos, Gager’s *Meleager*. Humphrey goes straight to the moral exemplarity of the play and all of his references refer to the character Oeneus, Meleager’s father, who is mentioned only fleetingly by Ovid as the king of Calydon who forgets to sacrifice to Diana in thanksgiving for a bountiful harvest; ‘only Diana’s altar was passed by (they say) and left without its incense’ (‘solas sine ture relictas | praeteritae cessasse ferunt Latoi- dos aras’).\(^{22}\) In Gager’s play, however, Oeneus becomes an archetypal hubristic

\(^{20}\) Bucer, *De Regno Christi*, p. 257; Pauck, *Melanchthon and Bucer*, p. 351.

\(^{21}\) Ibid.

\(^{22}\) Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VIII, 277–278, transl. Frank Justus Miller, rev. by G.P. Goold (London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977). Third ed., pp. 424–445.
tyrant, the vehicle for the play’s ‘lesson’ that power corrupts, to an almost cartoonish extent: his first words at the start of the second act are ‘Par diis superbis gradior’ (‘I walk as an equal to the proud gods’). Gager tends to concentrate his didactic content in the scenes featuring Oeneus: in the same scene, for example, the senex (old man) with whom Oeneus converses articulates a series of apothegms about pride and loftiness which go on to shape the future action of the play. After stichomythia between the two characters on ideas of destiny, pride and fear (ll. 528–537), the senex delivers the clinching if abstract point. To Oeneus’s proud ‘I am alive, a notable king’ (*Rex vivo clarus*, l. 537), he replies:

Nomine hoc magis expave.
Graviore turres decidunt casu arduae,
Altosque montes crebrius fulmen ferit,
Et vasta morbo membra maiori patent.

II; l. 538–541

(Then feel fear because of this title. Lofty towers collapse with a steeper fall, lightning strikes high mountains more often, and huge frames suffer greater maladies.)

We find similar protagonists articulating their overweening will-to-power throughout institutional tragedy in this period. To some extent the pattern is Senecan, and so the tragic preoccupation with tyranny is no surprise. But we can argue for an awareness among university playwrights that their works were both being seen by powerful men and also that the potentially powerful of the future might also be watching them, among the student body, or even acting in them. The visits of Elizabeth to Oxford in 1566 and 1592 and to Cambridge in 1564 were just the most high-profile examples of this kind of heightened scrutiny of Latin drama, but we know that many Elizabethan and, later, Jacobean and Caroline worthies were entertained at the universities. The 1592 preface to the publication of Gager’s *Meleager* makes clear Gager’s awareness of this process: the work contains two prologues, one ‘Ad Academicos’ (‘To the members of the university’; sig. A7r) and the other to the two courtiers who watched the play’s revival on a visit to Oxford in January 1585, ‘Ad illustriissimos Pembrôchiae et Lecestriæ Comites’ (‘To the most distinguished Earls
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23 Gager, *Meleager*, Act II; l. 472, ed. and transl. Dana Sutton (translation here mine). http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/gager/plays/meleager.
of Pembroke and Leicester’; sig. A8r). During that visit, we know from his household accounts that Leicester met with Lawrence Humphrey, whom he had nominated as vice-chancellor between 1567 and 1576: we might speculate as to whether the men discussed Meleager. I have argued elsewhere that these progresses were not visitations, but seemed to have functioned, nonetheless, obliquely as opportunities for the testing of conformity among the academic community.

One of Gager’s contemporaries at Cambridge offers a different illustration of how scholar-dramatists were committed to writing ethically challenging tragedy. When Elizabeth visited Cambridge in 1564, Thomas Legge, a canon and civil lawyer and head of Gonville and Caius, was among those college heads chosen by the then Chancellor William Cecil ‘to set fourth and to teache suche playes as should be exhibited before her grace’. During the next decade, Legge was one of the first at the universities to write an English history play: his Richardus Tertius (performed in 1579), a long play divided into three separate actiones, made a lasting impression on those who saw it, including Thomas Nashe and John Harington. Like Gager’s Meleager, Legge’s play seems sharply aware both of its classical ancestry, as we saw in the example of Rivers’s Electra analogy, and also of its political resonance, for we see similar explorations of hubris in the English history play as we did in the Ovidian tragedy. Early in Legge’s first actio, for instance, the melancholy Queen Elizabeth articulates the same concerns as Gager’s senex about the likelihood of the powerful toppling from their great height (1, 1; ll. 150–154):

```
timere didicit quisquis excelsus stetit, 
rebusque magnis alta clauditur quies. 
auro venenum bibitur. ignotum casae 
humili malum, ventisque cunctis cognita 
superba summo tecta nutant culmine. 
```

24 William Gager, Meleager Tragoedia Nova (Oxoniae: Excudebat Iosephus Barnesius, 1592).
25 See Simon Adams (ed.), Household Accounts and Disbursement Books of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, 1558–1561, 1584–1586 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 211–218, esp. p. 212.
26 Sarah Knight, ‘Texts Presented to Elizabeth I on the University Progresses’, in Edward Jones (ed.), A Concise Companion to the Study of Manuscripts, Printed Books, and the Production of Early Modern Texts (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015), pp. 21–40, esp. 27–28.
27 John Nichols, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth (London: John Nichols & Son, 1823), 1, p. 406.
(Anybody with high standing has learned to fear, and deep peace is excluded from great affairs. Poison is drunk from a golden cup, but evil is unknown to a humble house. Lofty buildings, buffeted by every wind, collapse from the top downwards.)

To some extent these are familiar, even well-worn, Senecan *sententiae*, but if we look at the ‘Epilogus’ to Legge’s tragedy such maxims fit into the work’s larger stated didactic purpose and into the teleology imposed by the dramatist on his three *actiones* taken as a whole. Legge reminds his audience what it has witnessed through pointed use of anaphora, drawing them in through the second-person plural, reminding them of the particular threat posed to ‘boys’ who get caught up in *Realpolitik*: ‘You have seen the dead boys’ bodies’ (‘extincta vidistis puororum corpora’; l. 4667), ‘You have seen the murderous struggles of the powerful and the deserved punishment received by the tyrant’ (‘funesta vidistis potentum proelia | et digna ceuit tyrannus praemia’; ll. 4669–70).

The epilogue ends on a Tudor triumphalist note: all of this political turbulence has led up to the accession of the *filia* (‘daughter’) and *virgo* (‘virgin’) Elizabeth (ll. 4696–4697). Humphrey and Gosson had figured drama as a means of distracting young men away from piety, but, knowing his audience and the turbulent historical moment they inhabited, Legge uses the tragic mode to argue for obedience, even if such obedience involves killing a tyrant like Richard of Gloucester, and, more subtly, he also stresses the value of a mature mind in making decisions and advising the youth.

Throughout *Richardus Tertius* Legge returns repeatedly to the suggestibility of young minds and the effects of vertiginous power: the premature responsibilities of the boy-king Edward v are often used as a means to discuss youth and power in more abstract terms, for instance in an extended stichomythia between the characters Buckingham and Catesby about boyhood, temperament and political power, as they exchange, and share, rapid-fire iambic *senarii* (ll. 1279–1281, 1287–1289):

*BUCKINGHAM*  furor brevis pueri statim restinguitor.  
*CATESBY*  at ira praeceps est magis pueri levis.  ...  
*BUCKINGHAM*  ducis potest authoritas  
 sơ ferociam pueri minuere.  
*CATESBY*  dum puer  est.  

(*BUCKINGHAM* A boy’s quick anger is soon suppressed.  
*CATESBY* The easy anger of a boy is more headstrong....)
BUCKINGHAM    The Duke’s authority will lessen the boy’s ferocity.
CATESBY    So long as he stays a boy.)

One of the main ways in which Legge aims tragedy squarely at a student audience, as this exchange shows, is through his use of stichomythic exchanges for spectators trained both in catechistical inquiry and in dialectics.

As an extension of this technique, Richardus Tertius also frequently stages public rhetorical acts, which exemplify to the audience how such oratory should work, and, in several cases, offer a negative definition by presenting versions which go wrong. In Act 3, scene 3 of the first actio, for example, the skilled boy orator Edward v addresses his people of London with a ‘Dear city, I greet you’ (‘urbs chara, salve’; 1, III, 3; ll. 636). But conversely, in the second actio the Cambridge Doctor of Theology and ‘vir literis insignis’ (‘distinguished man of letters’, 2.1.1996) Ralph Shaw (d. 1484) preaches a sermon in support of Richard of Gloucester’s usurpation at Paul’s Cross: the sermon is reported by a citizen of London, who first calls Shaw a ‘divinus praecox’ (‘sanctimonious preacher’, 2.1.2134), but concludes that the citizens ‘stupent’ (were ‘stupefied’, 2.1.2169) by the seditious content of the sermon. Later in the actio we hear directly from Shaw this time, not through a third party, about his terrible regret at deploying his rhetorical skill and theological training in support of a tyrant’s unlawful claim: _heu mihi_, Shaw laments, _animus semet scelere plenus fugit_ (‘Alas, my mind, full of crime, flees itself’; 4.1.2541). In conversation with a ‘friendly Londoner’ (Civis Amicus), who slips into catechizing mode again, Shaw’s conscience is interrogated and the effects of guilt analysed (4.1.2572–2573):

AMICUS    mors sola maculam demere infandum potest?
DR. SHAW    foedata nescit vita crimen ponere.

(FRIEND    Can death alone remove this unspeakable stain?
DR. SHAW    A corrupted life does not know how to free itself of crime.)

By staging so vividly a university-educated orator’s regret at an ill-advised political intervention, and misguided use of his training, Legge communicates how such powerful skills need to be used advisedly, and how book-learning alone does not always result in good moral decision-making. At this point of the tragedy, through the agonized conscience of Dr. Shaw, Legge educates his

28 Legge, _Richardus Tertius_, ed. and transl. Sutton, pp. 94–95.
student audience about the potentially pernicious effects of rhetorical display, and of badly directed efforts to persuade, harnessing his medium to offer a staged example.

Unsafe Kingdoms: Rhetoric and Power in Campion and Alabaster

Edmund Campion, target of Humphrey’s 1582 polemic, was also aware of drama’s exemplary power; an equally prominent orator during Elizabeth’s 1566 visit, he eventually directed his impressive rhetorical gifts into the composition of Latin drama. Campion’s experience of institutional performance was entrenched: while Humphrey had been in exile during Mary’s reign, as a London schoolboy Campion had delivered a speech to Mary I on her accession in 1553, and in 1566 Miles Windsor lists ‘Mr Campion at Saint Johns’ as one of the ‘Scholars appoynted to receave the Quene’. Such accounts, and Campion’s subsequent career, point to someone keenly aware of all elements of rhetorical performance: expression and costume, gesture, analytical acuity, and adaptiveness to context.

So often cited as a scholarly exemplar himself, by Protestants up until 1570 and thereafter by Catholics, Campion also possessed a strong idea of the exemplary student. He wrote a treatise entitled De iuvene academico (‘On the Scholarly Youth’) which dwells in detail on how the young man tending towards the study of theology should comport himself, and which offers, in its author’s words, ‘quoddam exemplar et quasi speculum iuvenis excellentis’ (‘a certain exemplar and, as it were, a mirror for an outstanding youth’). Campion is concerned that the young man should have performative as well as more interior spiritual and intellectual qualities: his ‘voice’ should be ‘adaptable, sweet and resonant’ (‘voce flexibili, dulci et sonora’, p. 105), for instance. As a poeta, besides the works of Virgil, Ovid and Horace, he ‘imitated Seneca’s tragic verses’ (‘Senecae cothurnos expresserat’, p. 113). And next, as an orator ‘by the sweetness of his speech’ he ‘could most elegantly stir the audience both by his subject-matter and cause’ (‘qui pro re et causa ornatisse poterat auditores sermonis dulcine titillare’; p. 113). Campion figures the academic arena as a place in which one needs strenuously to compete in order to win: ‘And so,

29 Thomas McCoog, The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits (Martlesham: Boydell and Brewer, 1996), p. xv.
30 Nichols, Progresses, 1, p. 474, n. 177.
31 For a relatively recent printed version, see Beati Edmvndi Campiani e Societate Iesv Martyris in Anglia Opvsclv (Barcelona: Franciscus Rosalius, 1888), pp. 103–117, esp. p. 103.
with great hearts and great hope, push on into this wrestling-school of learning’
(‘Itaque magnis animis et magna spe in hanc litterariam palaestram incumbite’, p. 116). Campion’s treatise shows us how seriously he took rhetorical training both for the improvement of the mind and for the training of the ministry. His own background as a celebrity orator at Oxford clearly sharpened his sense of the importance of rhetorical gifts in a theological context, and there is considerable overlap between the skills expected of a scholar and of an orator—even of an actor—described in the treatise.

Campion’s pedagogical theory can be read alongside his tragic practice. His only extant full-length play is Ambrosia, set in the fourth century and performed at the Clementinum in Prague ‘ipso Caesare spectatore’ (‘in the presence of the Emperor’ Rudolf I) in 1578, a year before Legge’s Richardus Tertius.32 Campion’s college audience was most likely younger on average than that of the English university plays, but he nonetheless assumed a high degree of theological sophistication among his spectators. Patrick Collinson has shown how Saint Ambrose’s prioritising of church over state made his story a troublesome one for Elizabethan churchmen like John Jewel, citing Jewel’s citation of Ambrose as an important example: ‘Trouble not yourself, my lord, to think that you have any princely power over those things that pertain to God’.33 As Robert Miola and Alison Shell have discussed, in Ambrosia Campion also takes the opportunity to debate this incendiary topic, which he may have first seen ‘staged’, as it were, in the previously mentioned debates of the 1566 progress visit in which Humphrey also participated, on whether a prince should accede by election or succession, and also whether ‘a private citizen [should] be allowed to take up arms against a bad ruler’.34 Shell’s point that, given its initial performance before Habsburg royalty, we would ‘be misinterpreting Campion to read Ambrosia as a play belittling monarchy’ is well made, as is her argument that nonetheless, ‘princes … must be accountable to the Church in a way that

32 See Wiggins, Catalogue 2, pp. 206–211. All citations from Ambrosia are taken from the text and translation by Jos. Simons (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1970), p. 155.
33 Patrick Collinson, ‘If Constantine, then also Theodosius: St. Ambrose and the Integrity of the Elizabethan Ecclesia Anglicana’, in id., Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), pp. 109–133, esp. p. 109.
34 See Robert S. Miola, ‘Jesuit drama in early modern England’, in Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay and Richard Wilson (eds.), Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 71–86, esp. pp. 76–81; Alison Shell, “We are made a spectacle”: Campion’s Dramas’, in Thomas McCoog and Joseph Munitiz (eds.), The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the early English Jesuits (Martlesham: Boydell & Brewer, 1996), pp. 103–118.
other Catholic monarchs can claim to be’. What we might think of as the ‘radicalizing’ power of Campion’s play—against unaccountable (non-Catholic) monarchs, and for (Catholic) monarchs deferential to the church—in its fertile context at the Clementinum seems clear, and it is worth thinking in more detail about precisely how Campion represents rhetorical skill leading to ecclesiastical and political success. His play can be read as a lesson in how to be both articulate and seditious, in how to direct ‘Seneca’s buskins’ in ‘hanc litterariam palaestram’.

In his 1582 sermon Humphrey had distinguished sharply between play and sermon. In Ambrosia, by contrast, Campion embeds homiletics, hymn, catechism and prayer in his five-act drama to extraordinary effect, blurring the lines between the rhetorical forms. As Legge does in Ralph Shaw’s botched sermon to the citizens of London, Campion also presents a variety of rhetorically performative acts as both exemplary and negatively defined in Ambrosia, to put before the eyes and ears of his audience how a speaker could move or alienate by turns. In Act 11, scene 7 Saints Ambrose and Augustine pray together, singing (the stage direction has ‘Cantant’). In Act 1, scene 4, for example, St. Ambrose preaches (‘Ambrosius Pro Concione’), and presents the dream spectacle of two ephebi (‘young men’; i, 4; l. 154) whose bodies mark the spot where he is to build a basilica. Legge presents us with the ill-judged sermon of Ralph Shaw as an example of bad rhetoric, while Campion gives his audience the skilful and pious sermon of St. Ambrose: both use the medium to present examples of a particular rhetorical act, but Legge uses Shaw to show the pernicious effects of cynical political rhetoric, while Campion charges Ambrose’s sermon with theological polemic. And while Legge had focused on boys’ morality in the abstract and the exemplary youth Edward V in particular, Campion wrote many of the play’s speaking roles specifically for boys, embedding this in the stage directions, as in Act 1: ‘A boy carrying a scourge stands higher than the others and recites’ (‘Puer ferens flagellum stat caeteris altior et recitat’), who then alternates in song with ‘another boy carrying a club and sword’ (‘Puer secundus ferens fustem et gladium’). Boys also provide the play’s rare moments of comic relief, as in 11. 6 where two boys, Syrus and Mopsus, fight and long for games to play. For the most part, the drama of Ambrosia depends on how church and state negotiate each other’s power, but its spectators are not allowed to forget the importance of young men to that delicate balance: in their play-fighting, they unconsciously mirror the more serious battles fought by the powerful.

35 Shell, “We are made a spectacle”, p. 108.
36 Campion, Ambrosia, i.2.s.d. before l. 89; s.d. before l. 110.
The sententious and pedagogical qualities of Legge’s, Gager’s and Campion’s plays extended into the university drama of the late sixteenth century. William Alabaster’s *Roxana*, performed at Trinity College, Cambridge in the mid-1590s, is our final example, a play full of disturbing moments even for those used to the period’s public acts of violent punishment, crude medical treatments and Senecan tragic excess: *Roxana* presents us with a woman gruesomely tortured and children fed to their parents. Alabaster writes brutal yet Sharply visual tableaux into his tragedy, such as the ‘fearefull dungeon’ (or, in the Latin, ‘secretus … thalamus’—‘hidden bed-chamber’, iv, 1; l. 988) reported by a messenger as full of ‘ominous pictures of reproach’ (‘horrenda … signa’—‘fearful tokens’, iv, 1; l. 1016) to which Atossa lures Roxana to her grotesque death. The description also combines two characteristics which we associate most readily with the baroque: first, a painterly eye for *chiaroscuro*: the room is uniformly painted in ‘unstayn’d black’ (‘constans nigror’, iv, 1; l. 1010) against which Roxana’s ‘golden locks’ (‘fulvae comae’, iv, 1; l. 1032) shine; and second, a ghoulish lingering on violence: shortly afterwards, Atossa whips Roxana, then makes her stab her children. Forcing spectators to dwell on the vulnerable, suffering human body, and pushing us into a kind of tragic mode paralleled on the English commercial stage by vernacular dramatists like John Webster, Alabaster also shows his debt to earlier university writing. In *Roxana* too, as in Humphrey’s sermon and Gager and Legge’s tragedies, classical and biblical antecedents jostle for supremacy. Alabaster skillfully juxtaposes both traditions to heighten the horror of the tragic denouement, again in Atossa’s black-hung chamber: neither ‘Egypt wat’red with seaven mighty flouds’ (‘ostiis septum sui | Aegyptus undans’, iv, 1; ll. 957–958) nor ‘a draught of Styx infernall lake’ (‘abhorrendae Stygis | Epotus imber’, iv, 1; ll. 963–964), the oblivion-inducing river Lethe, can make the messenger forget the tragedy. Here, too, characters and particularly royalty instruct through exemplary behaviour: ‘The people take example by their king | He allwayes teacheth best, that liveth best’ (‘Rex plebis est mensura, pietatem docet | Qui facit’, iii, 1; ll. 665–66) says the councillor Arsaces at one point to Oromasdes, King of Bactria.\(^{37}\) Shortly afterwards the two characters engage in the kind of apothegmatic stichomythia we have already observed in Gager and Legge, on general political topics (iii, 1; ll. 727–729):

\(^{37}\) William Alabaster, *Roxana*, ed. Dana F. Sutton, 111,1; l. 674 (www.philological.bham.ac.uk/alabaster); Sutton also reproduces a contemporary English translation by ‘i.b.’ found in manuscript at the Folger Shakespeare Library (ms v.b.222, fols. 29r–37v).
OROMASDES Ius est, salutem quicquid auget publicam.
ARSACES Ius illud esse, iura quod tollit, potest?
OROMASDES Ubi regna non sunt tuta, ius fasque excidunt.

(OROMASDES That which procures the kingdoms good, is right.
ARSACES Can that be right which overthrows all right?
OROMASDES Where kingdoms are not safe the right can’t stay.)

But Alabaster also touches on topics more contentious in Elizabeth’s last decade, however, such as how succession might work when the monarch leaves no heirs. When Oromasdes suggests that ‘Regina sterilis impedit regni vices’ (‘The barren queene denies our crownes succession’), we are reminded of the more oblique (although not necessarily more tactful) 1566 debates in which Humphrey debated on the question of election versus succession. The royal court in Roxana is a petri-dish of vice, too: ‘huc omnis illa turba vitiorum ruit’ (‘All kinds of sins resort unto the court’; 111, 4; l. 882), says Arsaces. Alabaster converted to Catholicism shortly after the performance of Roxana, and perhaps some of that disillusionment with contemporary political institutions finds its way into the play. Elizabeth Richmond-Garza has argued for the ‘subversive content’ of ‘this savage little play’, based on its Orientalism and the agency it accords to its female characters.\(^{38}\) Whether we see Alabaster’s work as deliberately provocative, or fashionably brutal but politically non-committal, the gap between Latin and slightly later English translation is intriguing. The Latin version ends with the desperate fall of Atossa into hell or Hades, battered by dire birds and condemned by Minos, judge of the dead: ‘Abite, volucrespessima. Sequar, sequar’ (‘Minos saith noe. | Then goe yee hellish feinds I come I come’; v, 1; l. 1560). The contemporary English translation, on the other hand, ends with a pious epilogue which begins: ‘Nor ought we to doe one another wrong | Nor wrongs revenge, but leave them unto God: it is as though the translator wanted to provide moral solace, and a kind of didactic tidiness, which the Latin version eschews. Four decades later, when the play was eventually printed, Alabaster dismissed it as a ‘morticianum … abortum’ (‘stillborn abortion’), and, by extension, as juvenilia, suggesting that he has brought this ‘foetum iuventutis’ (‘offspring of youth’) back ‘ad calculos’ (‘for a reckoning’); he

\(^{38}\) Richmond-Garza, “‘She never recovered her senses”: Roxana and Dramatic Representations of Women at Oxbridge in the Elizabethan Age’, in Barbara K. Gold, Paul Allen Miller and Charles Platter (eds.), Sex and Gender in Medieval and Renaissance Texts (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997), pp. 223–246, esp. pp. 224, 227.
also caustically suggests that it should be ‘recited with a froth of sound’ (‘recitare cum spuma soni’), ‘as poets typically read their tragedies’ (‘ut solent poetae tragoedias suas’). As Humphrey had half a century earlier, in retrospect Alabaster finds a way to make university tragedy seem both trivial and pompous.

But the content of such plays during this period suggests the opposite: the monarch kept scholars close during these years, and the academic playwrights responded by staging works of serious-minded political and theological relevance for the benefit of a student audience who would go on to shape the state and church. I do not suggest that their authors envisaged these highly imitative works, typically based on ancient—biblical or classical—subjects, as straightforwardly reflective of contemporary political situations. But the insistence of a tutor-theologian like Humphrey on the ephemerality of drama and even his studied dismissiveness demonstrate a concern that the questions drama raised in the abstract might be absorbed and pondered by its impressionable audience. Humphrey seems well aware that young minds are particularly prone to being distracted by entertainment rather than moved by profound religious truth, and makes it clear that, although both are highly rhetorical and performative modes, the sermon is more edifying than the play, which he accomplishes by emphasizing the relative triviality of drama. Yet despite his sermon’s emphasis on veritas, this stance is disingenuous: if such plays were only ludicra, why bother to argue so vehemently against them? One argument is that a considerable number of early modern Latin tragedies were ideologically engaged, even if that engagement, to modern tastes, acclimatised as we are to more explicitly political dramatists like Berthold Brecht and George Bernard Shaw, seems highly abstracted, as it maybe did to its contemporary spectators. Yet even if the play’s politics look conformist, the spectator’s reaction is unpredictable: well-intentioned orthodox lessons can always be reacted against and twisted. State management of the institutions of learning, and the fact that many Privy Council members including Leicester and William Cecil, to name but two university Chancellors from Elizabeth’s reign, were intimately concerned with the universities, meant that institutional stages were not neutral

39 Alabaster, Roxana tragaedia (London: Gulielmus Jones, 1632), sigs. A3r–v.
40 See Siobhan Keenan, ‘Spectator and Spectacle: Royal Entertainments at the Universities in the 1560s’, in Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, Sarah Knight (eds.), The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Queen Elizabeth I (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 86–103; and Linda Shenk, ‘Gown before Crown: Scholarly Abjection and Academic Entertainment under Queen Elizabeth I’, in Jonathan Walker and Paul Streufert (eds.), Early Modern Academic Drama (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 19–44.
Many of the monarch’s chaplains, bishops and courtiers were taken from universities, and student actors and spectators often grew into politically influential men. And as Humphrey, for one, well knew, given the fluctuations in royal favor which had affected his career throughout the 1550s, court and university were not separate worlds, and the tragedy performed on academic stages reflected their mutual interests.
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