Hellish Enfleshment

Embodying Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Culture

Doctor of Philosophy

Lachlan Malone B.C.A. (Hons)

2015

Abstract

This dissertation focuses on a term that I call "hellish enfleshment": early modern English descriptions of Catholicism that connect anti-papal sentiment to the human body. I examine this term in the work of preachers, poets, political writers, monarchs, and playwrights who not only approach anti-Catholic discourse through corporeal metaphors, but also attempt to link Catholicism with malevolence, disease, political dissension, and discordant sound. Exploring the significance of the human body in anti-papal writing, I investigate how a range of early modern texts located in differing spheres enflesh dramatists' conceptions of the Catholic body in their immediate historical setting. The embodiment of anti-Catholic discourse, I argue, occurs within the early modern English playhouse, as it is in this locale that playwrights attempt to affect playgoers' bodies through sensory phenomena inexorably shaped by contemporary anti-Catholic attitudes. Examining several dramas that explicitly embody anti-papal discourse, the majority of this thesis analyses texts that engage with early modern corporeality through literal and metaphoric allusions to the body: Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1607), Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1606), the anonymous *Lust's Dominion* (c. 1600), and Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (c. 1600). These plays, I argue, engage with the human body or reflect on its role in regard to fashioning anti-Catholic sentiment. Throughout this thesis, I attempt to examine discrete moments and cultural idiosyncrasies in these playtexts, utilising contemporary religious, medical, and political works to investigate the experiential qualities of an anti-Catholic discourse whilst contextualizing this evidence through references to early modern literature. Rather than analyse Catholicism as an international religio-political institution in early modern England, I have chosen instead to examine Catholicism as a domestic phenomenon in the imagination of English playwrights.

Certification of Thesis

The work contained in this thesis is the work of the candidate, and has not been previously submitted for an award. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due acknowledgement and reference is made in the thesis to that work.

Lachlan Malone

Darryl Chalk

Laurence Johnson

Acknowledgements

For Brenda, Jon, Gail, and Hannah.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

An anvil hitting wrought iron sings to the village smithy of medieval Europe. Biblical scripture resonates with preachers who expound that God's words remedy the soul infected with sin. Bloodthirsty crowds welcome the sight of a dismembered corpse convicted of treason. In early modern England, the body of Roman Catholicism does not sing but rather screeches, smells, and appears grotesque to the ears, nose, and eyes of contemporary culture. Taking hold of England's imagination in the sixteenth century, the idea that the Catholic body is an ostentatious eyesore infused with jarring sounds akin to a broken harp and diseased smells similar to a plague-ridden corpse first began to emerge. By the 1600s, the aforesaid conviction blossomed into a popular belief, filling political tracts, dramatic texts, and religious sermons with vivid descriptions of a distinctly reformed Catholic corporeality. The sudden rise of this social phenomenon, however, gradually faded into obscurity following the death of Prince Henry Frederick Stuart (King James's son) in 1612. Anti-Catholic rhetoric in the initial decade of the 1600s, I argue, cultivated groundbreaking motifs that combine experience, corporeality, representation, and anti-Catholicism in a sensory framework.

Hellish enfleshment—a term I have coined to define early modern English descriptions of Catholicism that connect anti-papal sentiment to the human body—signifies the imaginative proportions of Catholic corporeality in English culture at the beginning of seventeenth century. Emphasizing the reciprocal bond between differing culture spheres, ranging from scientific and political domains to religious purviews and drama, I will not only analyse the function of the body within an array of domains, but I will also demonstrate how sensory phenomena (particularly smell and sound) are inexorably shaped by contemporary anti-Catholic attitudes in a range of early modern texts. To achieve this, I dedicate most of the thesis to analysing a set of dramas that personify anti-Catholicism through visual, olfactory, and auditory phenomena.

I offer a close reading of these sensations during the height of English anti-Catholic sentiment in late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England. Rather than analyse the entire catalogue of anti-Catholic drama written or performed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I have chosen to limit my study, for the most part, from 1600 to 1610. Despite calling on material that extends beyond this timeframe I have attempted to perform a comprehensive reading of anti-Catholic drama in the period under investigation. These years, I argue, present a confluence of events pertinent to the formation of the sensory anti-papal discourse I am interested in, ranging from the death of Queen Elizabeth I and London's plague outbreaks to the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. The early seventeenth century, I claim, provided Church of England clergymen, Protestant theologians, medical practitioners, political writers, and poets with ample material for tracts on civic authority, diatribes on spiritual concerns, and pamphlets on disease. Unlike their contemporaries, however, playwrights staged the sensory qualities attached to anti-Catholicism by creating papal characters that embodied the religious, medical, and political ideas intrinsic to reformed writers' formations of Catholicism.

Staging Catholic bodies rampant with plague, papal villains steeped in treasonous commotions, and popish figures contaminated with pathogenic sounds, playwrights presented playgoers with burgeoning anti-papal ideas that dominated the

English stage from the 1570s through to the 1620s. Reaching its height at the beginning of King James I's reign, anti-Catholic drama flourished in the early 1600s, and it was these years that saw the publication of more anti-papal plays than any other decade in English history. Throughout this thesis, I examine how anti-Catholic attitudes shaped Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1607), Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1606), the anonymous *Lust's Dominion* (c.1600), and Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (c.1600). Before discussing how the aforesaid plays embody anti-Catholicism and demonstrate early modern culture's sensory landscape, I will offer a brief overview of the early modern body itself. By focusing on the early modern body, I argue, modern readers are able to recognize how this object provided preachers, politicians, scientists, philosophers, and playwrights with the bedrock that would go on to inform the sensory qualities attached to writers' interpretations of Catholicism.

In early modern England, the human body is an emblematic corporeality that functions in a theological, biologically physiological, and political theoretical context. Drawing on Plato's notions of the body, Thomas Adams in *Mystical Bedlam, Or The World of Mad-Men* (1615) summarises early modern concepts of corporeality. "As man is *Microcosmus*", he explains, the body is "an abridgement of the world". Correspondingly, the soul's counterpart is heaven while the heart's is the earth. The brain (figured as the sun) "gives the light of understanding" and "the senses are set round about, like the *starres*". For Adams, the heart "is like the *roote* in a tree: the organ or lung-pipe, that comes of the left cell of the *heart*, is like the stocke of the tree, which divided it selfe into two parts" ($C1^{r}$). A noteworthy figure in the religious sphere, Adams was a Church of England clergyman and Calvinist Episcopalian. Matriculating from Trinity College, Cambridge in 1598, he graduated in 1602. Two years later he became the deacon of the Lincoln diocese. Labeled the Shakespeare of Puritans by the eighteenth century English poet Robert Southey, he had a flair for evocative sermons and colorful attacks against the Church of Rome (McGee).

> Arguing a Protestant body is a celestial entity in tune with the universe, Adams elucidates the body of a Catholic for readers. "They are ever extravagant persons", he begins, and are "like rotten armes or legges [that] have drop'd from the body". They are "desperate men", he continues, and are "destitute of fidelity": the Catholic "seekes *Rome*, where their former learning, and the better learning of their conscience, is perverted". Instead of resembling the celestial, the Catholic body is figured as a spurious flesh fashioned by Satan. Papal agents maintain a diseased physiology that is responsible for spurting grotesque limbs and emitting gangrenous fumes. Imagining Catholics to speak with a "couzening voice", Adams eventually turns his attention to the pope, arguing that the pontiff is "a strange, stigmaticke, mishapen, half-borne, half-unborne child" whose body resembles early modern visions of the Capitalisation – check for consistency. Note that "the pope" and "jesuits" are mostly presented using lower case, but not "the King," "Emperors," "Protestants" and "Catholics."

Described as cooing at the sight of bloodshed, the deformed pope gurgles and foams at the mouth with poisonous dribble throughout the preacher's sermon. "I know not where" this baby was "bred", he declares, "but this I am sure, whosoever was the father, *Rome* keepes the bastard, and nurseth it with her best indulgence" ($K4^{v}$). The Catholic body, he believes, is more monster than man, and since the flesh has been corrupted through papal rituals ranging from Transubstantiation to the Eucharist the Catholic body is an inherently diseased corporeality.

In early modern England, Catholics are habitually pictured as both diseased and contagious. "Papists" maintain "a poysoned quality", explains William Est in

Sathan Sowing Season (1611) before reasoning that Catholics enter a Protestant Church like a disease entering a body, causing the innards "to swell". A preacher from Bideford and a prolific religious writer, Est repeatedly figures Catholics as unclean spirits that penetrate the body's openings: the eyes, ears, nose, and mouth. Note their "infectious sinne", he warns, and their "filthy tare". Catholics "infecteth the minde […] choaketh all graces" and "breedeth a consumption of all goodnesse in the soule where it is sowne". Catholics poison Protestants with "*Lenta phtisicorum febris*", or a fever, and it is this fever that "cleaveth to the marrow of the bones" and "consumeth the body" (D5^{r}). Subsequently, popish bodies "have nothing sound in the whole masse and body of their religion" (Fielde C7^{r}). Catholic sickness infects Protestants and "sitteth in mens consciences", polluting the body (Est *Sathan* E8^{r}).

In early modern political theory, the body politic expresses the function of the nation's citizens. Regarding the high court of parliament, King James states in *His Majesties Speach in This Last Session of Parliament* (1605), "it is composed of a Head and a Body: The Head is the King, the Body are the members of the Parliament" (D1^{v}). Dividing this body into two sections, James explains the upper house represents the "Nobility [and] Temporall men, who are heritable Councellors to the high Court of Parliament by the honour of their Creation and Lands" (D1^{v}-D2^{r}). Church of England clergymen and Protestant theologians also belong to this house. The lower house, on the other hand, "is composed of Knights for the Shire; and Gentry, and Burgestes for the Townes" (D2^{r}). In this model, the body represents England's Protestant citizens, and while obedient Catholics are included in this representational corporeality they are routinely considered as the infiltratory diseases that dismember the body politic. Speaking of "*passions*" and "those internall acts and operations of the soule" in *David His Oath of Allegeance* (1613), Daniel Price warns King James, "let no Popish *Philistine* come neere the *chaire*, much lesse the *eare* of your greatnesse, to *disgrace truth*" (*2^{v}). "Popish *Physitians*", he continues, "cure the body, by some *Idolatrous* dram, they infect the *soules of their unhappy* rather them *unhealthy patients*" (E3^{v}). Jonathan Gil Harris in *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic* (1998) argues such statements were an attempt to unify the developing Protestant nation, exalting dutiful townsfolk through anti-Catholic prejudice where the enemy is a political and physiological threat to the nation. As he has shown, Catholics represented pathogenic agents capable of infecting reformers' corporeality through acts of treason or spiritual disloyalty (12-20).

Catholicism's intrinsic contagion, specifically the capability to infect Protestant bodies with political treason through a religious conversion, is the focal point for Samuel Harsnett. Offering readers visions of infectious popish bodies *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (1603), Harnsett, the Archbishop of York, describes the Catholic physique by employing contemporary scientific attitudes in lieu of the political prescriptions used by authors such as Daniel Price or King James I. Known for his passionate attacks against both Puritanism and Catholicism, he argues, "this Popish body [is] compiled of so many horrible & detestable treasons" (B4^{r}). Calling on the body of an English Jesuit named William Weston, Harsnett declares papal clergy are "principall limbs of this popish body" whereas the head resembles the Antichrist while the torso is the Whore of Babylon (B4^{r}). "The whole Popish bodie", he laments, "of the Traytors (halfe dead before) did suddainly conceive, how every limb, member, and joynt of that holy bodie did bestir it self, to be serviceable" (B3^{v}). Referring to Catholicism as a "half dead" treasonous body on the verge of extinction due to the seemingly triumphant introduction of Protestantism, Harsnett is perturbed by Jesuits, arguing they are powered by the spirit of Satan and

reanimate the metaphoric papal body in order to sow sedition and breath disloyalty into the hearts of English bodies. Corporeality, as I have briefly indicated, is not only significant to physiological and political mediums but is also profoundly associated with anti-papal discourse, and while early modern writers repeatedly discuss Catholic corporeality there is yet to be a study that investigates connections between the early modern body, anti-Catholic sentiment, personification, and sensory phenomena.

Understanding the personification, or physical embodiment of anti-Catholic thinking, requires investigating papal bodies in an experiential domain: the playhouse. As I will show, English anti-Catholic dramas exemplify cultural motifs through personifications of Catholic monsters and sensory phenomena. Examining the relationship between corporeality and reformers' conceptions of Catholicism in contemporary culture, I investigate how dramatic works intersect with contemporary discussion of religion, politics, and the body. Anti-Catholic playwrights during Elizabeth and James's reign, I posit, stressed audiences experience anti-Catholicism through sight, smell, and sound. Staging visions of the body to engender convincing fears surrounding everyday interaction with members of the papacy, *The Devil's Charter, The Whore of Babylon, Lust's Dominion,* and *Hamlet* embody ideas that extend beyond mere visualizations of early modern life. Anti-papal literature, which had previously gone to great lengths to associate corporeality and bodily experiences with Catholicism, had transformed into an experiential phenomenon within the playhouse during the sixteenth century.

Demonstrating that a prevalent network of ideas pervaded the London stage, the English playhouse showcases how the cultural embodiment of anti-papal texts engaged in themes contemporary to their time. These historical events include, but are not limited to, the accession of the Stuart king, James I; the 1603 plague; the increasing public memorializing of the recently deceased Elizabeth I on the streets of London after her death, and a strong sense of anti-papal paranoia, fuelled by the spectacular circumstances of various failed assassination attempts on Elizabeth's and James's lives. With regard to their theatrical setting, the aforementioned plays represent the dichotomy between specific cultural intertexts and onstage representation. While King James I did not officially condone the identification of the pope with the devil after 1605, this idea is perpetuated in a play that was performed by the Kings Men (James's personal acting company) in 1607: Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*. This then calls into question: how was anti-Catholicism suitably performed in early modern England? Were staging devices and certain characters (such as smoke, music, and ghosts) used to disseminate anti-papal sentiment? How did playwrights go about personifying popish behavior? How did anti-Catholic rhetoric become a site of embodied discourse, and in what ways did such onstage representations relate to contemporary cultural debates about acceptable performance and unacceptable protest? My thesis will pursue such questions.

Mapping the Study of Anti-Catholic Histories

Analysing the history of anti-Catholicism in modern studies reveals a significant gap in the cultural history of Post-Reformation England. At the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars began to investigate the historical events surrounding fluctuations of anti-Catholic sentiment in English culture. In 1908, Roger Merriman provided the first critical account of Catholicism during the seventeenth century: "the reign of Queen Elizabeth of England offers no more fascinating topic for historical research than the government's treatment of her Catholic subjects" (480). Noting how bouts of

anti-papal activity often coincided with moments of real or imagined political tension or crisis, Merriman offers a compelling study unlike anything prior in historical scholarship, revealing how legislation prohibiting religious factions (including both Catholicism and Puritanism) occurred at times when the commonwealth feared for the safety of its Protestant sovereign. Considering that studies focusing on Protestant diatribes against Catholicism generally concentrated on the theological rather than the historical, debating the validity of anti-Catholic rhetoric in place of concentrating on it as a cultural phenomenon, Merriman's study is a unique piece of scholarship at this time.

Several decades following Merriman's investigation into English anti-Catholicism, anti-papal histories slowly became a topic of analysis in early modern studies. In 1971, Carol Z. Wiener, questioning why such a prolonged silence followed Merriman's investigation into anti-Catholicism, argued, "anyone curious about the emotional and intellectual climate of sixteenth and seventeenth century England must perforce be curious about the meaning of Elizabethan anti-Catholicism". Perplexed by a lack of historical investigation into a topic irrefutably linked with the Protestant Reformation, Wiener speaks to the rising tide of scholars concerned with exploring the intricate nature of post-Reformation culture beyond hagiography. Wiener's commentary on Elizabethan and Jacobean society elicited a statement that would come to define scholarly investigation into the history of anti-Catholic literature for the proceeding decades. "Hatred of Catholics, once the private obsession of religious extremists", she claims, "developed into a part of the national ideology". Noting that it is difficult to gauge when this initially occurred, Weiner concludes that by Queen Elizabeth's death, "no good Englishman could have defined his national identity without some mention of his distaste for Rome" (27). This sentiment, she argues, continued to impact national thought well into the proceeding century.

Wiener's exploration of early modern anti-papal discourse generated ongoing discussion in regard to the role of anti-Catholic sentiment in shaping contemporary ideology in Elizabethan and Jacobean culture. Her investigation into anti-Catholicism contributed to the proliferation of groundbreaking scholarship on the Protestant Reformation in the ensuing decades. For example, the 1970s saw the beginning of discussions surrounding the antichrist pope. Explaining the reality and prominence of this figure in religious circles throughout the seventeenth century, Christopher Hill was among the first scholars to make a significant contribution to this topic. His seminal research led to the notion that 1530 to 1640 saw prolonged bouts of religious intensity regarding the identification of the papacy with the Antichrist (*Antichrist* 18-21). Delving further into the Lutheran conviction of the papal beast, Hill reveals that this connection, which in the past exemplified religious heretics and atheistic devil-worshipers, had acquired newfound popularity under a Protestant regime. Expanding on the origins of antichristian popery in Europe, David Whitford argues Martin Luther, for the most part, is responsible for the widespread promotion of this conviction.

Since Hill, a number of scholars have explored the abundant histories associated with the papal antichrist. Analysing the endurance of this figure in the historical imagination of post-Reformation culture, Paul Misner argues that the antichrist pope trope received unceasing encouragement from many English Protestants throughout the nineteenth century. However, he finds this phenomenon was at its most vehement at the turn of the seventeenth century (382). Similarly, Bernard McGinn has argued that charging the pope with the label of Antichrist became a weapon against Catholicism, galvanizing Protestant factions in militant

jubilation throughout the sixteenth century (155). Claiming the antichrist pope represented everything from Christian eschatology to apocalyptic millenarism in Tudor and Stuart England, Richard Bauckham and Paul Christianson both argue in their respective research that Protestants under Elizabeth unendingly supported the notion that the pope is the Antichrist. In recent decades, however, Peter Lake has provided scholars with detailed explanations of this monstrous construction within the Elizabethan and Jacobean period. Analysing puritan preachers that verge on the side of temperance, Lake considers how the antichrist pope led puritan divines such as William Whitaker, Robert Some, William Fulke, and Laurence Chaderton to determine the Antichrist was a figure that resembled Christ's inverted reflection confined to a filthy puddle (162). As Lake suggests, the papal antichrist was not the nebulous creation of a few specific theologians. Rather, the identification of the pope with the Antichrist was a common notion in Elizabethan culture (Lake "William" 570; Lock 197-98). Although the aforementioned scholars acknowledge that anti-Catholic sentiment during the seventeenth century was a multifarious beast, all agree the pope personified the bodily materiality of the antichrist.

Such studies contested the idea Catholicism disappeared once Protestant doctrine came into effect, proposing that papal figures did not simply fade into the background of culture. Alan Dures, building on Wiener's study, argued that England's post-Reformation political policies were largely concerned with the identification and treatment of Catholics. Outlining that the implementation of government legislation resulted in widespread convictions, he argues that men and women found to be practicing Catholicism were fined, murdered, or (oddly enough) ignored. Revisionist historians including Christopher Haigh in *The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation* (1981) and Eamon Duffy in *The Stripping of the Altars* (1992) unpacked this seemingly incongruous range of penalties, suggesting that individuals found practicing Catholicism were either prosecuted or ignored depending on their geographic location. Analysing both papal and anti-papal texts such as early modern penal records, English parliamentary bills, and recusancy fines, Haigh's and Duffy's studies revealed that although England had become a Protestant kingdom under King Henry VIII the nation maintained sundry aspects of the Catholic faith throughout the 1500s. Such revelations challenged pre-existing opinions that the birth of English Protestantism witnessed the extinction of Catholic ceremony and papal edifice in England's post-Reformation landscape.

The continuing pervasiveness of Catholicism in this Protestant period, it would seem, led to an increasing amount of anti-Catholic publications, and it appears that by the early 1600s anti-papal feeling had reached its height in England. Claiming that by 1605 persecution of Catholics was in vogue, Dures observes how anti-Catholic discourse had become a widespread cultural phenomenon by Queen Elizabeth I's death in 1603. As he notes, "By 1610 a number of factors were combining to persuade James towards greater persecution of Catholics" (47). Among these was "the fourth session of the 1604 Parliament, which met in February 1610". This session, he explains, "called for a stricter application of the penal laws and in particular a more stringent administration of The Oath of Allegiance" (47-48). The Oath of Allegiance, a piece of legislation passed in 1605 in response to the Gunpowder Plot (otherwise known as the Jesuit Treason) that occurred in the same year, attempted to separate political allegiance to a Protestant sovereign and Catholic loyalism to a foreign pope. Anthony Milton, on the other hand, suggests this oath was formulated prior to the Gunpowder Plot. Arguing the machination provided a window of opportunity for the Protestant regime, Anthony Milton states,

> Anti-popery in England was more generally preoccupied with fears of plots and conspiracies engineered by Romish priests and Jesuits at home, aimed at the deposition or assassination of the king as the only means of regaining the island for Roman Catholicism. In this respect, the Gunpowder Plot served merely to confirm and intensify long-established fears. It was this political threat from Rome which caused King James himself most anxiety, and which was the engine behind the Oath of Allegiance. (43)

Above all, late Elizabethan and early Jacobean anti-popery faced mounting popularity because of laws like the Oath of Allegiance. Searching archival records and manuscripts, historians determined government policy between 1580 and 1603 reflects growing anxiety about popery and behavior deemed popish (30). In the 1570s and 1580s, Jesuit priests were pictured as pathogenic agents penetrating England's body politic while the Spanish intervention in Ireland's religious affairs became a symbol of revitalized Catholic conspiracy in the minds of many English clergy and politicians. In 1585 an act against seminary priests resulted in the expulsion of Jesuits from the kingdom, and it was this piece of legislation that was responsible for one hundred and twenty three state deaths by 1603 (30-31). More specifically, in 1588 twenty-one Jesuits were sentenced to the gallows while the 1590s saw eighty-eight Catholics put to death (30-32).

Going to great lengths to clarify that anti-Catholic discourse not only reached an unprecedented height at the beginning of the seventeenth century but also that it extended beyond the writings of Puritan parties, historians began to offer close studies of English reactions to real and imagined Catholic foes. The antichrist pope, for example, was examined because of its impact on numerous mediums, ranging from woodcuts to cheap broadside prints. Considering this motif was displayed in a range of ocular mediums during a period known for its "visual anorexia", ophthalmic renderings of anti-popery—like theatre—produced contradictory claims (Collinson 119). Endorsing acts of iconoclasm in order to elevate spiritual reflections, many Protestants endorsed the destruction of Catholic images whilst venerating anti-Catholic images. This confusing relationship between art and Protestantism has led scholars including Tessa Watt, Margaret Aston, Patrick Collinson, and Michael O'Connell to explore England's paradoxical fascination with visual representation. During the same years, Alexandra Walsham, Peter Lake, Alison Shell, and Arthur Marotti offered nuanced studies of anti-Catholic discourse, examining the complexity of England's religio-political landscape. In particular, Shell, Lake, Questier, and Marotti offered revolutionary readings of anti-Catholic discourse in early modern culture, approaching the impact anti-popery had in literary, religious, and political circles whilst noting the overall influence of this distinct discourse in the imagination of English writers.

Representing a turn in early modern studies concerning the prevalence of anti-Catholicism in English thought, scholars' analysed literature beyond the work of early modern politicians and preachers. Authors began studying religious controversies between 1560s and 1660s in poetry, drama, and an array of allegorical literature, but as Shell notes, anti-Catholicism in the literary imagination of English writers is a topic yet to be explored in any substantial capacity. Explaining, "interactions between Catholic and Protestant could never occur without, at the very least, some awareness of anti-Catholicism", she argues,

> With its call to arms against Catholic Babylon on the European stage, anti-popery was a shaping factor to domestic and foreign policy throughout this period, stimulating precautions which at least one historian has argued were

> out of all proportion to any real threat that Catholics could have posed; and, to a degree that is still not fully recognized, it was a stimulus to imaginative writers. These two manifestations of prejudice are inseparably and symbiotically linked. Because of its quest to make differences clear and suppress similarities, religious polemic thrives on distortion; its generic links with satire are a commonplace, but more generally, it is perhaps nearer to imaginative writing than any other theological mode. (*Catholicism, Controversy* 16-17)

Despite Shell's observation, historians, and literary critics (for the most part) did not venture outside of canonical dramatic works, choosing to examine anti-Catholic polemic in texts by Thomas Middleton, Ben Jonson, and Shakespeare. By taking lesser-known playwrights such as Thomas Dekker and Barnabe Barnes (the former of which was present at King James's coronation pageant) into consideration, I argue, offers a transformative understanding of anti-Catholicism shaped by religious, medical, political, and experiential considerations.

In the past, scholars have approached the European Reformation, the formation of English Protestantism, and post-Reformation English culture with an acute sense of how these movements represent moments of social, political, and religious significance. It is clear that an abundant amount of literature exists on these subjects, and this is evidenced by seminal texts ranging from Patrick Collinson's *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (1988), Sheldon Wolin's *Calvin and the Reformation* (1957), Wilhelm Pauck's *The Nature of Protestantism* (1937) to David Cressy's *The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England* (1990), Susan Brigden's *Youth and the English Reformation* (1982), and finally Alexandra Walsham's *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (1993). Such works deal with figures and topics including Martin Luther and his declaration of the pope to be the Antichrist, the death of Mary I, and the accession of King James I. What has not been discussed at great length, and in some cases not at all, however, are the post-Reformation and culturally significant moments of anti-Catholic embodiment that engage directly with key Reformation ideas.

Approaching cultural embodiment through literary texts by Dekker and Barnes (among others), I will demonstrate, requires taking into account the post-Reformation structures of religion, corporeality, medicine, and politics through the prism of a sensory environment: the playhouse. While the latter half of the twentieth century saw the gradual dissolution of the notion that English drama transformed a religious culture into a predominantly secular nation, the argument that drama during the Elizabethan period advocated irreligious institutions, which effectively hollowed both government and entertainment of religious sentiment, quickly began to unravel with studies such as Margot Heinemann's *Puritanism and Theatre* (1982), Martha Tuck Rozett's *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabeth Tragedy* (1984), and Huston Diehl's *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage* (1997) emerging in early modern scholarship. In particular, Diehl's study argued that playwrights in the Elizabethan and early Jacobean regimes accentuated religious orthodoxy through embodying Protestant and Catholic beliefs within a dramatic framework. Exploring the impact of Protestantism on theatre, she argued for an early modern theatricality informed by reformist attitudes in lieu of a vigorously secular analysis of entertainment. Using Shakespeare's plays to support such assertions, Diehl demonstrated that drama often called into question Protestant author's overt fear of theatricality (embodied in Catholic artifice) and simultaneous fascination with

theatricality (anti-Catholic drama). Dramatic representation at this time, she argues, exhibits ardent Protestant propaganda and fervent descriptions of religious instruction (5). The result is a deeply puzzling milieu in which theatre became a tool for religious polemicists to hollow Catholic ritual, replacing papal theatricality with Protestant theatricality. It is this contradictory relationship between religion and theatre that saw scholars begin to analyze the Protestant Reformation's ideological structures further.

Analyzing the extent to which pamphlets encompassed Protestant and Catholic sentiment, scholars began to examine how religious ideals manifested in drama. Such studies, however, largely concentrated on Shakespeare's religiosity, suggesting the playwright's work demonstrated residual traces of Catholic belief and paternal longing. Arguments of this kind are most likely rooted in suggestions that Shakespeare's father, a suspected Catholic, converted the playwright to the papal religion at an early age (Holland). Ignoring the capricious and literary nuances of religious identities in early modern drama, scholars abandoned Shakespeare's dramas to analyze Shakespeare himself. In recent years, however, a new wave of literary critics committed to exploring Shakespearean drama in a sensory context has begun to emerge. Proposing scholars take into account the profoundly unhinged character of spiritual belief that existed in this period, historians and drama theorists are using corporeality to frame discussions that examine how the early modern body reveals a cultural web of sensory patterns.

Embodying Anti-Catholic Ideology in English Drama

Human bodies and cultural embodiment in mimetic, social, political, religious, and medical domains presently captivate drama theorists, literary critics, and historians. In particular, studies in early modern culture reveal historical moments wrought by cultural fantasies and sensory phenomena. The work performed by Gail Kern Paster, Mary-Floyd Wilson, Bruce R. Smith, Jonathan Gil Harris, and Tanya Pollard specifically have shaped the structures and ideas in the later sections of this thesis where drama and cultural personification are taken into consideration against sensory stimuli. In particular, Bruce R. Smith's phenomenological approach to dramatic texts, which uncovers links between corporeality, perception, and the English landscape in what he refers to as a process of "historical phenomenology", is, in part, the methodological crux of the present thesis (6).

In the playhouse, Catholics became spiritually corrupt vessels that polluted Protestant figures with toxic whiffs, illicit reverberations, and religious contaminants. Examining dramas that stage papal bodies as objects designed to be experienced by playgoers provides culturally aware and physiologically detailed evidence that supports the notion that anti-Catholic discourse was not merely a Protestant sermon or piece of government legislation, but rather it was a lived experience. Bruce R. Smith provides a succinct definition of such an approach to early modern literature, arguing historical phenomenology "attempts to reconstruct bodily experience in the past on historically informed terms [...] with respect to the past, such a way of knowing recognizes the embodiedness of historical subjects and attends to the materiality of the evidence they have left behind" (*Hearing Green* 6). Using Smith's definition as a guide, the following chapters approach anti-Catholic literature within an experiential-hermeneutic paradigm.

Experiencing anti-Catholic phenomena in the playhouse, I argue, required little physical participation on behalf of the spectator because of the remarkably assaultive quality intrinsic to drama. This extremely somatic aspect of anti-Catholic

discourse, which is yet to be discussed by modern scholars, came to a peak in the early 1600s, and it is these years that are responsible for transforming corporeal metaphors into physical realities. Consequently, the majority of this thesis examines several dramas that explicitly engage with anti-papal discourse through both literal and metaphoric allusions to the body. Ranging from canonical works to lesser known dramatic texts, these plays attempt to engage with the human body or reflect on its role in regard to fashioning anti-Catholic sentiment. Throughout this thesis, I attempt to examine discrete moments and historical locations in *The Devil's Charter, The Whore of Babylon, Lust's Dominion,* and *Hamlet* by using evidence from contemporary literature to investigate the experiential qualities of an anti-Catholic discourse. Rather than analyse Catholicism as an international religio-political institution in an early modern setting, I have chosen to chiefly examine Catholicism as a domestic phenomenon in the works of English playwrights.

As I will demonstrate, these dramas embody anti-Catholic resonances through olfactory and auditory devices. Entering the stage in Act Two Scene Two in a display of frenzy, Hamlet's appearance indicates a corporeal madness caused by the ghost. Showcasing signs of forgetfulness, Hamlet appears unable to recognize Polonius: "Do you know me", he entreats before Hamlet responds with a resounding yes, stating, "You're a fishmonger" (2.2.173-176). The prince's demonstration of forgetfulness is especially salient when the ghost's words "Adieu, adieu, Hamlet. Remember me" are taken into consideration (1.5.91). As I will discuss in chapters three and five respectively, both forgetfulness and madness function in post-Reformation English culture as evidence of Catholic bodies innate diseases. Catholic bodies, I demonstrate, transmit pathogenic agents and are thus capable of spreading a spiritual contagion that in turn transforms susceptible physiologies into mad vessels steeped in oblivion.

All four dramas, I will show, reveal the historical tones of a decade entrenched in definitions of popish behavior. For example, all forms of dissonant sound or inharmonious noise, such as screams or discordant music were recognized as inherent aspects of Roman Catholicism's pathogenic sounds, and by extension qualities of a Roman Catholic. In Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon*, audiences experience the poetic resonances of musical metaphors that clearly suggest the Catholic body is a musically discordant instrument that infects Protestant bodies with papal contagion and treasonous actions. Similarly, certain colours, such as scarlet and black, and various animals, such as owls and toads, and acts including fornication and incest, were all deemed popish. Performed during years when most English Protestants held that James's religious authenticity was dubious, and the ever-present fear that Spain, despite its spectacular failure with the Armada of 1588, would once again attempt to usurp the English crown, these texts are an example of how terms such as monstrous, infectious, and dissonant are experiential descriptions of the papal body.

Viewing anti-Catholic discourse through a phenomenological lens involves analyzing the cultural sensations that accompany contemporary experiences of anti-papal literature. This approach, which adopts Martin Heidegger's definition of phenomenology insofar that I will discuss the physical sensations that are intricately woven into anti-Catholic idiom, draws attention to the experiential features that in turn characterize early modern conceptions of anti-Catholicism. Until recently, phenomenological studies of the body in the history of drama have restricted corporeality to a fixed moment, utilizing an over-arching definition of phenomenology bound by a fixed trajectory. Disregarding the cultural context connected to such moments, however, misses the historical constitutions of those

experiences and thus fails to explore the parameters of a phenomenon in any given historical moment. Perception relies on the body's participation in a period's circumstance: phenomenology is the culturally informed experience that shapes the circumstance.

While historical phenomenology is the dominant methodology I apply throughout this thesis, my focus on the persistence, as well as the continuing evolution, of anti-Catholic discourse traditionally associated with historical, literary, and dramatic research allows me to draw on several methodologies simultaneously. For example, the work of Reformation historians such as Peter Lake, Michael Questier, Christopher Haigh, and Alexandra Walsham alongside critics who discuss anti-Catholic literature such as Alison Shell and Arthur Marotti inform the initial chapters of the thesis. Later chapters, on the other hand, call on the research of historians who analyze early modern disease and plague such as Jonathan Gil Harris, Margaret Healy, and Rebecca Totaro. In later chapters, I call on studies that examine the body's humours, passions, and senses in a phenomenological framework. Using research by Gail Kern Paster, Bruce R. Smith, Mary Floyd-Wilson, Bruce Johnson, and Carla Mazzio, I examine how smell and sound in particular are essential to understanding anti-Catholicism in its historical setting. Approaching the early modern period through the body, I call on diverse contemporary methodologies when it is appropriate to do so. As Paster explains with reference to emotion, this intermethodological approach, which is equal parts historical phenomenology, cultural history, and a theatre study, is "transactional not only in being a response to a stimulus—whether that stimulus is external or internal, real or imaginary, present or remembered—but also in occurring, almost inevitably, within a dense cultural and social context" (8). In the following chapters I argue that anti-Catholic literature is an "affective discourse" that participates in our understanding of how early modern people engaged with cultural phenomena (24).

The thesis itself is divided into six chapters. The types of embodiment that I examine in the following chapters—chiefly religious and dramatic—have been chosen because more than any other of England's cultural spheres, their representation of Catholicism in Elizabethan and early Jacobean culture illustrate the influence of medical and political opinions, particularly those associated with disease and political treason. The first two chapters establish a religious, medical, and political context in the intensely anti-Catholic decades leading up to the beginning of the seventeenth century. Both sections highlight the importance of the papal body in divergent spheres and introduce a corporeal paradigm from which the remainder of the thesis emanates.

Chapter one examines the anti-papal polemic of religious writers' sermons, treatises, and dialogues. Rather than focus on the writings of a few religious extremists, I have chosen to analyze a range of mainstream, moderate, and more hardline preachers in an attempt to demonstrate that anti-Catholic formulations surrounding the papal body are more than historical curiosities upheld merely by crazed fanatics and religious zealots. Although modern audiences often ascribe the term "Protestant" to signify the opposite of Catholic, in early modern England this label represented an acutely fragmented community comprised of divergent members including Anabaptists, Calvinists, Church of England Separatists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans. Protestants, an assemblage of intensely disjointed proportions, were still able to agree on particular topics and specific issues with respect to anti-papal rhetoric though, and this is no more evident than in relation to corporeal configurations of the biblical Antichrist and Whore of Babylon; or, the pope and Catholic Church

respectively. Using the Book of Revelation as a basis for creating corporeal formulations of Catholic bodies, preachers under Elizabeth I and King James I envisioned popish monsters in place of pontiffs, cardinals, bishops, monks, and Jesuits.

In chapter two, I examine a range of Elizabethan and early Jacobean events pertinent to the development of continuing prejudice against Catholicism through the cultural lens of plague, politics, and sound. The goal of this chapter is to briefly provide a historical impression of the medical, diplomatic, and sensory motifs at the core of anti-papal sentiment that inform the later chapters of this thesis. Chapters four, five, six, and seven, on the other hand, reveal how the heritage of anti-Catholic sentiment explored in this section led to the application of culturally informed sensory phenomena in the English playhouse in the early 1600s. Revealing how a network of disastrous events from the plague in 1590s and 1600s to treasonous conspiracies intended to dismember England's Protestant body politic led to growing concern over the papal body, chapter two discusses early modern occasions of disease, civil discord, aural dissonance, and anti-Catholicism.

Chapter three addresses the origins and elaboration of papal representation within the playhouse in post-Reformation English culture. Offering spectators fits of leisure, religio-political spectacles, and images of intense propaganda, anti-Catholic drama not only recast papal figures in a decidedly Protestant light but also came to epitomize a cache of texts that were a part of a broader entertainment continuum informed by social, religious, and economic realities. The English Reformation, I explain, is responsible for the creation of a new theatrical genre: anti-Catholic drama. Appearing initially during King Edward I's governance in 1549 and reaching its height in King James I's rule, anti-Catholic spectacle offered theatregoers ocular proof of malignant Catholics through the outward display of alleged popish qualities including sorcery, violence, and greed. Drawing on the graphic visualizations of Catholic corporeality common in religious sermons, playwrights emphasized the sight of papal bodies in a mimetic domain. Staging iniquitous Catholics cultivated novel papal stereotypes, and the dramatic manifestation of the Roman Clergy, I explain, are organized into five Catholic stereotypes: the antichrist pope, magical friars, papal fools, bloodthirsty clergymen, and diseased Catholics. Arguing dramas such as Nathanial Woodes's *The Conflict of Conscience* (1581), Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1588), and John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* (1612) are responsible for personifying the aforesaid archetypes, I demonstrate that the optical nature of anti-Catholic plays reflects sellable sentiment, popular ideas, and the relationship between dramatic convention and the emblematic body in King Edward VI's, Elizabeth I's, and King James I's reigns respectively.

Against this background of anti-Catholic embodiment, the remaining chapters consider the cultural significance of smell and sound in a selection of groundbreaking dramas that explore the cultural traces of socially informed experiences.

Chapter four analyses how shifting conceptions in early modern medicine allowed playwright Barnabe Barnes to use the terminology of disease to articulate anti-Catholic ideas that are imbued with the vernacular and sensory qualities associated with plague literature. Staging an insalubrious pope rampant with corporeal sickness and spiritual disease, Barnes personifies unsavory smells and infectious odors in *The Devil's Charter* (1607). The play, which focuses on the supposed exploits of a Catholic family, is the first drama to use olfactory infection and contagion in an ant-Catholic framework.

The fifth chapter studies the interplay between the politically charged resonances of aural phenomena and treasonous Catholics by continuing to track the significance of the papal body in drama. In this section, I demonstrate that not only does Catholicism embody a specific sound in Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1607), but also that Catholic bodies emit contagious reverberations capable of infecting English Protestants with dissonant behavior. Representing inharmonious sounds and pathogenic noises, Catholic characters throughout the drama recurrently coax English bodies into committing treason, dissension, and other actions perceived to be Catholic. In contrast, the leading Protestant body in the play, which is a monarch modeled on Queen Elizabeth I, symbolizes a harmonious apparatus. Hearing even the faintest of Catholic sounds because of the papal body's inability to cease producing jarring noises, the Protestant sovereign in the drama is able to detect dissonant bodies through acts of aural physiognomy and providential hearing.

In chapter six, smell and sound converge in the embodiment of papal figures. In this chapter, I build upon the idea that Catholic bodies maintain pathogenic traits, arguing papal figures did not simply stir one's passions and humours with their presence and in doing so affect Protestant ontology. Catholic smells and sounds, I argue, are imagined as entering susceptible bodies and transforming non-Catholics into Catholics. Analyzing the anonymous drama *Lust's Dominion* (c.1600), I reveal that the sensory aspects of anti-Catholic sentiment within the play result in the religious conversion of a foreign body: Eleazar the Moor. This religious transformation then onsets a physiological alteration, inducing psychosis in the drama's leading character and transfiguring his physical and spiritual corporeality into that of the Catholic body.

Finally, chapter seven investigates the phenomenological landscape of anti-Catholic reverberations in *Hamlet*, arguing notions surrounding the papal body in early modern culture were far-reaching and intricate. In this section, I examine the significance of taking anti-Catholic sentiment into account when analyzing Hamlet's interaction with the ghost. In particular, I allow sensory phenomena to frame the chapter's discussion, suggesting that sound and hearing must be approached in the play from an experiential perspective. I posit that hearing directly relates to a sense of being within the drama, and in doing reveal the consequences of ingesting dangerous sounds common in anti-papal discourse.

While anti-Catholicism is the thematic rope that binds this thesis together, each chapter explores in varying degrees anti-papal writing that either called on the body to further metaphoric images or engaged with the body in an attempt of empirical persuasion. As I will demonstrate, the early 1600s produced a set of dramatic texts that detail with extraordinary magnitude what it meant to encounter a Catholic body in early modern England. Exhibiting an unparalleled theological, hermeneutic, and epistemological impact on early modern English culture, this decade experienced intense cases of plague outbreak and treasonous plots that in turn affected the dichotomy between anti-Catholic sentiment and cultural embodiment. Hellish enfleshment thus signifies the dramatic personification of anti-Catholic literature within the framework of corporeal metaphors, cultural realities, and experiential nuances.

Chapter 2

Constructing Hellish Visions of the Catholic Body

In the decades following Martin Luther's public rejection of Catholicism, descriptions of the papal body consumed Protestant writers' imaginations. In England, the effect of Luther's declaration that the Catholic Church resembled a hellish beast provoked woodcuts of monstrous limbs, gangrenous members, and distorted flesh, and inspired writers to reformulate the physical appearances and personal attributes of church figures. Following Protestant writers' literary attacks on the pope, the church, and the clergy, several reconfigured Catholic bodies began to appear in English sermons. Among the most popular of these reimagined Catholic bodies were the antichrist pope, the Whore of Babylon, and viperous bishops. Providing writers with a reformed papal hierarchy, Protestant writers utilised scriptural exegesis to explain the biblical origin and significance of these religious constructions within England. In this chapter, I analyze the cultural implications of taking these reformed bodies—the antichrist pope, the papal Whore of Babylon, and the beastly clergy—between the mid-sixteenth century and the initial decades of the seventeenth century into consideration.

The accession of Queen Elizabeth I in the 1550s heralded the sustained proliferation of anti-Catholic discourse across a range of textual and sensory mediums in England. Following the death of Queen Mary I in 1558, anti-papal representation flooded the English printing press, the pulpit, and the playhouse. Among the many motifs and nuances of a once emerging phenomenon, corporeality, I argue, became a polemical centerpiece in the established landscape of Elizabethan anti-papal harangues surrounding the antichrist pope, the popish Whore, and the monstrous clergy. In particular, reformers' used a bodily configuration to frame anti-Catholic idiom, exchanging nebulous formulations for literal descriptions. Contemporary opinion surrounding Catholic corporeality, however, went beyond the imagination of a few religious extremists, and by the early 1600s Protestant theologians, Church of England clergymen, religious controversialists, reformed separatists, and Puritans were describing in exceptional detail Catholicism's metaphoric head, torso, and limbs. These body parts, which correspond to the pope, the church, and the clergy respectively, each contained their own imaginative complexities. Envisioning the Catholic body's hellish corporeality, reformed preachers, controversial theologians, and Protestant writers describe in extraordinary detail the appearance and function of papal figures. Although the Catholic body's torso and limbs are discussed in vivid detail in the aforesaid writers' works, it is the pope who is habitually examined because he is the chief emblem of the monstrous Catholic body. From hardline Puritans to more moderate Protestants, ministers re-imagined, I argue, the body of Catholicism by replacing visions of everyday men with otherworldly monsters.

Focusing on Jacobeans' fascination with beastly oddities, Katharine Park and Lorraine Daston reveal that conceptions of monsters throughout this period are more than crude stories and mythological fables confined to an archaic past. The topic of both cultural and scientific interest, monsters were frequently discussed throughout the seventeenth century. For example, the early modern scientist Francis Bacon dwells upon unusual figures and distorted physiques on several occasions in his pamphlets. Advising philosophers in *Novum Organon Scientiarum* (1620) to compile a comprehensive list of "monsters", "prodigious births", and all "which is new, rare, and unusual in nature", Bacon rationalizes that this must be performed with "rigorous

selection" in hopes of compiling practical evidence on the appearance and behavior of early modern beasts (qtd. in Daston and Park 20). In contrast, discussions of popish monsters are first found in the writings of Martin Luther. Employing Philipp Melanchthon to illustrate visions of papal beasts, Luther recognized the importance of the monster figure in post-Reformation polemics and so built upon the medieval tradition that identified literary beasts with social calamity and civil turmoil. Finding their home in the broadside ballads throughout the English Reformation, monstrous visions of an antichristian papacy became definitive images in the Protestant mindset (26-28).

Michael Riordan and Alec Ryrie discuss one such example as they explain how Stephen Gardiner (the Bishop of Winchester from 1531 to 1555), often times engrossed in the evangelical practice of creating anti-papal fabrications, would illustrate grotesque caricatures of Catholics' heads (1043). According to Gardiner, the Catholic "church could not be an abstraction" (1045). Rather, "it needed a human face" (1045). Indeed, the writings of Protestant polemicists demonstrate the conventions and influences of anti-papal descriptions that support the idea that Catholicism is a religion comprised of lurid members and dangerous forms.

The pope's grotesque body, which is the principal focus of the hellish body at this moment in time, is comprised of deplorable materials that double as bodily indispositions. Publishing the first English translation of the German reformer Thomas Naogeorg's *The Popish Kingdome* in 1570, Barnabe Googe explains in the epistle to the reader that this work is "chiefely made for the benefite of the common, and simpler sorte" (A1^{r}). Highlighting that the sin of pride enlivens popish bodies, Naogeorg describes the head of the Catholic Church as "lewde and monstrous" (R3^{v}). The mortal sin of pride, which is the chief transgression amongst the seven deadly sins for Protestant ministers during this period, is coded Catholic because the pope, as Walter Lynne expounds, "boasteth himself to be God" (B1^{r}). Providing readers with vivid accounts of the pope's physique, Laurence Deios makes similar statements, explaining the pontiff is "Proude lyke the Lyon, cruell lyke the Beare, filthie like the Swine, full of poyson through his blasphemies like the Dragon, and yet in shew of *hornes like the Lambe*" (D5^{r}). Basing their opinions in eschatological scripture, ministers label the pope a "*beast*", "*whore*", and "*dragon*" (Sohn A6^{r}). He represents Saint John's vision of "*the man of sinne*, *the sonnne of perdition*", and "*the Adversarie*" (A6^{v}).

The pope's outward appearance suggests religious piety and spiritual divinity, however beneath such habits of suppression exists a twisted body wrought by sinful acts including fornication, murder, and usury. The Book of Revelation, which was crucial in the formulation of such opinions, offered comprehensive readings of a distinctly popish corporeality, invoking visitations of leviathans in lieu of Catholics. Representing the metaphoric head of the Catholic body, the pope afforded contemporary English writers a figure worthy of intense description.

The Antichrist Pope

The antichrist pope was a truly monstrous being in the cultural imagination of sixteenth and seventeenth century England. Many early modern authors describe how the pope has "flaming eyes, a great hooked nose, bloody teeth, and long crooked nailes" before describing his discordant sounds and dissonant resonances (Beard Ggg2^{r}). "Braying out [in] an hideous voice", the pope permeates Protestant bodies with a hideous totality (Ggg2^{r}). Attuning their gaze to the papal antichrist, Protestant

writers throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean period published tracts grounded in biblical exegesis that recognized the pope as the head of an antichristian body. Between the 1550s and early 1600s a number of writers emerged who depicted the pope as the source of Christian deviancy and religious ineptitude. "This whole body of Antichrist hath an yron forhead", John Fielde explains, "& a brazen brow, a crooked & a poisoned tong" (B3^{r}). Fielde, a Protestant clergyman who dedicated much of his time to producing anti-Catholic discourse in this period, reasons that the pope has "eares like those of an Asse" and "the head of a Wolfe" (B2^{r}). For the playwright Robert Greene, "this Antechrist the Pope" is a "monster" (B2^{r}). Functioning as the head of a monstrous corporeality, the antichrist pope captures Protestant feelings that the Catholic body is a mass of contorted flesh and hellish imperfections. Drawing on Revelation to explain the corporeal significance of the antichrist pope, preachers express their concern over potential interactions between the Antichrist and Protestant bodies.

From publishers to preachers, the papal antichrist faced rigorous investigation in the early modern sphere. The Bishop of Derry, and supporter of Calvin's doctrines on predestination, George Downame was a popular theorist among his contemporaries. Arguing that, "*the Pope is Antichrist*", Downame calls on "the prophecies of scripture" to shed light on the Roman Church, which is "*the whore of* Babylon, *and synagogue of Antichrist*" (A2^{v}-A3^{r}). "*Papists*", he argues, are "*the limmes of Antichrist*" (A3^{r}). Relating the "filthy contagion" of the papal doctrine, and how it spreads though the Church, he states the Book of Revelation is a "mysticall and allegoricall" work that requires theological analysis and dissemination throughout the commonwealth (Q2^{r}). "For example", he writes, "in that thirteenth chapter, where the Holy Ghost speaketh of the marke of the beast, which the followers of Antichrist should receive on their foreheads & on their right hands", Catholics interpret this in a literal sense whereby the marked will receive a token akin to a cattle brand (Q2^{r}). Arguing this view is too material an interpretation the bishop reasons the antichrist's mark is a mystical symbol that is visible to perceptive Christians. Although allegory runs deep throughout Revelation, Downame maintains the material and immaterial be conflated if the book's message is to be understood by readers.

Henoch Clapham also shares this view. Born in Lincolnshire, Clapham appears to have been a dedicated Presbyterian minister during the 1590s before rejecting the Church of England's doctrine some years later. Accused of religious separatism and ecclesiastical dissension in 1593, Clapham nonetheless insists in his pamphlets that both Puritans and religious secessionists are his enemies (Walsham "Henoch"). An unconventional character, the preacher in *A Chronological Discourse* (1609) offers a unique perspective regarding apostolic policy and Christian asceticism. "The word *Ecclesia*", he writes, "or Church, doth sometimes intend, the whole mysticall Body of Christ Jesus" (C2^{r}). At other times, it represents Christian bodies that fight against immoral trappings: money, rapacity, and the flesh. Concerning Babel, the author explains, this Biblical site "is two fold: *Literall* or *Spirituall*: The *literall*, is a name given; first to a *Tower*, then afterwardes to some *Citie*" (L4^{v}). An "instrument of opposition to the Church", spiritual Babel represents "*Rome*, or for the whole *politicall body* of false Christians" (L4^{v}). Preaching on Jesus Christ, or the "churches divine head", Clapham explains to readers that the world during Christ's visitation was an abode for religious corruption and men who desired to "become Gods" (I4^{v}). "One that was verily God", he continues, "must stoope downe to become verily Man" (I4^{v}). For Clapham, the Antichrist is God's antithesis in faith, manners, and appearance. Accordingly, "the First Beast" in Revelation "is the

Body of the *Romaine*" (L1^{r}). Declaring himself Christ's ambassador, the pope is not anti-pneuma (representative of Satan) he is the Antichrist because he is a physical being.

Walter Lynne, on the other hand, aligns doctrine on the antichrist pope with theological interpretations of the Catholic Church's spiritual being. Moving from Antwerp to London in the 1540s, Lynne was an active publisher and translator under Edward VI (Pettegree). In 1547, the English sovereign commissioned Lynne to translate and publish Joachimus's *Vaticinia, Sive, Prophetiae*. Published in 1588 as *A Most Necessarie Treatise, declaring the beginning and ending of All Poperie, or the Popish Kingdome*, Lynne opens the dedication by proclaiming, "this little booke" offers the lives of Bishops "at their first beginning, what their estate was and condition, and what was their office or duetie" (A2^{v}). Several pictures of a papal figure accompany descriptions of the pope standing on an eagle, talking with a fox, grasping an eagle by the throat, listening to the devil, and maiming a lamb with a sword. Declaring that Catholics acknowledge, "the Pope is the supreame head" of the Roman Church (C1^{v}-C2^{r}), the author offers readers an illustrative example of how the pope acquired power of "spirituall and temporall matters over all Christendome" (E4^{v}).

Thomas Mason and Thomas Beard's diatribes on the antichrist pope contain similar themes. A Church of England clergyman, Mason's *A Revelation of the Revelation* (1619) functions as the title suggests. His exploration of the text is predominantly a replication of the Geneva Bible's anti-Catholic commentary: perhaps published to offer readers a copy of the aforementioned discourse after the King James Bible eradicated the previous account. "Whosoever shall worship the *Image* of the *Beast*", he warns, "that is, the *Pope*, and receive the print of his name, that is, make holinesse in crossing himselfe, and in other superstitions, hee shall drinke of the wine of the wrath of God" (E8^{v}). Expressing distaste for Catholic ceremonies, Mason supports a Puritan outlook. His belief that "the *Pope* taketh to himselfe that which onely belongeth to *Christ*, to have all power in *Heaven* and earth, and whatsoever prerogative the *Scripture* attributeth to *Christ*" he "blasphemously taketh himselfe" is, however, reminiscent of more moderate theologians (E4^{r}). The pope "is like the *Leopard*", he argues, "no *Beast* is so beautifully spotted as the *Leopard* is; so no *Emperour* or *King* was ever so richly or gloriously decked with gold and precious stones, as the *Popes* have beene" (E4^{v}). Describing how the pope's hands resemble talons, Mason depicts the pontiff with the "clawe[s] [...] of a *Beare*" and the "mouth of a *Lyon*" (E4^{v}). Like the commentary in Revelation of the Geneva Bible, these descriptions theriomorphize the pope in order to represent his autocracy, viciousness, and temporal strength over Kings and Emperors.

A prominent religious polemicist and Protestant theologian, Thomas Beard conveys to readers how the mark of the beast is both literal and metaphoric. The mark is a symbol that implies there is a difference between the Christian and antichristian faith. In a literal sense, the antichrist's mark pertains to speech (oration relays the images of the mind to a listener) or mannerisms (rites and ceremonies). "These different acceptations of the word", he writes, "shew plainly, that the *Papists* who retaine the word to some corporall and visible marke to bee imposed by *Antichrist* upon his followers, doe manifest wrong unto the *Holy Ghost*" (R2^{r}-R2^{v}). Beard's outlook emphasizes the corporeal qualities of a symbol employed to convey the allegoric. To modern readers, and perhaps to Protestantism's early modern enemies, this is a deeply paradoxical conclusion that emphasizes the visibility of an unseen metaphor. However, these writers are merely suggesting the antichrist's mark is a

liturgical sign that can be seen in Catholic lore rather than physical insignias: to simply be a Catholic was to don the antichrist's mark.

Constantly employing particular verses of Saint John's Book of Revelation to further anti-Catholic imagery, Protestant preachers use scriptural exposition as the basis of theological arguments that confirm the pope's antichristian status. Religious pamphlets generally call on Revelation Chapter Nineteen Verse Nineteen in order to achieve this correlation: "and I saw the beast, and the Kings of the earth, and their warriors gathered together to make battle against him that sat on the horse and against his army". "The beast here spoken of", Laurence Deios argues, "is the Pope of *Rome*" (A4^{v}). The kings of the earth, on the other hand, refer to "the princes that submit themselves to the obedience of him: their *armies*" are "captaines", "warlike souldiers", and "sundry sortes of Ecclesiasticall and spiritual persons, as they call them, which either by force of armes, or by witte and eloquence, by strength or pollicie fight for him" (A4^{v}). Unlike his puritan contemporaries, Deios, a hardline ecclesiastic from Shropshire, acknowledges the antichrist pope whilst condemning puritan sects because of their asinine views (Allen). Striving to provide a succinct account of the papal antichrist throughout the diatribe, Deios submits to the reader that the "devill is doubtlesse the chiefe leader of all that fight against our Saviour". However, he is not the beast, argues Deios, but instead "*giveth his power to the beast*." Rather, the "*beast* is a visible earthly power raised up by the divell" (A5^{r}-A5^{v}). According to Deios, "this *beast* [...] is the *Pope of Rome*" (A5^{v}).

For various preachers, the pope is the source of antichristian pride and this moral disease spreads from the head to infect the remaining corporeality of the Catholic body. Coursing through the papal body's veins, the antichrist pope issues a poisonous toxin that descends into the papal torso and limbs, infecting the Catholic body with a noxious blood. Before examining how these emblematic motifs engender anti-Catholic sentiment in relation to the Catholic body's beastly limbs, it is necessary to analyze the significance of the Catholic torso in Protestant polemics. The Catholic body's torso: or, the Whore of Babylon, signifies the Catholic Church. Unlike concepts surrounding the antichrist pope however, which Protestant writers undoubtedly derived from both theological interpretations of biblical scripture and Martin Luther's treatises, the corporeal details concerning the Whore of Babylon stem largely from the Book of Revelation.

Scriptural Exegesis and the Whore of Babylon

The Book of Revelation and its accompanying Protestant commentary influenced religious representations of the papal body in early modern culture. Published in 1560, the Geneva Bible was England's authorized Protestant edition of Christian scripture. In addition to containing Christian scripture, the Geneva Bible also included explicit descriptions of Catholic figures amidst apocalyptic images of a spiritual Armageddon. Many Protestants reviled the anti-Catholic commentary that sat alongside the New Testament whereas Puritans revered the annotation because of its derogative dialect and radical axioms. Nonetheless, the Geneva Bible and its explicit commentary shaped English views of Catholicism for several decades. In an effort to calm the intensifying odium of Catholicism, which had reached its zenith by the early 1600s (a point to which I will return in the following chapter), King James I published the King James Bible in 1611. A noticeable difference between the Geneva Bible and the KJB is the removal of the anti-papal commentary in the latter. Although several

other conspicuous alterations distinguish the two versions, one of the more perceptible alterations is the elimination of each chapter's opening argument.

A detailed argument prefaces The Book of Revelation in the Geneva Bible. This critique, otherwise known as the overview of the chapter, is that of "the livelie description of Antichrist [...] whose time and power notwithstanding is limited" (FFf2^{v}). Catholics, the writers describe, are "permitted to rage against the elect" however their "power stretcheth no farther then to the hurt of [...] bodies" (FFf2^{v}). Catholics and Protestants alike believed God would allow Satan to procure souls under the guise of Christianity and religious doctrine for a period. The Holy Spirit then consumes Christ's antithesis in a display of sacred retribution. Protestants situated their Catholic adversaries in this prophetic scaffold whilst Catholics cited their Protestant enemies. In the argument at the beginning of Revelation, Catholics retain both masculine and feminine values through allusions to the duplicitous Whore of Babylon.

The Whore of Babylon represents the church, or rather the members that comprise the church: Catholics. Superficially, Catholics resemble Protestants: the body acts as a screen for both camps, obscuring one's metaphysical essence. However, unlike the pope, which I will explain shortly, the Whore of Babylon encapsulates the misshapenness of the Catholic body somewhat in its entirety. A wholly metaphoric symbol, the Whore represents the body of Catholic believers, embodying idolatrous behavior, materiality, and fanaticism. These believers are those who attend Catholic Church, practice papal ceremonies, and participate in clerical duties. Masculine attributions arise from the Whore's submission to its head the pope whilst its femininity is tied to contemporary opinion surrounding sexual disease and the Protestant value placed in religious ceremony and popish tradition.

In Revelation, The Whore of Babylon is indisputably the rhetorical body of a larger Catholic corporeality. Described as "false teachers" inspired by knowledge from "the depe dungeon of hell", Catholics are pictured as the beguiled souls who have succumbed to Satan's illusions (FFf3^{v}). Directly after association between popery and Luciferian artifice, the 1560 commentary records descriptions of symbolic imaginings concerning violence, disease, and the body: "And I loked, & beholde, a pale horse" (FFf4^{v}). Signifying "sicknes, plagues, pestilences, & death", the horse is but one of the many images masked in allegory throughout the chapter (FFf4^{v}). Emblematic imaginings concerning the Catholic Church eventually culminate in later sections:

> And the first Angel blewe the trumpet & I saw a starre fall from heaven unto the earth, and to him was given the keye of the bottomles pit. And he opened the bottomles pit, and there arose the smoke of the pit, as the smoke of a great fornace, and the sunne, and the ayre were darkened by the smoke of the pit. (GGg1^{r})

In this passage, the star represents the clergy. As part of this ministry, the pope emerges as the leader, or metaphoric head. The vessels of Catholic ministry, popish preachers retain precise qualities. Although the body of Catholicism represents the church, the limbs of this papal corporeality are reserved for the clergy alone—a notion that I will return to shortly.

Offering readers compelling exposés of the papal torso, Thomas Whetenhall focuses on the Whore of Babylon. Like previous writers, Whetenhall grounds his opinion in theological elucidation. For the most part, Whetenhall is an obscure religious figure in the Christian underground. Records show, however, Josias Nicholls (a religious controversialist) faced the Star Chamber in 1606 on charges of aiding the

publication of Whetenhall's *A Discourse of the Abuses Now in Question in the Churches of Christ* (1606). Whetenhall, on the other hand, did not face court. Presumably he was living abroad (perhaps in the Netherlands) during these years. In any case, he was most likely a Protestant separatist minister on the run because of accusations relating to Catholic continuity within the Church of England (Usher). These attacks can be seen in the pages of the aforesaid pamphlet. "*Christian Reader*", the pamphlet begins, "*it is well knowne to all men, how odiously the adversaries of the Churches reformation in England do accuse and defame the seekers of the said reformation with Noveltie, Singularity, Schisme, Error*" and "*many other such like most foull crimes*" (*2^{r}). A staunch opponent to the Church of England, Whetenhall nevertheless agrees with his Protestant enemies when analyzing the Book of Revelation. "The Babilonish whore", he argues, "is the great Cittie, that in *Johns* time reigned over the Kings of the earth, which all men know was the Cittie of Rome; and now calleth her selfe *the Catholique Church*" (A2^{r}-A2^{v}).

Although the minister deems the protraction and appropriation of Catholic ceremonies in Reformed sermons as dregs of antichristian practices, he contends papal edifice is the source of satanic influence within England. "*Christian minds ought not to be occupied in outward rites & Ceremonies*", he implores the reader, "*but to be fed by the word, to be instructed by the Sacraments, to be inflamed unto prayers, to be confirmed in good works, and excellent examples of life*" (L4^{r}). Recalling Clapham's discussion of *ecclesia*, Whetenhall acknowledges how in recent times "there hath been contention, what a Church is" (K2^{v}). Grounding his view of the term in the Holy Scriptures, the author calls on "the minde of the spirit" before arguing a Church is simply a company who "do believe in Christ their only head" (K2^{v}). "Who knows this church", he asks, "only but God" (K2^{v}). This is an example of the mild intensity Whetenhall throws toward the Church of England, reserving more heated discussion for Catholicism. "But what shall we say of the *Pope*, *Cardinalls*, and *Bishops*, which come togeather into a Counsell", he asks readers (K2^{v}). "Are not they also the Church?" Responding to his own question, Whetenhall answers, "they are only members of this Church if so be it that they believe in Christ & acknowledge him for their head" (K2^{v}). Aware of Catholic allegiance to the pope, the author then claims papal bodies "have turned an wholesome medicine into an hurtfull poyson" (M3^{v}), arguing they are "*the Church of the Devill, the Church of Satan, the church of wicked men*" and "*the Church of liars*" (S3r).

Whetenhall's study of Revelation employs bodily motifs to describe the antichristian beast. "*The tayles of Antichrist are Bishops*", he argues, are "Officials, Commissaries, Deanes, Registers, Chancelours, Proctors, and Somners, *which are like unto venemous serpents*" (Q3^{v}-Q4^{r}). The Church of Rome or the Whore of Babylon, on the other hand, is the antichrist pope's spouse. Quoting Thomas Cranmer, the author depicts the ancient church as lawful, pure and chaste. Over time, however, "she plaied the harlot, and maried her selfe to Antichrist" (V3^{v}).

Throughout the Book of Revelation, the pope is the figurative head of a diseased body of which the torso is the church, or Whore of Babylon. The clergy, which are the virulent limbs of this figure, bear the antichrist's mark and so when the seventh angel pours its curative viol throughout the earth, "monkes, friers [...] Priests" and other "filthie vermon" experience heavenly justice in the form of "sores", "boiles" and "pockes" (GGg3^{v}). The clergy's papal doctrine is pestilential, contagious, and a "horrible plague" (GGg3^{v}). Returning to descriptions of the Whore of Babylon, the woman sitting atop "a skarlat coloured beast" is revealed to be "the Papistrie" (GGg4^{r}). The "beast" itself, on the other hand, is "ancient Rome" while the

feminine body atop it is "new Rome" (GGg4^{r}). Arrayed in purple, scarlet, gold, and precious stones, "this woman is the Antichrist, that is, the Pope with the whole bodie of his filthie creatures" (GGg4^{r}). While the Antichrist and the Whore of Babylon belong to the same metaphoric body, they are separate entities that contain differing idiosyncrasies. As Peter Lake clarifies, "it has to be remembered that the seemingly simple identification of the pope with Antichrist could imply a whole view of the world" ("The Significance" 165). Rather than solely signifying the pope, the Whore of Babylon is in many ways the Catholic torso that embodies the papal church. Cardinals, friars, monks, and the religious congregation are the antichrist's ancillary instruments that relied on the head and torso for venomous nourishment.

The Catholic Body's Viperous Limbs

In early modern English culture, papal bishops, Catholic ministers, and popish vicars represent the Catholic body's metaphoric arms, legs, hands, and feet, proficient in the ways of religious dissemination and spiritual subjugation. Like dangerous creatures that brim with poison capable of infecting human bodies, the clergy are the papal body's vessels of religious communication and action and are often depicted in sermons as insects, bugs, or dangerous animals. According to ministers and Protestant commentators, the Roman clergy are theriomorphized in both The Book of Revelation and contemporary sermons because it allows for intense visions of septicity, penetrability, and physiological affect. The conduits of spiritual and physical contagion, the clergy are corporeal sites of toxicity to convey a greater sense of the interplay between the Catholic body and the world's objects. The pope is the head of these unruly organs, directing the Whore of Babylon's extremities toward matters of biological infiltration and spiritual penetration.

Embodying modes of Catholic transmission, the papal clergy are sagacious, diplomatic, and elusive to their Protestant enemies. To aid in the discovery of the Catholic body's occult limbs, the authors of the Revelation commentary offer precise explanations for verses nine through eleven—"and the sounde of their wings was like the sounde of charets when manie horses runne unto battel. And they had tailes like unto scorpions [...] and they have a King over them, which is the Angel of the bottomles pit"—offering readers discernable qualities of Catholic constitutions (GGg1^{v}). The reference to scorpions symbolizes the Catholic ministry's innate capability to "infect & kill with their venemous doctrine", and the King, or angel of the bottomless pit, represents "Antichrist the Pope, king of hypocrites, & Satans ambassadour" (GGg1^{v}). Cloaked in smoke, the clergy shroud their "heresie and error" through willful dislocation amid the wreckage characteristic of a period steeped in annihilation (GGg1^{r}). Supplementary to descriptions of smoke in Revelation, which represents diseased vapors that issue from polluted bodies, are locusts and scorpions, and these creatures symbolize heretics: "Monkes, Friers" and "Cardinals" (GGg1^{v}). Adorned with gold crowns and "the faces of men", the symbolic locusts are the pope's "proud, ambicious, bolde, stoute, rash, rebellious, stubberne, cruel" and "lecherous" clergy (GGg1^{v}). Described as teachers who abandoned Christ in favor of "false doctrine", these members are the pope's auxiliary bits and pieces (GGg1^{v}). This is not to suggest, however, that the clergy are pictured in contemporary sermons as inferior members of the papal body.

Using scriptural exegesis as a foundation for their views, preachers reimagined Saint John's prophecy of desolate wastelands abroad, replacing theological divinations with discussions of cardinals, bishops, and friars attacking

England's exposed body politic. Analyzing chapter sixteen of Revelation, Thomas Mason suggests that God's fourth plague will ravish the limbs of Catholicism. Unlike the commentary in the Geneva Bible, Mason pinpoints "Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, Monks" and "Friers" living in "houses and dens in England, Scotland, & other reformed countries" (F3^{v}). In contrast, the biblical commentary in Revelation does not specify England or Scotland and simply refers to reformed nations. Portraying Catholicism as a domestic threat, the author speaks to English unease surrounding papal bodies and their unrelenting presence on converted shores. Imagining "the fift viall" consuming "the throne of the Pope", Mason explains this act denotes "the cutting off" of the pope's "revennues, which were infinite out of all countries, and England was the most profitable in revennues unto the Pope of all countries, and therefore was called the Popes Asse, for bearing all taxes & impositions" (F3^{v}). Discussion of papal authority sustains a contemptuously Protestant tone, and for Mason it is unfortunate the English nation will remain somewhat Catholic until the end of the world occurs.

Mason's succeeding point of attack is Jesuits. Describing Rome as "the spirituall Babilon", the author discusses how the pope's breath produces unclean spirits: or frogs (F4^{r}). "These uncleane spirits are the Jesuites", he claims, "for they are sworne at the Popes command to goe unto any Countrey" (F4^{v}). Labeled "the rotten-pillers which proppe up the falling tower of Babell, the Popedome; they are called three, in respect of the triple division of the Popes Dominions, to wit, into the land, the sea, & Rivers", Jesuits represent frogs as it is these creatures that ravished Egypt and will overpower England if given the opportunity (F4^{v}). Likewise, "as frogs turne all things that they eat to poyson", Jesuits wound the soul (F4^{v}). "Their study", Mason asserts, "is nothing but treasons, poysonings and murders of Protestant Kings, Princes, and Countries" (F5^{r}). In chapters two and five, I return to such rhetoric in-depth, arguing that contemporary definitions surrounding political dissension are shaped by civil, cultural, and auditory influences.

Arthur Dent's *The Ruine of Rome* (1603) supports a similar outlook with regard to the Society of Jesus. "Jesuites", the preacher declares, have "grown exceedingly crafty", "cunning", and "buzze into the eares of the common people, and unlearned sort, many things cleane contrary to the doctrine of the Scriptures" (C1^{r}). A Protestant rector and popular preacher, Dent's renowned sermons would draw huge crowds during the 1580s and 1590s. In the early years of the ensuing decade, he became one of the most sought after authors in the Elizabethan and Jacobean period. For example, his sermon on repentance preached at Leigh in 1582 had undergone over twenty reproductions by 1638. Correspondingly, *The Ruine of Rome* had reached its tenth edition by 1656 (Usher). "But heere wee are further to observe", Dent preaches, "that the Jesuits perceiving the great decay of Rome, and continuall drying of their Euphrates, do bestir them to stop the leak, that it might not dry up altogether". Alluding to England, the theologian describes Jesuits, "perceiving the waters of their Romish Euphrates to expire and drie up daily, doe mightily take on, digging and searching everyday to open the springs, and to find out some fresh fountaines". In turn, Jesuits desire to make Protestant nations part of "their great fish-pond, & to keep the waters deepe enough, that they may be safe passage over, for the kings of the earth to come & take their great Babylon". Like other Protestant theologians, Dent includes chapter sixteen to support this prophecy: "*S. John* in vision seeth *three uncleane spirits like Frogs, comming out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false Prophet*" (Ff3^{r}).

These frogs, Dent argues, are "Jesuits and Seminary Priests". For the preacher, frogs describe these papal figures for three reasons. The first is that frogs live in muddy waters: "Jesuits delight in the filthy puddles of idolatrie and superstition" (Ff3^{r}). The second reason pertains to frog's sound: "Jesuits make a great croaking in kings courts, in Noblemens houses, and Gentlemens houses, and almost every where, where they can get any entertainment" (Ff3^{r}-Ff3^{v}). Jesuits are incessantly "croaking and cracking of the Popes supremacy", he scoffs, "the popes holinesse, the Popes blessing, the popes keyes, the popes power, *Peters* chaire, *Peters* successor, Christs Vicar, & many good morrowes". The final reason concerns frog's behaviour and autonomy: "the Jesuits are al of one mind, & disposition in evill, croaking every where to maintain their Euphrates, & living daily in whoredome, Sodomitry, and all kind of outragious beastlinesse" (Ff3^{v}). Described as the "verie limmes of the devils", Jesuits are the foreign infiltrators that disease England and corrupt the religious conscience of English men and women (Ff4^{v}).

Arriving in England from Italy, Jesuits infiltrate Protestant communities to carry out the papal head's directions. They disembark from popish abodes and enter English shores bearing "the very mind and message of the Pope, & the Roman Empire, so consequently with the very mind & spirit of the Dragon" (Ff4^{v}). Embodying "the very breath of the Pope" and "the spirits of the Divell", Jesuits are the pontiff's "spit" and "the very boweles of the Pope" (Ff4^{v}-Gg1^{r}). Infecting Protestant bodies with noxious opinions Jesuits, argues Dent, "teach and conclude in their cursed conventicles, that it is not onley lawfull but also meritorious, to murther any Christian prince, that is not of their catholike religion" (Mm3^{r}). Innately mutinous, Jesuits are the pope's disembodied resonances: his voice, poison, and infection. "Sathan", Mason argues, "brought in all popish blasphemies, Superstitions and Idolatries, and grievously persecuted those that stood to the puritie of the word against Antichrist" (G4^{v}-G5^{r}).

Indeed, the head of the antichristian church displaced notions of corporeal craniums. Representing the body of the antichrist, Catholics were both a literal body and a part of a metaphoric corporeality. Focusing on this body, Deios describes how "the people of one church must knit together as members of one body", and "*as the bodie is one & hath many members*" congregations of a church "grow into one body, & are most neerely knit together, which pertaine to Gods election, and are spiritually united in *Christ*" (K3^{v}). Satan animated the pope and the pope animated his congregation. Catholics received poisonous sustenance from their metaphoric head, whereas Protestants received religious nourishment from Christ. In turn, medical allusions to an infected member saw the convergence of anti-Catholic sentiment and diatribes on infection. In 1606, the Jacobean playwright Barnabe Barnes (an author I dedicate chapter four to analysing in relation to anti-Catholic sentiment, conceptions of disease, and smell) reflects on early modern ideas of physiology and its connection to broader meanings of the body in a pamphlet on political obedience and religious conviction.

Arguing that the English commonwealth consists of a body and soul in *Four Bookes of Office* (1606), Barnes maintains a healthy body resembles Protestant England while an unhealthy body signifies Roman Catholicism. The Protestant body, or the English commonwealth, acknowledges one celestial being and one temporal mediator. God and the King govern Christian bodies: one counsels in apostolic matters and the other guides in affairs of civil law. More specifically, the right arm of England's metaphoric body represents musical harmony, Protestant magistrates, and the nation's military whereas the left arm denotes civil ministers. England's liver

distributes currency to the fingers and toes: English men and women. The ribs and "baser entrailes" are likened to obedient citizens that serve the receptacle of the body's mind and heart: the sovereign ($K4^{v}$). Animated by God, England's body politic is melodious because it embodies Protestantism. Thus, Catholicism becomes a religious contaminate and vile sound in the reader's mind, permeating the body with contagion, perturbations, and malformations. Arguing Catholics do not acknowledge England's "laws nor order", Barnes warns if the government "bee sicke, or diseased" the " Counsellor should play the part of a wise Physition, by purgations, diets, vomites, bloud-lettings, or other remedies, to medicine and rectifie the state of that bodie, where such policie laboureth" ($G1^{v}$). In chapter four, I will analyze the significance of the body in Barnes's violently anti-Catholic drama *The Devil's Charter*, however, for the moment it is sufficient to say that the playwright's descriptions of England's reformed body politic signifies binary oppositions between Catholic and Protestant corporeality. Advising King James I to heal the English nation of its papal disease, Barnes engages with contemporary anti-Catholic ideas relating to plague, politics, and sound—ideas I unpack in the following chapter.

Throughout the 1580s, 1590s, and early 1600s, controversial preachers, reformed theologians, and Protestant ministers offered public congregations, religious activists, and English readers explicit accounts of the reformed papal body. The antichrist pope, the Whore of Babylon, and the poisonous clergy provided polemicists with ample material to create hellish images of a clearly reformed Catholic corporeality. By emphasizing the bodily connotations of the papacy, Protestants of varying beliefs were able to establish ideas of evil Catholic monsters whilst envisaging the otherworldly capabilities of what were intrinsically precarious bodies. Employing corporeal veracities with tones of the unimaginable and horrific, Protestant writers conveyed to the wider public the relationship between Catholic bodies, which for any sensible Protestant signified danger, and the English world. While preachers provided a Protestant framework of Catholic corporeality through scriptural exegesis, the reality of such monsters relied on information sourced from contemporary realities and daily interactions in the early modern environment. To achieve this, reformers continued to shape anti-Catholic discourse through corporeality, combining cultural realities such as political unrest, dissident behaviour, plague, and musical sound with anti-papal vitriol.

Chapter 3

Catholic Treason, Papal Disease, and Popish Dissonance: Politics, Plague, and Sound

"Papists", Thomas Adams preaches in *The Black Devill* (1615), "are ready instruments of commotion, perversion [and] treason" (K3^{v}). Catholics "are a sickness", he continues, they "rore their Musicke" and poison "their Phisicke" (K3^{v}). At a glance, Adams's description of the papal body appears abstract: it is an aberrant construct that operates in the theoretical background of one religious writer's imagination. This body, the author argues, is an intensely pathogenic, dissident, and jarring site in the early modern community. While the preacher's overview of the Catholic body may appear poetic or even capricious, it in fact speaks to early modern meanings of a reformed corporeality that connects the body to plague, politics, and sound. Building upon the previous chapter's argument that papal corporeality in its immediate cultural settings offers modern readers visions of disease carrying beasts that spew contagious materials, this chapter examines how Catholic bodies became sites of political dissidence, contagious disease, and musical discord throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

In this chapter, I seek to touch on the historical origins of anti-papal motifs that associate disease, treason, and music with the Catholic body. I begin by analysing how the 1500s are responsible for forming connections between papal bodies and dissonance in relation to treason. After discussing how various failed assassination attempts targeting Protestant sovereigns led to stringent laws regarding the treatment of Catholics in England, I examine further parallels between Catholicism and dissonance. Arguing that papal bodies are capable of transmitting disease, I observe how plague outbreaks led reformers to suggest that Catholics contaminate English Protestants with pestilence. After discussing how dissonance speaks to treason and plague, I suggest that cultural imaginings of dissonance are also shaped by descriptions of discordant music, arguing that anti-Catholic literature contains musical images connected to early modern conceptions of sound and hearing. As I will demonstrate in chapters three, four, five, six, and seven, the Catholic body in drama embodies cultural conceptions of early modern dissonance in visual, olfactory, and auditory ways, and that each of these experiences are profoundly influenced by contemporary political, medical, and religious events in England's history.

Catholicism and Political Dissonance

Following disputes between the Catholic Church and English sovereigns, the early sixteenth century marked the beginnings of new radical laws, political discussion, and partisan doctrine. Such edicts were the result of growing conflict between Catholicism and English monarchs that started during King Henry VII's governance, and the succession of four Protestant sovereigns in the timeframe following his death bore witness to the idea that papal bodies resembled treasonous monsters waiting to strike at the reformed head of England's newly fashioned body politic. By 1609, authors such as Simion Grahame argued Catholic bodies "entrap soules" and are the "inventors of treason". In this context, the Catholic body is a dissonant and "hellish instrument" that "ruines Countries, sworne enemies to God", and "diligent factors for the devill" (A3^{v}). In this section, I will discuss the origins—and the subsequent elaboration—of a historical artifact that connected Catholicism with burgeoning

conceptions of dissonance within England's increasingly Protestant political system. This system, I will argue, created a religio-political environment in which the papal body threatened the autonomy of England's post-Reformation crown, generating public opinion on a politicized corporeality that allegedly exposed a refractory being attired in papal flesh.

Tension between the Catholic Church and the English throne first began to take hold of England's civic sphere in the late 1400s, and continued to intensify in the ensuing century. Although King Henry VII was to all intents and purposes a practicing Roman Catholic who subscribed to the papal church, he nevertheless challenged ecclesiastical authority on several occasions during his reign from 1485 to 1509. His son, King Henry VIII, showcased a similar tenacity toward the church in the initial decades of the sixteenth century. Henry's obstinate attitude, however, exceeded that of his father's, and the monarch eventually severed ties with Rome in the 1530s (MacCulloch 53-60). As has been well established by scholars including Shell, Lake, Haigh, and Questier, it was at this time that the Protestant Reformation swept throughout England, rebranding long-established religious customs with a markedly reformed title. On a superficial level, Catholics became Protestants: abandoning papal lore for what many considered Martin Luther's ameliorated doctrine. Beyond posturing reclassifications that claimed the religiosity of an individual depended on a dissatisfied sovereign's worldview rather than a genuine spiritual reawakening, England remained a nation of Catholics forced into retitling themselves Protestant (Haigh 37-40; Duffy 2-6). Henry himself maintained papal custom, performing Catholic ceremonies whilst donning the label of Reformed monarch in order to break his nuptial vows.

While Henry continued to employ papal rituals under the guise of Protestantism, his implementation of novel statutes in the 1530s resulted in social connotations that would subsequently be responsible for the lasting association between Catholicism and treason. Chief amongst these statutes was a piece of legislation titled the Acts of Supremacy. Passed in 1534, the Acts of Supremacy blurred the ideological distinctions that separated religion from politics. Outwardly, the decree outlined England's transformed body politic. In this recently constructed paradigm, Henry (alongside future English Protestant monarchs) assumed the head of England's political corporeality, displacing the nation's former head: the Pope (Lake and Questier *Antichrist's Lewd* 284; 703-707). Many English Catholics publicly refused to legitimatise the act by repudiating its tenets, reasoning the pontiff is the ordained head of the spiritual, temporal, and political body. Following this behavior, which Henry found unacceptable, English parliament passed The Treasons Act of 1534, a piece of legislation that in effect made the feat of denying the validity of the Acts of Supremacy a crime punishable by death (237-240; 258). English Protestantism, which according to its leading adherents was said to establish political and religious boundaries through its post-Catholic reasoning, had deviated from claims of secular governance and self-determination.

King Edward VI endorsed further amendments to England's constitutional policies throughout the 1540s. Although the young monarch's time as sovereign was brief, ruling for a total of six years before his death at the age of fifteen, he governed with an unruly fierceness reminiscent of both his father and grandfather. Unlike his predecessors, however, Edward's birth coincided with the Protestant revolution: a revolution that championed religious bigotry, legalized Catholic vilification, and favored the hatred of papal figures. By all accounts, Edward oversaw his nation with a resolute mindset and firm hand, imposing (at the time) the strongest injunctions

against the ceremonial use of Christian images in church services (McCulloch 252-259). He required English citizens to comply with the Acts of Supremacy that his father established in the previous decade, and showed no mercy to those who rejected its credence. By the time Edward had reached adolescence he had overseen thousands of state deaths. Most, if not all, of these fatalities were Catholics who defied the injunctions Edward imposed on their religion. The Treasons Acts of 1534 allowed the sovereign to rebrand individuals convicted of performing religious disavowals with the title of political traitor whose actions were said to be motivated by an innate dissonance rather than religion subjugation. Although this had been occurring since the 1530s, Edwards's accession to the English throne rigorously supported the notion that Catholic bodies strove to overthrow Protestantism's political structures instead of its spiritual precepts. In the midst of a growing public opinion that emphasized Catholicism's rebellious nature, Edward died and it would be several years before English communities returned to such discussions.

Nearly a decade after the death of England's youngest Protestant ruler, Queen Elizabeth I ascended to a throne entrenched in religious unrest and the political negotiations of incompatible ideologies. In the space of ten years, England's politicians designated that the community was a nation of Protestants under Edward in 1547, a Catholic nation under his successor Mary I in 1553, and finally a Protestant nation once again under Elizabeth I in 1558. As was to be expected, English men and women were skeptical of Protestantism's longevity, perhaps expecting the relatively young religion to subside in the years following Elizabeth's claim to power. Consequently, many English parishes preserved material objects relative to papal practices ranging from the Eucharist and baptism to the exaltation of holy images. Parishes donned a Protestant exterior in order to mask Catholic traditions that not only were religiously significant but also incredibly expensive in terms of monetary value. Rather than abandon the objects that parish ministers believed they would have to repurchase in the event that a Catholic sovereign assumed the throne, papal preachers chose to keep holy materials and perform services and instead masquerade as a Protestant establishment. Realizing that many ministers continued to practice Catholicism, Elizabeth implemented harsh laws designed to cement the notion that Catholic bodies are politically dissonant vessels capable of committing treason unless a wholly immersive conversion to Protestantism took place.

Among the many pieces of anti-Catholic legislation passed in parliament under Elizabeth, several articles went to great lengths to stress the link between religiosity and dissension. In 1559, Elizabeth reinstated King Henry VIII's Acts of Supremacy after Mary abolished the law only years beforehand. Once again, Catholics convicted of non-compliance regarding the statute were charged with treason and sentenced in the name of politics rather than religion (Graves "Thomas Norton" 17-35). Like Henry VIII and Edward VI, Elizabeth persecuted thousands of Catholics through this regulation, attacking individuals that did not recognize England's reformed body politic. Elizabeth's treatment of Catholics, which progressively fostered the illogical impression that one could not separate religious belief from political belief even though the two were said to be compatible regardless of spiritual conviction by the sovereign, resulted in an inimical reprisal from Pope Pius V in the 1570s.

Excommunicating Elizabeth in a papal bull published abroad in the 1570s, Pope Pius called for a religious war on England's shores in an attempt to displace the existing body politic with a distinctly papal presence. Within the pamphlet, the pontiff explains how religion and politics are areas that are unable to exist without

reciprocity, arguing the two depend on one another for survival. A question of politics is a question of faith, and so the Pope frequently demands throughout the tract that English Catholics rebel against the Protestant crown or face excommunication. In response, Elizabeth created a legislative bill unparalleled in terms of Catholic vilification. This bill, which passed parliament in 1571, rendered the mere existence of a Catholic body on domestic soil illegal on grounds of treason. In effect, Elizabeth had created a statute that inarguably located contemporary definitions of dissonance in the papal body: whether in the physical body of a Catholic or in the metaphoric papal body politic (McGrath 69-71). Jesuits, popish preachers, and Catholic congregations were now the nationwide target of authorities. Formulating various schemes to remove the Protestant monarch, English and non-English Catholics began to prepare stratagems that would replace Elizabeth with a Catholic ruler.

Between 1570 and 1586, Elizabeth experienced the brunt of injunctions against Catholics in the form of several failed insurrections directed at her and the Protestant government. The first of these designs was the Ridolfi Plot of 1571. Pope Pius V effectively hired Roberto di Ridolfi, an Italian trader, in 1566 to carry out various religious missions. Employing Ridolfi's skills as a merchant to smuggle papal documents into London, Pope Pius sent countless banned books into the city at Catholic ministers' behest. Realizing Ridolfi was a robust ally the Pope gradually bestowed more responsibility upon the Italian merchant, ultimately providing the papal mercantile with tens of thousands of pounds to aid domestic rebellions within England. Over time, Ridolfi began to garner support for a coup d'état, bolstering relationships with Spanish, Italian, and English powers that endeavored to overthrow England's Protestant monarch (MacCulloch 333-335). Shortly thereafter, Ridolfi (alongside the duke of Norfolk Thomas Howard, Mary Stuart, and the Bishop of Ross John Leslie) organized a Catholic rebellion in the city of London that would depose Elizabeth and instate Mary Queen of Scots. In the weeks leading up to the uprising, Protestant spies discovered the plot through government intelligence, and English characters connected to the revolt faced trial before undergoing a public execution. Although Elizabeth remained the head of England's body politic—narrowly escaping assassination—the Protestant monarch would face several more papal conspiracies in the ensuing decade.

Throughout the 1580s, four papal plots to murder Elizabeth and supplant Protestantism for Catholicism transpired. The first of these stratagems was the Throckmorton Plot. Named after Francis Throckmorton, an English fellow and devout Catholic, the plot was discovered by Elizabeth's principal secretary Francis Walsingham in April of 1583. Known to socialize with renowned Catholics, Throckmorton's name was passed on to Walsingham at the beginning of the 1580s, and from this time onwards Elizabeth's Protestant spies kept him under close surveillance (Budiansky 123-125). In 1583, Walsingham arrested Throckmorton, stating that the Catholic had been conspiring to massacre English Protestants and usurp Elizabeth's crown in favor of aiding Mary Queen of Scots to ascend the throne. Even though the Ridolfi Plot had occurred ten years prior, many Protestants feared that it was only a matter of time before revelations of another, more sinister papal conspiracy to destroy England's body politic would be unearthed. It was this relentless paranoia that contributed to Throckmorton's capture. Similar to the Ridolfi Plot, Francis Throckmorton had been exchanging plans for a Catholic revolution in England with foreign papal forces. The leading power of these Catholic armies was Spain, and it was agreed between the parties involved that an elite taskforce of Spaniards would invade London's shipping docks before occupying Elizabeth's court.

At the same time, Throckmorton and his brother agreed to assemble a horde of English Catholics to aid in the mission (125-130).

In the same year, Francis Walsingham discovered the Somerville Plot. John Somerville, unlike those involved in the Ridolfi and Throckmorton plots, acted alone, and perhaps could be viewed as a somewhat crazed individual motivated by an irrational psyche rather than a religious provocation. Although Somerville and his family were passionate Roman Catholics, John (prior to his arrest) had never planned papal machinations against Elizabeth or the Protestant nation in general. However, in October of 1583 he became ill, and remained in bed for prolonged periods with acute fevers that induced convulsions and senseless ramblings. The bed-ridden and sick Somerville finally left his room, perhaps still unwell, and began a journey to London unbeknownst to his family members. Stopping at several inns along the way, Somerville would rant to anyone who would listen, rumbling of firearms, Elizabeth's assassination, and fantasies of Protestant dismemberment (130-145). This ultimately found its way to Walsingham, and John was arrested on the grounds of high treason in December of 1583. News of Somerville spread quickly throughout London with preachers focusing on John's fascination with penetrating Elizabeth's head with a bullet. Explaining to congregations that Somerville's beguilement with the sovereign's body related to wider conceptions of the Catholic desire to destroy Protestantism's literal and metaphoric corporeality, preachers advised English men and women that papal agents are attracted to the Protestant body because it is a site by which individuals are ravaged, converted, or killed (143-148).

The Parry and Babington Plots respectively are the last known conspiracies to overthrow Elizabeth and re-establish Catholicism. Both conspiracies were contrived to appear as legitimate Catholic threats to the Protestant nation, however, there is little evidence to support that the former of these was anything beyond an overdramatic rendering of political grumblings. Walsingham arrested William Parry, a Protestant spy, in 1585 on grounds of treason. Edmund Neville, an accomplice to Parry, revealed to the principal secretary that Parry maintained unsavory company with Catholics (an act relevant to Parry's occupation), and was said to discuss plans to assassinate Elizabeth over a drink at local inns. Confirmation of Parry's disloyalty was never sufficiently proven by Walsingham, yet his arrest and execution received praise from preachers, politicians, and playwrights—a comment that I will further explore in chapter five. Conversely, the Babington Plot involved a complex network of papal agents working together to carry out plans of Elizabeth's assassination.

The foiling of the Babington Plot in 1586 led to the deaths of several high profile Catholic figures and strengthened the anti-papal idea that popish bodies inadvertently maintained a politically dissident corporeality. "Monsters of Rome", Robert Greene writes in *The Spanish Masquerado* (1589), are "preserved to the Papacie" before their bodies are "incensed with envie, fall to treasons, conspiracies, privie murders, and poisonings" ($C2^{r}$). In 1586, William Herbert argued along a similar line of thought, maintaining "every Bodie Politique, and everie state that is established to continue amongest men, live by their lawes and constitutions". Unlike England's Protestant body politic, "the Romaine church", the author claims, is "fashioned to the Image and imitation of the Roman Empire, and thereby a monarchie: whereof the Pope is soveraigne and chiefe" ($H3^{v}$). The Catholic body politic, he continues, "hath no life, strength or forces, in her lawes and decrees" because it is the dissonant body comprised of antichristian flesh ($H4^{r}$). Anthony Babington (alongside previous historical conspirators) exemplifies Herbet's descriptions of the Catholic body politic. In addition to arresting Babington, the Jesuit

John Ballard, John Savage, Edward Abington, Chidiock Tichborne, and Charles Tilney, Walsingham also discovered correspondence between the aforesaid conspirators and Mary Stewart. This ultimately proved useful because it not only verified the accused parties' guilt, but also resulted in the death of Mary Queen of Scots—a figure Walsingham had been collecting evidence against for years (Budiansky 150). While Protestant divines, politicians, and the public championed Mary's execution it also engendered fears in English communities that the Catholic leader's death would result in a vengeful reprisal from papal bodies' bent on destroying Elizabeth.

In some ways, the collective failure of the aforementioned plots imparted a greater sense of anxiety in Protestant groups than if any of the plans had been successful. For example, the incessant trepidation of Londoners following the Babington Plot led Elizabeth to impose stricter laws that galvanized Catholicism's illegality in the nation's mindset. Likewise, the application of the Recusancy Acts in 1593 is but one order that illustrates the status of popish behavior during these years. Attempting to convert Catholics to Protestantism by way of fining individuals that did not attend Church of England sermons, Elizabeth proposed that the implementation of the Recusancy Acts would eliminate the Catholic threat once and for all. In an effort to remedy popish bodies display of political dissonance, Elizabeth's anti-Catholic laws endeavored to transfigure one's spiritual essence through religious conversion or destroy the body through public displays of state-sanctioned violence in the form corporeal mutilation and execution. At the center of both solutions is an English obsession with the Catholic body. As the 1500s came to a close and the 1600s approached, definitions of Catholic dissonance outgrew the limitations of a political agenda, developing into a phenomenon that reformulated contemporary descriptions surrounding disease and, as I will discuss later in the chapter, dissonant sound.

Catholicism and Plague

Early modern scholars and medical historians have long recognized plague as an important aspect of the religious, political, and social landscape of English culture. "How, then, might one depict the plague [...] for Christian readers?" asks Rebecca Totaro (*The Plague Epic* 11). Analyzing the impact of disease on the publishing industry, theatre, and poetry in early modern England, Totaro considers how citizens, politicians, playwrights, and preachers dealt with the physical and mental anguish that accompanied prolonged bouts of disease and death. The result, she finds, is diverse representations of sickness in both literary and artistic clusters throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Drawing on Totaro's analysis, Graham Hammill argues plague literature offers modern readers a politicized model for reading issues on authority and monarchial power (86). Similarly, Richelle Munkhoff and Philip Seargeant have examined how the religious administration and civic establishments shaped plague discourse, disseminating religious and scientific evaluations in local communities (Munkhoff 2-5; Seargeant 340-345). Regarding the social implications of circulating such information, plague literature influenced the conflation of medical and spiritual tropes throughout England.

As a result, the sixteenth century saw the dissolution of distinctions surrounding spiritual illness and physical infection within English communities. Among the physicians, scientists, and doctors examining the cause of disease and its mode of transmission, religious writers aided in the propagation that plague was a communicable disease that spread through a physical and spiritual toxicity. An

example of physical contagion, many argued, was miasma: or, bad air, and I return to examples of such air in chapter four regarding olfaction and plague in *The Devil's Charter*. Spiritual contagion, on the other hand, represented a satanic influence: or, a Catholic body. Offering readers "phisick of the soule", the pope's idolatrous poison infected Catholic bodies with a heathenish contagion that in turn risked jeopardizing the health of susceptible Protestants (Ewich *8^{v}). The pontiff's toxicity contaminated his body and thus Catholics "infect" and "abuse" English communities with their poisonous being (Naogeorg B1^{v}). Reflecting that avarice is a vice said to be championed by the pope, Naogeorg argues "sicknesse" begins "first at [the] head: and [is] so dispersed through them [Catholics]" (I3^{v}). The pope, the preacher claims, "hath with loathsome poison stuft his members […] with poison" (G1^{v}). Imagery of Catholic bodies "swell[ing] with filthie blood" akin to "Horseleachers or loathsome Tickes" bled into descriptions of "venomous Papistes" with "vile infective tongues, and mouthes envenomed […] with poison" (G3^{r}; B1^{v}; R3^{v}). According to Thomas Naogeorg this infection first entered the church with the advent of the pope's universal authority. Harnessing medical concepts to demonise Catholicism in the same terms as lethal epidemic disease, authors like Naogeorg and Ewich argue that the papal body will continue to pose a legitimate threat to Protestants' health until the disease that is the papacy is vanquished by science or divine retribution.

Locating Catholicism's innate poison within a biblical paradigm, Laurence Deios calls on the Book of Revelation to elucidate the many diseases caused by papal agents. The "marke of the beast", he discusses, "is a noysome and grievous sore" that contaminates Catholics (C3^{r}). Figuring these sores to be either "the French disease which began among them in warre at *Naples* betweene the *French* and *Spaniard*, in the yeere 1494" or "the plague, which in the time of poperie flourish", Deios contends the pope's "poison and infection" is truly "secrete" (C3^{r}-C4^{r}). Accordingly, anti-Catholic discourse and religious imaginings throughout this period evolved alongside Renaissance and early modern conceptions surrounding disease. Hence, distinctions between the material and immaterial, physical and spiritual, are regularly blurred in Protestant rhetoric, and this is no more evident than in relation to medical conceptions of pestilence.

In the early years of the seventeenth century, a series of plagues decimated London's population. In response to the ongoing discussion of its origin and transmission, various tracts on pestilence emerged in 1603. "Sinne", wrote Stephen Hobbes in *A New Treatise of the Pestilence* (1603), "is the original and chiefe cause of this most cruel disease" (A2^{v}). Similarly, Roger Fenton admitted the community's "sinnes have made such a thick cloud" in recent times (C10^{r}), concluding *A Perfume Against the Noysome Pestilence* (1603) with the statement, "our sinnes […] have so poysoned and infected our soules, as the contagion thereof hath even zeased upon the outward man" (D7^{v}). Issuing from imagery that identified the pope as sin incarnate, writers began to explore the pestilent behavior of the Antichrist in the wake of plague visitations. Writing on Catholicism, Downame finds, "*a filthy contagion* […] *spreadeth it selfe now adaies though the whole Church*" (H1^{v}). The "men of sin" who are "infected" with wickedness, he settles, are "the Pope" along with those who subscribe to "heresy, opposition or enmity to Christ, apostasy, hypocrisy" and "satanical pride" (N4^{r}). Likewise, George Abbott claims that the Catholic body is "infected with Antichrist superstition" (N5^{r}). Warning English citizens to stay away "from the gangrene of Popery" (Q8^{v}), he cautions Protestants to stay away from "Catholikes" as they are a "contagious sinke of exerable lewdness" (Cc1^{v}-Cc2^{r}). Constructing religious ideals within a medical framework, Protestant ministers

repeatedly called themselves spiritual physicians. Administering medical rhetoric to English Protestant souls, English clergymen continually linked Catholicism with pestilent contagion.

Recent scholarship on the plague in early modern English culture emphasizes the disease as central to London's formation of quarantine laws. Kira Newman shows the measures the government went to in order to restrain Londoners from infection, revealing how citizens remained in isolation from one another in hopes of reducing the epidemics perceived miasmic capabilities (812). For many early modern writers, however, disease was an immaterial construction heralded by the papal antichrist and communicated by popish vessels.

Between 1602 and 1620 religious treatises connected leprosy, plague, and infection with the Catholic body. In Andrew Willet's preface to the Christian reader he notes, "Skilfull Physitians, to worke safely and cure soundly, doe use preparatives before they minister to their patients, and prescribe a dyet to be observed after" ($A1^{r}$). Accordingly, he offers to take the same course of treatments but replaces medicinal remedies for spiritual preservatives. A Protestant clergyman who sternly opposed Presbyterian sects and nonconformist behavior, Willet's *A Catholicon, That Is, A Generall Preservative or Remedie Against the Pseudocatholike Religion* (1602) locates the Catholic religion in an exogenous paradigm. "I have out of S. *Judes* Catholike epistle", he explains, "confected a *Catholicon*, that is, a generall preservative against popish infection, I will first briefly prepare the minde of the discreete Reader, in shewing the danger of this overspreading and contagious disease". Describing papal bodies as "dangerous & hurtfull", the Calvinist preacher denounces "the contagion of Poperie" and connects treason with "the Whore of Babylon", that is, the body of Catholicism ($A1^{v}$). The papal body, Willet claims, is contagion that ontologically exists outside of the body. Spreading from body to body, Catholic infection spreads between individuals in English communities. More specifically, the papal body infects non-Catholic bodies through sensory phenomena—an idea that I will return to and examine in closer detail in chapters four, five, six, and seven.

Criticizing the Church of England's ceremonies, Robert Parker adds to this imagery by announcing, "grosse corruptions [...] infecte the bowells of our Churches" (*1r). A Protestant nonconformist, Parker published *A Scholasticall Discourse Against Symbolizing with Antichrist in Ceremonies* (1607) in the Netherlands. However, the text appears to have made its way to London and Parker's bishop grew incensed by the document upon reading its contents. Puritans, however, championed the book, and so after his suspension from the ministry Parker fled overseas to join more rigid Protestant factions (Sprunger). The pamphlet, which chiefly focuses on the sign of the cross in Protestant ceremonies, criticizes the Church of England's papal nuances. For Parker, these rites and ceremonies are "the cobwebbes of poperie" and he asks, "doe not even cobwebs foster poysonful spiders?" ($*2^{v}$). Arguing popish practices including the sign of the cross and clerical vestments spread "incurable" religious infection ($B1^{r}$), Parker declares, "we must not make our selves sicke, for the healing of other: neither must Protestants participate with Papists, to reduce them from poperie, but in compassion heale rather with medicine contrarie to their disease" ($C3^{r}$). Connecting plague to Catholicism, the preacher warns readers: the slightest contact with a pestilent party "infecte[s] [the] whole lumpe" ($I1^{r}$). From pestilent air to thought contagion, Parker declares, "we must away with all the armes and badges of poperie, else the sight of them will bring forth popish monsters againe in the

mindes of the simple, in whose infected imagination" conjures Catholic phantasmagorias (R3^{v}).

In the years following these publications, Thomas Adams emerged and engaged with spiritual remedies and religious infection on an unprecedented level. *The Sinners Passing-Bell* (1614), *Englands Sickness* (1615) and *Diseases of the Soule* (1616) are testament to the preacher's avid interest in merging a medical understanding of disease with Protestant sentiment. Exemplifying this style in *The Sinners Passing-Bell*, Adams is a self-declared spiritual physician whose prophetic words function as pharmaceutical devices for reader's souls. "Physitians cure the body", he preaches, "Ministers the Conscience" (Dd4^{v}). Declaring "Prophets are the Physitians" while "People are the Patients", the author asserts, "Physitian[s] without Balme" and "Patient without both" is "an unhappy disjunction". If a man or woman is sick, he continues, "there is neede of Physicke; when he hath Physicke, he needes a Physitian to apply it. So that, here is miserie in being sicke, mercie in the Physicke" (Ee2^{r}). Analogously, "if bodily Disease so afflict our sense, how intollerable will a spirituall sicknesse prove?" (Ee2^{v}) In Adams's mind, Protestants derive remedial solutions from God's "naturall and spiritall Physicke (Ff3^{v}). The latter of these derives from the scriptures while God's ministers exemplify the former. Constantly referring to "balme", "Phisitians", and "the sick" (Mm3^{r}), Adams clarifies, "Popish Balme" is an unsavory remedy because it is "stale, vnsauory, rammish, lanke" and "vile" (Pp4^{r}).

Dismissing the Catholic clergy because of papal ceremonies' innate contagion, the preacher condemns popish vessels. "It is God onely", he writes, "that can turne the heart, and tune the tongue, heale the body, and helpe the soule" (Ss3^{v}). Reformed theologians are the mediators of celestial tonics while the Roman Clergy administer "*Antichristian* poysons, to breede the plague of *Idolatrie* among the people: these are Seminarie *Phisitians*" (Vv1^{v}). "Others of this *Sect*", he finds, "send over venomous prescripts, binding Princes Subjects to Treasons and Homicides: these are devillish Phisitians" (Vv2^{r}). Jesuits, cardinals, bishops, and monks are "the worst diseases" because they open the floodgates to evil passions and infect vulnerable bodies with a Catholic sickness that envenoms the soul (Vv3^{v}-Vv4^{r}).

Beginning with the head, Adams explains to readers the cause of an infected soul. He argues pestilence, which infects the heart, proceeds from both vice and heresy, and that Catholicism's body politic becomes the metaphoric site of spiritual and physical contagion, plague, and disease. Comparing a Londoner afflicted by plague to a crypto-Catholic, Thomas Beard advises, "for the safety of" your "body flye out of an house infected with the plague". Likewise, Catholics are instructed to "flye out of the Church of Rome" for it is "infected with most pestilent" diseases (T2^{r}). "The *Sicknesse* of this *World* is *Epidemicall*", Adams argues, "and hath with the invisible poyson of a general pestilence infected it to the heart". This poison, advises the minister, resembles "*Vice* in manners" and "*Heresie* in doctrine", as both "distilleth insensible contagion into the fountaine of Life" (B1^{r}). Again, Adams tells readers to consult their ministers to begin treatment that will in turn remedy their souls. If "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint", he warns, "from the sole of the foote, even unto the head, there is no soundness [...] *but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores*", then the Christian soul is in danger of Catholic conversion. Continuing to explicate moral discourse through corporeal descriptions, Adams opts to combine the two themes in order to treat one's entirety. Noting, "*Physicians* begin their medicinall institutions or instructions at the *Head*" as it this site that is the "most noble part of the body; the principall seate of the wits, the beginning of all the

organicall sences, and the proper house and habitation of the animall vertue", Adams contends that he too, "for metaphors sake", will "suffer my selfe to be led after their rule" (B1^{v}).

Borrowing "much Timber out of *Galens* wood" for "a scaffold to build up [a] Morall discourse", the preacher attempts to first cure the head before tackling "the infirmities of the descending parts" (B1^{v}-B2^{r}). Ending this exposition by comparing medical physicians to spiritual doctors, Adams settles, "there be three things, say Physicians, that grieve the body". The first "cause of *sicknesse*" is a "contranatural distemper, which lightly men bring on themselves, though the sediments rest in our sinne-corrupted nature". Secondly, "*sicknes* it selfe" (L1^{r}). Finally, there are "the coincidents" (L1^{r}).

For metaphysicians, there are also three grievances, albeit within the soul. The first is a "proclivite to evil" or "contradiction to good" while the second is "actuall sinne" or "the maine *sicknesse*". The third cause, however, is a combination of the literal and the mystical. "Concomitant effects", he writes, "are punishments corporall and spirituall, temporall and eternall. For all sinne makes worke; either for *Christ*, or *Sathan*: for *Christ*, to expiate by his *bloud*, and the efficacie of that once performed, ever available passion". The devil, on the other hand, becomes "Gods executioner to plague". Acknowledging, "many remedies are given for many diseases", Adams determines "the best *Physician* is *Christ Jesus*, the best *Physicke* the *Scriptures*" (L1^{r}).

Making his way to the body, the preacher combines descriptions of the flesh with the church. Recalling Protestant theologians from the previous decades, Adams compares the body of a church to the body of its believers. In both cases, the animating force is Christ and the disease capable of rendering it sick is a religious doctrine. The Holy Spirit courses in the veins of the Christian Church while God's glowing utterances kindle the soul. The literal and metaphoric bodies both receive their vital powers and operations from God. Disease, however, affects them in different ways.

Sickness to the human body results in an alteration of the humors, passions, and spirits in the heart and brain. In contrast, sickness to the church descends from the head and is a secret movement capable of remaining hidden. Conflating the two, Adams argues in both instances sickness is from "some inbred distemperature" or "by the accession of some outward malady" (E3^{r}). Arguing the Church and the body are inexorably connected through their adherence to the mind, Adams explains,

> For as the naturall body of man, when it is overcharged in the veines and parts with ranke and rotten humours, which it hath gathered by […] infect ayres; the man growes dangerously sicke, til by some fit evacuation he can be discharged of that burthen. So the body of a *Church* being infected with humours, and swolne with tumours of unsound doctrine, of unsounder life, supersitious ceremonies, corrupting the vitall pores and powers thereof: troubled with the colde shakings of indevotion, or taken with the numbnesse of induration, or terrified with windy passions of turbulent spirits, cannot be at ease, till due reformation hath cured it. Now such a *Church* sometimes is more swelling in bignes & oftents a more bulky shew; but once truly purged of such crude superfluities, it becomes lesse great and numerous, but withall more sound, apt and fit for spirituall promotions. Our particular *Church of England*, now fined from the drosse of *Rome*, had a true substantiall beeing before, but hath gotten a better being, by the repurgation wrought by the Gospell, maintained of our Christian Princes, the true *defenders of the faith*

> *of Christ*. God had doubtlesse his Church among us before; for it is *Catholike* and universall: but his *floore* was full of chaffe. The Papists demand where our *Church* was before *Luthers* time. We answere, it lay hid under a great bulke of chaffe. (E3^{r}-E4^{r})

Uniting two bodies in order represent Christian health Adams presents readers with celestial remedies to combat popish disease. The body of a sick man, he claims, must be purged of "rotten humours" that in turn "infect the ayre" with their noxious fumes. If the diseased individual is unable to evacuate their body of putrid humours, then they continue to grow sick, infecting those around them with their contagion. Arguing the body of a diseased man is analogous to that of a diseased church infected with Catholicism, Adams conflates the corporeal body with the institutional body. The Catholic Church, he declares, must be purged of its rotten humours: "unsound doctrine, unsounder life, [and] supersitious ceremonies" (E4^{r}). Stating that Protestantism cures the Catholic Church of its diseased mechanisms and sickly traditions, the preacher uses corporeality to frame anti-Catholic discussions of sick bodies and even sicker churches.

Throughout the 1500s, reformed ministers consistently denigrate Catholicism with descriptions of disease. In an effort to further the imagery of papal bodies as infectious agents, reformed ministers frame discussions of their Catholic foes within the scaffold of plague discourse. Bodily sickness, alongside cultural events such as the outbreak of pestilence in 1603 they argue, is the result of a belief in Catholicism. Arguing that spiritual conviction can either cure the body of its physiological illnesses or aggravate physical infirmities, Protestant writers posit that Catholicism enters the soul akin to an infection entering the body. In the broader framework of early modern English culture, Catholicism not only disrupts the body of individuals but also attacks the reformed body politic.

Early modern England's fervently religious and politically hostile context certainly influenced the anti-Catholic tropes that emerged throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet disease, unlike politics, showcased the body's helplessness to spiritual contagion because it appealed to the senses. Perhaps in an attempt to showcase how Catholicism embodied both political dissension and diseased conceptions, writers merged the two fields by combining political discord and plague with sensory stimuli. Personifying the early modern climate of anti-popery, writers refashioned contemporary opinions surrounding politics and plague through an auditory phenomenon: discordant music.

Catholicism and Musical Dissonance

Descriptions of dissonance in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries represent the semantic evolution of contemporary meaning concerning sound, religion, and politics. Hence, prior to explaining the aural implications of dissonance and its relevance to anti-Catholic sentiment it is imperative to discuss the word's historical origins and subsequent development before returning to the expression's ideological bearing. The dominant definition surrounding descriptions of a dissonant thing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries broadly focused on disagreements or incongruities in nature, or objects "out of agreement, accordance, or harmony in any respect" ("Dissonant" def. 2). It was not until the 1570s that dissonance began to be used in relation to sound. "Dissonant and jarring dittyes" captured Gabriel Harvey's mind in the 1570s while dissonant sounds mingled in the ears of Thomas Morley during the 1590s (Harvey 117). For the most part, dissonance and discord were

largely interchangeable words. Discord, an expression used to denote inharmonious sound since the mid-fifteenth century, often spoke to cultural disparities in the process of aural resolution. This particular type of musical discord, or dissonance, however, signified sounds that were partial melodies rather than harsh noises driven to an extreme. The earliest instance of both discord and dissonance used to denote harsh noise first occurs in Joseph Hall's *Virgidemiarum* (1598) and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1600). Certain words in criminal trials, Hall argues, embody a "harshness and dissonance" in "judiciall eare[s]" (H4^{v}). Meanwhile Shakespeare writes, "I never heard/ So musicall a discord, such sweete thunder" (4.1.117). Responding to the jarring sounds commonly heard in courtrooms or thunderstorms, Hall's and Shakespeare's employment of sonic dissonance signifies a shift toward the word's cultural relationship with politics and hearing.

In the years immediately following both writers' use of dissonance, the expression's political and auditory nuances coalesced due to tumultuous religious events and the alleged threat Catholicism posed to English bodies. More specifically, events in the early 1600s are irrevocably responsible for the sudden synthesis of politics and sound in anti-Catholic literature. Catholicism's ties with dissonance, which had been occurring in public sermons and political tracts since King Henry VIII, evolved alongside conceptions of disease, politics, and sound until the authors of anti-papal discourse conflated the three landscapes within a corporeal framework that stressed the physiological perils involved in encountering papal bodies and their diseased, discordant sounds. By 1616, preachers argued Catholic bodies are "like a Bell rung too deepe" with disease and dissonance (Adams *Diseases* B3^{v}). Popish bodies had "mouth[s] like the divils trumpet" that "sounds nothing but the musicke of hell" (H4^{v}). The incidents that shaped this conflation were four papal conspiracies involving King James I: the Gowrie Conspiracy (1600), the Main Plot (1603), the Bye Plot (1603), and the Gunpowder Plot (1605).

Popish conspiracies to assassinate James in the first decade of the seventeenth century remain the collective catalyst behind the early modern English identification of Catholicism and auditory dissonance. Similar to the Elizabethan attitude that shaped the anti-Catholic resonances surrounding political definitions of dissonance, the early Jacobean period announced cultural reverberations that united conceptions of disease, political dissension, and sound through personifications of Catholics' contagious utterances. In 1606, one English author records that religion is like a "musical instrument" (Birnie B3^{v}). Although "there be many different strings yet must they al be tuned to harmonical proportions [...] otherwise the ingratious discord in the eare of the last string will mar all the mirth" (B3^{v}). The Catholic body, he goes on to explain, is a discordant apparatus that renders England's body politic dissonant, forcing Protestant bodies to wail dissonant tunes like unstrung viols. In chapters five and six, I will attend to this phenomenon more closely by analyzing two seminal and yet rarely discussed dramas (*The Whore of Babylon* and *Lust's Dominion*) that showcase this motif through embodying an early modern understanding of dissonance in its immediate religio-political context. In the meantime, I will discuss the historical overview of the abovementioned plots and reveal how together they created a popular and yet short-lived belief involving Catholic bodies and dissonant sound.

Both the historical details and legitimacy of the Gowrie Conspiracy are shrouded in secrecy and diplomatic intrigue. Pamphlets published in the same year the plot occurred narrate stories of a seemingly disastrous day involving James, recreational activities, and Catholic villains. Describing the day's events for readers,

the anonymous author of *The Earl of Gowries Conspiracie Against the Kings Majestie* (1600) helps to sets the scene. "James", he writes,

> was Bucke-hunting neere his residence at Falkland, first day of August, Tuesday, and raide out to the Parke, betwixt sixe and seaven of the clocke in the morning, the weather being woonderfull pleasant and seasonable. But before his Majesty coulde leape on horse backe, his Highnesse being now come downe by a query: all the Hunst-men also being now come downe by the enquery: all the Hunst-men with hownds attending his Majestie on the Greene, & the Court making to their horses, as his Highnesse selfe was: maister Alexander Ruthwen, second brother to the late earle of Gowry being then lighted in the towne of Falkland, hasted him fast downe to overtake his majestie before his on-leaping, as hee did. Where meeting his Highnese, after a very lowe curtesie, bowing his head under his Majesties knee, (although he was never wont to make so lowe curtesie) drawing his Majestie aparte, hee beginnes to discourse unto him with a very dejected countenaunce, his eyes ever fixed upon the earth. ($A2^{r}$-$A2^{v}$)

Approaching James from a distance, Alexander Ruthven (brother to John Ruthven after whom the Gowrie Conspiracy is titled) appears to have nervously approached the King of Scotland clutching a soiled bag overflowing with dirty coins. Explaining that inside the bag there appeared to be foreign, or perhaps "popish" coins, Alexander implored the monarch inspect the sack's contents. Interested by the fellow's news of "popish" coins, James dismounted from his horse and examined the currency ($A3^{r}$). As James inspected the money, Alexander relayed to the sovereign that he and his brothers discovered a buried chest of these coins on their property.

Eager to review the chest, which by law went to the king since items discovered in the ground belonged to the ruling sovereign, James followed Alexander to his residence. Upon arriving at the estate, James discovered the story was an elaborate plot designed to ensnare and assassinate. Fighting off his Catholic assailants, the King broke free, screamed treason, and escaped. Scholars have contended this view, however, noting that James borrowed a substantial amount of money from the Ruthven family in the years prior to the plot (McNeill 301-302). James, who was unable to pay the loan back because of the exorbitant amount he had borrowed, was involved in regular disagreements with the family who demanded the sovereign honor the terms and conditions of repayment. Perhaps, then, James (rather than repay the loan) organized an elaborate strategy to murder the household. Regardless of what actually transpired on that fateful day, members of the Ruthven family never stood trial for charges of treason because they were executed by the King's attendants following the sovereign's cries of treason. Official documents published in *The Earl of Gowries Conspiracie* (1603) later reported that Alexander Ruthven, using papal sounds to bend the King's ear, employed infectious reverberations to disease the monarch's mind and lead the king away from safety.

Similar to the Gowrie Plot, the Main, Bye, and Gunpowder Plots demonstrate a belief in Catholic bodies diseased resonances through allusions to auditory dissonance and the perceived ability of papal bodies to infect English Protestants with politically dissident opinions. Although each plot varied in terms of their outline and designed application, all were reported to involve a leading Catholic villain who rendered English bodies medically, religiously, and politically sick through contaminating corporeal physiology via an auditory means of spiritual pollution. "Go dull the eares of Antichristian Rome", argued one political writer in 1613, with the "sweeter musicke" produced by melodious Protestant bodies (Allyne

D9^{v}). Reporting the details of each plot to readers, writers describe how leaders in Catholic conspiracies were Catholic priests, papal spies, and popish believers, while the victims were the English Protestants turned conspirators Catholics had contaminated through pathogenic sounds that converted the body into a treasonous monster. The Bye Plot's iniquitous leader who wailed Catholic discord was Thomas Grey while Henry Brooke guided the Main Plot, and finally the Gunpowder Plot had Guido Fawkes. Separately these events represented subversive attacks against England's body politic, but together they exemplified Catholicism's capacity to infect Protestant bodies with seditious sounds. By 1610, several anti-Catholic laws relating to treason, sound, and the body passed parliament, and more than a dozen vehemently anti-papal dramas had flooded the English marketplace. In chapters three, four, five, six, and seven I will map this historical trajectory in finer detail, but for the moment it is sufficient to say that contemporary definitions of dissonance informed an anti-Catholic discourse that focused heavily on sensory phenomena.

The Elizabethan and early Jacobean periods were responsible for laying a sensory groundwork that informed the corporeal basis of later anti-papal discourse. Building upon a pre-existing anti-Catholic heritage, Elizabeth went to excessive legislative lengths to demonstrate that Catholicism signified political dissonance. Throughout her reign over the nation, English communities observed the dogmatic renderings of both real and supposed popish machinations, the continual development of contemporary definitions surrounding unorthodox behavior, and sermons that catalogued the lives of Catholics encased in diplomatic opposition. In the later years of Elizabeth's life, political dissonance nurtured the cultural ideas relevant to Catholicism's perceived link with aural dissonance, and under James this phenomenon extended beyond the pulpit. For doctors, politicians, and preachers alike, Catholicism afflicted the body. In the Book of Revelation, the plague affects papal bodies while Catholic dissension attacks a Protestant body politic whereas London's epidemics assaulted bodies in general. In all three cases, anti-Catholic sentiment is embedded into the vernacular of cultural expression. Exemplifying an exchange between medical concepts, theological views, and political outlooks, this transposable model is nowhere more evident than in the English playhouse.

Chapter 4

Staging Papal Bodies from Edward VI to King James I

Theatrical representation of papal bodies in post-Reformation England can be divided into five categories: the genealogy of the antichrist pope, thaumaturgical friars, popish fools, bloodthirsty cardinals, and diseased Catholics. The classification of popish stereotypes stems from particular historical periods (generally from King Edward VI to King James I) where the veneration of a Protestant ingenuity to create definitive Catholic villains was highly regarded and in constant demand. Reflecting the cultural visualization of a milieu entrenched in emergent conceptions of religion, corporeality, and popular entertainment, personifications of Catholicism on the English stage direct our attention to the manifestation of a prevailing fascination with both the Catholic body and cultural embodiment of contemporary ideas. These performances, which are undeniably positioned from a Protestant vantage point, participate in constructing popular sentiment that in turn forms the basis of a developing type of commercialization designed for mass appeal: anti-Catholic spectacle. Beginning with private showings and ending with public performances, I will examine several stage plays that contribute to the formation of archetypal popish characters in early modern English culture. Stimulating the circulation of widespread trends concerning the dramatic origins of anti-Catholic spectacle, early modern stage plays that revolve around the Catholic body present modern readers with visceral ideas of a cultural imagination draped in dangerous flesh.

Early modern England habitually engaged with displays of communal violence and state power in order to control information and disseminate prevailing ideologies. Jean Howard has discussed the social intricacies of public trials, coronations, and civic events, arguing these processes served agendas of defamation, regulation, and delegitimization (1-5). Theatrical platforms ranged from the gallows to pageantry to sermons and, of course, to the playhouse. During Elizabeth's and James's reigns, Protestantism shaped dramatizations of England's religio-political structure. In contrast to other displays of state power and religious domination where the population's presence was mandatory, the playhouse had to appeal to crowds if playwrights wanted to survive in the competitive marketplace of popular culture. Theatre, as Jean Howard notes, "became the focus for discharging anxieties about many sorts of social changes or threats to established power" (6). Maintaining differing ideological ideals informed by divergent eras, early modern playwrights present papal bodies as both harmful and dangerous to the religious, moral, and social order of the spheres they inhabit.

The plays I will be examining in this chapter are examples of the religious, moral, and social anxieties surrounding Catholicism's perceived characteristics and satanic propensities. Personifying contemporary belief whilst reflecting sellable agendas, anti-Catholic plays draw the spectator into a theatrical illusion through the visualization of evil bodies. These bodies are always Catholic or reside in Catholic countries such as Spain or Italy. Regarding physical appearance, papal bodies would have been obvious figures to early modern playgoers. Actors playing a cardinal, friar, or pope would wear the appropriate vestments. Witnessing Catholic characters through costume, audiences would have seen a Catholic character before observing the actions that would come to define that character. Michael O'Connell defines these visualizations in tandem with "technologies of representation" (5). As O'Connell and Elizabeth Williamson have noted, these new ways of seeing had an extraordinary

impact within England (O'Connell 5-11; Williamson 12). Antitheatricalists, Protestant theologians, and Catholics alike took issue with role-playing because it essentially transformed one body into another: a man into a woman, a Protestant into a Catholic, or a person of affluence into a hollow minded fool. For example, the Catholic priest Thomas Wright dwells on the transformative quality of clothing in 1604. "Extraordinary apparrell of the bodie, declareth well the apparrell of the mind", he writes, "for some you have so inconstant in their attire, that the varietie of their garments pregnantly proveth the ficklenesse of their heads: for they are not much unlike to Stage-players" (K4^{v}). Players, he continues, become gentlemen, clowns, and fools when they adorn their bodies with garments of a certain appearance.

In contrast, Protestant preachers understood that to wear the papal clergy's clothing onstage was to become a member of the papacy. This is not to suggest that all audience members would have viewed theatre in this light. Certainly, many would have distinguished between reality and illusion. Mistaking fiction for veracity, however, was not a problematic issue provided such parallels adhered to the dominant notions of religion and politics. Before examining the rich catalogue of anti-Catholic dramas written that subscribe to these ideologies it is important to mention Protestantism's paradoxical and yet persistent relationship with theatricality itself.

Considering Protestant writers' numerous accusations of Catholicism's inherent theatricality, it is rather strange that many Protestant ministers located stage plays in territory somewhere between entertainment, didacticism, and evil. Although George Abbot scoffs at exorcists in Catholic countries who writhe with papal artifice, comparing the possessed to characters "of stage-playes" where "a Devill and a foole" are always present (R3^{v}), other preachers such as Leonard Wright declared, "Both the body and the mind, are sometimes to be refreshed with playes, saith Peter Martyr: to make us afterwards more prompt unto graver matters" (A4^{r}). Another minister, referring to "Satanical pride and "his hellishness" the pope, compares the reception of dramatic plays to English reactions surrounding social tumults and political dissent (Harsnett Y1^{v}; X1^{r}). Offering a lengthy description of theatricality's link to religion and politics, one preacher explains the cultural interplay between drama and the body. "The end of a Comedie is a *plaudite* to the Author, and Actors", he explains at length,

> the one for his invention, the other for his good action: of a Tragædie, the end is moving of affection, and passion in the spectators. Our *Daemonopia*, or devil-fiction, is *Tragico-comedia*, a mixture of both, as *Amphitryo* in *Plautus* is: and did by the good invention, and cariage, obtaine both these ends. First it had a *plaudite* often; *O Catholicam fidem*! and *O that all the Protestants in England did see the power of the Catholick Church*: and it moved affection and expression of teares. Marwood did tumble, foame, and rage so lively, when hee was touched with *Campians* girdle, as the gulld spectators did weepe to see the jugling knave, in such a supposed plight. But our Romane Authors, *Edmunds*, and his holy crue (his twelve holy disciples) the plotters of this devil-play, had a farther and deeper end: which by this impious devise they had achieved pretie well, and that was (after the Popes dialect) *the gaining of soules* for his Holines, and for Hell, the bewitching of the poore people, with an admiration of the power of theyr Romish Church, and priesthood, by these cogd miracles, and wonders; and thereby robbing them of theyr fayth towards God, and theyr loyaltie to theyr Prince, and reconciling them to the Pope, the Monster of Christianitie. (Harsnett V3^{v}-V4^{r})

Arguing the Antichrist wears "Popish apparell", Thomas Whetenhall refutes theologians who do not take issue with religious surplices. If ministers wear what appear to be papal costumes, they will be "compelled either to loose their Ministery, or else to be attyred like vices and fooles in playes" (V3^{v}). "Papistes", declares Thomas Naogeorg in 1570, practice "whoredome" to the extent they "count it but a playe" (R2^{v}). For several religious writers and moralists, the outward revealed inner qualities. "To become a Christian visible unto others", preaches Henoch Clapham, requires "outward Workes (as fruites) whereby we may be well perswaded of the Fayth that is inward, as in the inwardlife of the tree; which is unseeable otherwise then in the fruites flowing from it" (D4^{r}). Carrying out malevolent activities and wearing papal attire, the Catholic body represents religious misdeeds and immoral behavior.

The plays under investigation in this chapter appeared between the 1540s and early 1600s. Hence, in this brief survey, I seek to neither offer a comprehensive analysis of early modern drama in this period nor examine every theatrical text that dramatizes papal bodies. The texts I have selected represent new characters in the literary canon (the antichrist pope for example) while others exemplify cultural trends and the burgeoning interest in Catholic villains. The playwrights of these texts range from evangelical reformers to business savvy writers who recognized there was a massive amount of public interest and commercial gain in staging anti-Catholic stereotypes.

The Satanic Body: Anti-Catholic Drama under Edward VI

King Edward VI's dominion over England coincided with the inaugural staging of the antichrist pope. This legendary creature, which had originated with Luther during his early series of propaganda woodcuts illustrated by Philipp Melanchthon in the 1500s, is the focal point for playgoers in Bernardino Ochino's *A Tragoedie or Dialoge of the Unjuste Usurped Primacie of the Biship of Rome* (1549). Portraying the pope's body as a deformed creature whose sole purpose is to commit blasphemous acts in the name of Lucifer, Ochino's anti-Catholic drama anticipates the rise of anti-papal literature under Elizabeth and James. "I have devised with my self", utters Lucifer at the beginning of the play,

> to make a certaine newe kingdome replenished with idolatry, superstition, ignoraunce, error, falsehoode, deceit, compulsion, extorsion, treason, contencion, discorde, tiranny, and crueltie, with spoylinge, murder, ambicion, filthines, injuries, factions, sectes, wickednes, and mischiefe, in the which kingdome all kyndes of abhominacion shalbe committed (A3^{v})

For Protestants throughout Elizabeth's reign, these qualities would come to define Roman Catholicism for the better half of a century.

Translated by John Ponet and initially published in the late 1540s, Ochino's drama focuses on the satanic pedigree of the papal antichrist. A Capuchin friar admired by John Calvin, Ochino left Italy for England in the 1540s. By 1548, he was a favored minister among London's Italian population. Although his drama never received a public response (reserved for private showings in prestigious London homes), this text showcases motifs at the core of Protestant attacks against the papacy throughout the sixteenth century (Taplin). The play opens with Lucifer plotting to claim ownership of the world. Reflecting on how "God sent hys sonne into the world […] for the salvacion of all mankynde", Lucifer explains to his fellow fiends in hell that he too "wyll sende [a] sonne into the world, who for destruction and

condemnacion of mankynde, shall so advaunce hymselfe that he shall take upon hym to be made equall with God" (A3^{v}-B1^{r}). Similar to God's desire to enflesh the Holy Spirit with the body of man, Satan desires to infect a man with his devilish spirit. The result of which is the hellish enfleshment of Lucifer. Praising the Devil for his diabolical design, Beezlebub excitedly remarks: "For who would beleve that christian menne (which excell in wisdome and judgement) could be brought to this poynt to beleve that the kingdome of the devill is the kyngdome of God?" (B1^{r})

The two devils go on to discuss the qualities of this unholy candidate. After describing how this man must be prone to idolatry, superstition, pride, and wickedness, Beelzebub quips, "Me thinketh that I heare the lively image of Antichriste hymselfe handsomly and properly described of you [Lucifer]" (B3^{r}). Lucifer, however, finds "the Bishoppe of Rome" to be "the most mete instrument to bringe about the thynge that we intend" (B3^{r}-B3^{v}). Reminding audience members of Protestant attacks against the antichrist pope in sermons at this time, Lucifer's plan sustains allusions to unhealthy bodies and visceral penetration. "Infect this church of Rome", he schemes, "by little & little, not in the outward showe, but in the inward bowells" of the body (B3^{v}). Arguing Satan infiltrated the Catholic Church akin to a foreign object that slowly enters the body prior to sickness, Thomas Bell in *The Survey of Popery* (1596) enlightens readers by clarifying, "popery was not hatched al on one day, moneth, or yeere, but crept into the church by little and little" (N5^{r}). Indeed, Protestant preachers identified the origins of Roman Catholicism to be a most holy and unspotted religion. The abuses that "crept in [to]" the church writes Thomas Whetenhall, grew "little and little" until finally they engulfed the papal body, creating "Antichrist the Pope, that great *Papa*" into existence (C2^{r}). Tracing the lineage of specific satanic popes, and citing the Book of Revelation as evidence, preachers were able to pinpoint the precise date the papacy performed the inaugural pact with the devil.

Arguing the papacy challenged Christ's supreme authority over the universal Church, preachers declared the pope's title of ecumenical Bishop dismembered Christ's head from the body. The Bishop of Constantinople, Thomas Bell argues, "sought by all means possible to have the primacy of al other bishops, & for that end termed himselfe universal bishop" (N6^{r}). A Roman Catholic priest and Protestant activist, Bell's history is imbued with religious controversy and paradox. The preacher enrolled in St. John's College, Cambridge in 1565 and became deacon four years later. In 1570, he converted to Catholicism before undergoing imprisonment in York Castle. Eventually fleeing in 1576, Bell escaped to his beloved Rome and became a student of philosophy at the recently founded English College. During these years, the exiled minister participated in the debates surrounding the formation of Jesuits and was quite vocal in his condemnation of the Society of Jesus. In 1582, Bell left Rome on the papal order that he was to preach Catholicism in England. Returning to his native land, Bell faced rising ostracism from the Catholic Church because of his radical views that one could be Catholic whilst swearing allegiance to a Protestant sovereign. By 1592, he had grown cynical of the papal administration. In the following year, Bell began to work closely with local authorities to curb the spread of Catholicism within England (Walsham). From the 1590s onwards, Bell wrote several popular works that were intensely anti-Catholic.

Asserting that it was "Bonifacius the bishop of Rome and third of that name" who first demanded to be called "the chief of al bishops, and that Rome should be the head of all Churches", Bell explains to readers this prepared the way for the Antichrist (N6^{r}). Echoing these claims, Downame affirms that under Emperor Phocas the "Anti-

Christian title of *the head of the catholike or universall Church, or oecumenicall & universall Bishop*" emerged (B2^{v}). Infecting Pope Boniface III (the historical figure that ruled the Catholic Church in the seventh century) with devilish ingenuity, Lucifer corrupts the pontiff because this figure is the religious and physical source of the Catholic body. Labeling the pope "a childe of the devil", Walter Lynne argues in *The Beginning and Endyne of all Popery* (1548), "by the persuasion and illusion of the devil [….] the pope […] became [the] successor" and "chiefe governour here on earth" (E1^{v}-E2^{r}). Thomas Wright finds that prior to Boniface, "the Sea of Rome remayned in some reasonable order, not presuming to exalt her selfe above her sister-Churches" (B1^{v}). However, once Boniface received the title of "supreme head of the universall Church", this damned the Christian Church, opening the floodgates to satanic lore (B1^{v}). Approving of Boniface's satanic heritage, George Downame, Oliver Ormerod, and Thomas Beard agree the pontiff was the inaugural antichrist pope. "About the yeare 607", Downame explains, "when *Boniface* the third obtained the supremacie over the universall Church" the "Antichrist was come and shewed" (C1^{v}).

Claiming the head of the antichristian body resembles both the pope and the lineage of popes, preachers stressed the satanic genealogy of Catholicism. Figuring this into an imaginary dialogue between a minister and a recusant, Oliver Ormerod explains, "Albeit the Church of Rome was once the eye of the west, and the true Church of god", it "fell […] away from God into idolatrie and Apostasie, about the yeare of our Lord 607" (V2^{v}). Again, Boniface is the "first Antichristian Bishop of Rome", and "since him", the preacher argues, "all his successors have taken unto them the same Antichristian title" (V2^{v}). Thomas Beard in *The Antichrist the Pope of Rome* (1625) explains "when we say that the pope is Antichrist, and that Rome is his seate, we do not meane that all those that have bene Bishops of Rome since the Apostles times have bene Antichrists", but instead "when Pope *Boniface* the third obtained of the Emperour *Phocas*" all subsequent antichrists "hath beene" of the devil (C1^{v}).

Returning to the play, we find that Beelzebub is unsure of Satan's plan to coax the pontiff into submission by appealing to the clergyman's mortal pride. "When I conysder howe shorte the lyfe of man is", he begins, "it semeth to me a thinge unpossible, that one byshop of Rome, in so shorte a space shoulde bring to passe so many mischefes" (C2^{r}). Lucifer retorts, "me thinketh that ye be very dull for this name of Antichrist is not the proper name of any one man, but is common name to many", and "notwithstanding that it is a fyt name for all of them, that be contrary and enemies to Christ, yet chiefly and above all other it agreeth to those byshopes of Rome" (C2^{r}). Following the news that Emperor Phocas has declared the Bishop of Rome the head of Christ's mystical body, the people of Rome exclaim, the pope "hathe the spirite of the devyll" and is a "a develishe head" for Christian corporeality (F3^{r}). Mourning the death of God, the citizens in the drama lament how the pope "shall bee a thynge lyke a monster", reminding audiences of preachers' caricatures of papal beasts and Romish monstrosities (F3^{r}). Meanwhile, Satan revels in the success of his strategy, decreeing the "byrthe of Antichrist" has arrived (S2^{r}).

Ending on a markedly Protestant tone that perhaps encapsulates the public's desire that King Edward will eradicate Catholicism during his reign over England, the drama comes to a close as Christ plans to destroy the antichrist pope. Sitting alongside Archangels Michael and Gabriel, Christ beckons them forth. "Myne angels", he asks, "see you not howe a mortall manne in earthe, beinge most viciouse, and abhominacion it selfe, with no small injurye and contempte of god adventureth to

settel himselfe to be my Vicar, and the universall head of my churche?" (X3^{r}) Disgusted by the pope's behavior, he continues, "see you not howe under that pretence he hath crucified me agayne? And buried me agayne with all my great benefites? My gospell, and my grace? See you not howe he hathe defiled, and infected the holy churche" with his abominations?" (X3^{r}) Searching for an appropriate container to fill with his spirit, Christ discovers the perfect candidate in the form of an English King. Selecting Henry VIII, Christ provides a celestial remedy to the papal plague. To add further strength to this cause, Christ provides Henry with a noble son, Edward VI. Like his father, Edward will follow in Henry's footsteps and will purge kingdoms of Catholicism with divine strength.

Through scriptural exegesis preachers in the early modern period aligned papal corporeality with purportedly historical accounts of satanic influence in the Catholic Church. John Fielde, a Protestant clergyman who dedicated much of his time to producing anti-Catholic discourse in this period, maintained "sundry of the Popes [...] have had familiar conference with the divell, their owne damme, and by his meanes they have had their entrance, exercising themselves in magical and devilish arts" (B3^{r}-B3^{v}). Often labeled a puritan preacher and hardline minister, Fielde was a leading figure in the scholastic underground (Lake and Questier *The Antichrist's Lewd* xxii). Throughout 1567, he held scholarly apprenticeships that lead him to research material for the second edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. By the 1580s, Fielde was preaching on antichristian ills in private estates throughout London, perhaps addressing crowds in the homes of individuals that had witnessed Ochino's anti-papal drama in the previous decades (Collinson). Publishing a response to the Jesuit priest Robert Parson's pamphlet *A Brief Discourse Why Catholics Refuse to Go to Church* (1580) in 1581, Fielde provides further chronological details as to when the papacy entered into nefarious rituals of a satanic orientation. "Martine the second in the yeare of Christ 882", he argues, "atteyned to his Popedome by Nigromancye" (Biij^{v}). The notion the pope had secret dealings with Lucifer gained traction amongst Protestant theologians, and by the end of Edward's rule explicit details on the popes ascension by way of Luciferian dealings had taken hold of preachers, playwrights, and the public.

Magical Bodies, Foolish Vessels, and Bloodthirsty Figures: Elizabethan Anti-Catholic Drama

Queen Elizabeth's appointment to the throne in 1558 cultivated the construction of novel Catholic scoundrels in the public sphere. Although playwrights continued to explore the genealogy of the antichrist pope on the stage, alternate anti-Catholic histories began to saturate playgoers' minds. Coinciding with Protestant preachers' exploration of demonic friars, imprudent Jesuits, and savage cardinals, Elizabeth's dominion over England led to dramatizations of papal magicians, popish clowns, and murderous Catholics. Achieving graphic visualizations of anti-Catholic readings, playwrights continued to showcase theatre's ability to embody contemporary religious concerns by staging Protestant images of Catholic bodies. Unlike sermons, however, the stage continued to highlight the visual properties of anti-Catholic discourse, offering audiences a sensory experience of a sentiment formerly restricted to spectators' imaginations.

Thirty years after the staging of Ochino's drama, Nathanial Woodes's *The Conflict of Conscience* (1581) emerged. Set in Italy, the drama revolves around Francis Spiera. Otherwise known as Philologus, Francis is a devoted Protestant

coerced into a Catholic conversion. Discussing his beloved son, Satan reflects on his papal progeny. "My daryling deare, My eldest boy, in whom I doo delight", he purrs, "his hart with love, to mee, so much anounds" (A4^{r}). Referring to the pontiff, Satan establishes himself as the pope's father. In many ways, *The Conflict of Conscience* is the dramatic sequel to Ochino's *A Tragoedie or Dialoge of the Unjuste Usurped Primacie of the Biship of Rome*: Edward has been unable to purge Catholicism unequivocally, Protestantism is still in its nascent stages, and the pope remains the head of the Catholic Church. Before too long audiences witness the pope, or rather the pope's vestments, as "under his Cloake our partes we should playe" explains the characters Avarice, Tyranny, and Hypocrisy (B4^{r}). These characters represent both "popish policye" and the antichrist pope (B4^{r}). Spiera then becomes the centerpiece of dramatic action when the aforementioned characters bicker amongst one another, stating that the Italian Protestant has been declaring throughout the land, "the Pope is Anticraist" (E1^{r}). Demanding Francis repent and admonish, Tyranny, Hypocrisy, and Avarice request that the Protestant convert to Catholicism. A nervous Spiera accepts the demand (albeit grudgingly) and is free to leave the papal court.

Unlike Ochino's *A Tragoedie or Dialoge*, Woodes's drama has two alternate endings. In the original conclusion of the performance Spiera commits suicide because he is unable to accept his Catholic conversion. "Oh dolefull newes" reports the narrator,

> Philologus by deepe dispaire hath hanged himselfe with coard,
> His Wife for dolor and distresse, her yellow haire she teares,
> His Children sigh and weepe for griefe, lyfe is of them abhorde:
> But in this man we may describe, the iudgements of the Lord:
> Who though he spare his rod awhile, in hope we will amende,
> If we persist in wickednesse, he plagues vs in the ende.
> These thirty weekes Philologus , hath had afflicted mynde,
> All which time, he would take no meate, but that against his wyll,
> A certaine man of courage stout, his handes with coards did bynde:
> And with a fether, or a spoone, his mouth with broth did fill,
> Hee with his power laboring, the same, on ground to spill:
> He did auoide no maner thing, no sleepe he could attaine.
> And his owne hand, now at the last, hath wrought his endles paine (Hunter 29).

In the alternate 1581 edition of the text readers observe a different ending. "O joyfull newes" shouts the narrator, "Philologus, that would have hangde himselfe with coard, Is nowe converted unto God, with manie bitter teares" (I4^{r}). Woodes, imagining someone in the throes of Catholic conversion, conceives two possible outcomes: recantation or suicide.

Focusing on Satan's bonds to the Catholic Church, Ochino's and Woodes's dramas trace the genealogy of the Antichrist to show the corporeal manifestation of Lucifer's spirit. The devil permeates the pope thereby eliciting visual associations between the papal body and Satan. As I explored earlier in the chapter, the lineage of antichristian popes had a specific history for many Protestant theologians. In *The Hunting of Antichrist* (1589) Leonard Wright reveals to readers the antichrist's ancestry. "First the devil begat darknesse", he begins,

> darknes begat ignorance, ignorance begat error, error begat merits, merits begat the Masse, the Masse begat superstition, superstition begat hypocrisie, hypocrisie begat lucre, lucre begat purgatorie, Purgatorie begat abundance, abundance begat pompe, pompe begat ambition, ambition begat the Pope &

> Cardinals, and the Pope & Cardinals brought forth tyrannie, murther of Saints, & licence to sinne, the end whereof is death and utter destruction. To conclude, forasmuch as Christ himselfe was accused of high treason, against the romane empire, persecuted, condemned, and crucified, within the circuite of the Romish dominions, by the Romish officers, & according to the romish lawes: it must needs follow, that the same Empire which hath so persecuted the head, should bring forth that monster which should persecute the members (B4^{v})

Drawing on biblical scripture, Wright stresses that the pope demands material veneration. The pontiff's personal qualities, religious conditions, and hubristic properties determine his antichristian pride. Imagining the antichrist's corporeality, Wright states the pope doubles as both the Antichrist and the head of Satan's church: "his greasie shavelings, as Cardinals, Bishops, & Priests for the bodie: and his rascall rable of Monkes and Friers, for the venimous tayle of that monstrous dragon" (B4^{v}). More specifically, he finds in the time of Constantine there were many "infectious heresies" and "pestilent Disciples" of what were to become the antichrist's flock (B1^{r}). For a time, however, God sanctioned the Catholic religion. This changed when Satan "infected the minde of John Archbishop of Constantople, as at length he presumed to chalenge unto himselfe the proude title of universall Bishop, Pope, or Arch-father" (B1^{v}). Once the church suffered initial infection, antichristian blemishes plagued the papacy thereafter. Discussing a few notable devilish popes, John Panke finds, "*John* 12 was a monster of monsters for pride, whoredomes, adulteries […] sacrileges, blasphemies, incest, murders, perjuries, and such others" (Y1^{r}). As I will discuss in the following chapter, pestilence, infection, murder, and incest are qualities that Catholic characters repeatedly embody throughout Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*.

The fuel that powered the antichristian machine, Satan is the inverted Holy Spirit that breathes poisonous life into the papacy. Arguing the devil sustains the Catholic body, Deios clarifies, "but he in the *Revelations* is not called the *beast*, but by other names: for he is named the *Dragon*, the *olde serpent*, and *satan*" (A5^{r}). For the staunchly anti-puritan minister, Catholics are unable to discern the pope's true nature because they do not align the beast described in Revelation with the pontiff, or Catholicism for that matter. "The papists worhsipfull *Antichrist*", he explains, is "a perilous beast that shall raigne but three yeeres and a halfe" (A7^{r}). In this time, Catholic "minds are turned away from seeing the Pope to bee the very beastly *Antichrist* as hee is" (A7^{v}). Consequently, the Antichrist "is a secret enemie cloked with the name of a friend" (B1^{v}). The proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing, the pope, Deios asserts, represents the apocalyptic Gog in the Old and New Testament because he is "covered, secret, and hidden: wherefore as the one is an open enemie [Magog], so the other is secret, and therfore more dangerous" (B3^{r}). Lucifer lures the pope into submission by espousing his supremacy within the church. The pope: or, "the papists worshipfull *Antichrist*", worships Lucifer in order to undergo an ecclesiastical transformation of satanic preeminence (A7^{r}). Yet by the 1590s the antichrist pope and Catholicism's devilish pedigree was no longer in vogue. Rather, the magic the pope utilises to summon Lucifer became the subject of intense interest in dramatic circles.

Replacing alleged historical accounts of the antichrist's inception and infectious capabilities, Robert Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1588) stages papal limbs enthralled by magic and demonic conjuration. A figure who dabbled in euphuistic writing, pastoral stories, Greek mythology, and pamphlet writing, Greene is England's first dramatic celebrity prior to Shakespeare. Describing how the poet and playwright was already an icon in England by the early 1580s, Gabriel Harvey

dismisses the author as an over-productive hack. "Who in London hath not heard of his dissolute, and licentious living", he asks readers in 1592, "his fonde disguising of a Master of Arte with ruffianly haire, unseemely apparrell, and more unseemelye Company [...] his fine coosening of Juglers, and finer juggling with cooseners" (qtd. in Greenblatt *Will in the World* 206). Referring to the author's "impudent pamphletting, phantasticall interluding, and desperate libelling", Harvey condemns Greene's prolific career, accusing the author of fashioning a quasi-mythological image in order to woo English men and women and conceal his literary aptitude (Dyce xci). Despite Harvey's feelings, patrons of public playhouses demanded continuous performances of Greene's plays. Although he does not appear to preserve passionate anti-Catholic feeling, the playwright does include Ludovico Ariosto's opinion that the pope is both a "monster" and the "Antechrist" in *The Spanish Masquerado* published in 1589 ($B2^{r}$).

Performed consistently from the 1580s through to the early 1600s, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* is a comedy set in eleventh century England that revolves around amorous lovers and conjurors. At the beginning of the drama, Ralph (the play's fool) implores the lovesick Prince Edward to seek the help of a purported magical Catholic living within England. "Sirrah Ned", he cries, "we'll ride to Oxford to Friar Bacon! Oh, He is a brave scholar, sirrah; they say he is a brave necromancer, that he can make women of devils, and he can juggle cats into costermongers" (1.1.82). Intrigued by the news, Edward, or Ned, discourses at length with his fellow comrades. Declaring, "the fool hath laid a perfect plot", Prince Edward announces, "necromantic spells" and "charms of art" will "enchain" his love (1.1.95-99). Riding toward Oxford, the troupe discuss how "Bacon shall by his magic do this deed" (1.1.103).

Audiences first see Friar Bacon in Scene Five. Resting in his study at Brazenose College, Oxford, the Catholic magician notices three of the University's doctors in his doorway. Inquiring into the sorcerer's studies, Doctor Burden, Doctor Mason, and Doctor Clement request the friar entertain them awhile. Miles, the friar's servant, enters the stage carrying necromantic books under his coat. Described in the stage directions as a "*simple youth who regards his master's experiments with respectful amusement*", Miles does not enter the room quickly enough (1.2). "Miles", barks Friar Bacon, "where are you?" (1.2.1) Replying in Latin, Miles states, "*Hic sum, doctissime et reverendissime doctor*" to which Bacon retorts, "*Attulisti nos libros de necromantia?*" (1.2.2-3) Recorded as "*intoning*", Miles replies, "*Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum habitare libros in unum!*" (1.2.4) In addition to this exchange, audiences witness a second scene where Latin is the acoustic focal point. "You canst speak not one word of true Latin" scoffs Bacon (1.5.14) "No, sir", Miles retorts, "yet, what is this else? *Ego sum tuus homo,* "I am your man": I warrant you, sir, as good Tully's phrase as any is in Oxford" (1.5.15). In a fit of exasperation Friar Bacon jeers, "Come on, sirrah; what part of speech is *Ego"* (1.5.16). It is "I", replies the servant, "marry, *nomen substantivo*" (1.5.17). Cuffing him, Friar Bacon hollers, "Oh gross dunce!" (1.5.20). The Friar personifies anti-Catholic sights in that he is cruel to his onstage counterpart and is attired in decorous papal garments. His sounds, however, add further depth to the drama's anti-Catholic resonances.

In post-Reformation English culture, Latin became a semantic device constantly mocked by preachers because of its link to Catholicism's sound. Defining papal priests whom "rowte" and "knowe never a worde of all that he, in latine phrase doth sounde", Thomas Naogeorg describes Latin as a "babbling noyse" that represents "the outwarde shew" of "ceremonies darke" ($K3^{v}$). Friars, cardinals, and

bishops, the preacher announces, produce "filthie tune" and a "filthie noyse" when they make occult utterances during Catholic rituals (P2^{r}; P3^{v}). "Mumbling with a secret voyce", papal figures enjoy producing sounds they neither understand nor recognize beyond mere noises (E2^{v}). For Naogeorg, the Latin tongue is a "lewde", "filthie", "secret", and wholly Catholic expression (H3^{r}; H1^{v}). Arguing Latin functions to preserve Catholic secrecy and seduce "th'unlearned simple minde", the preacher argues these sounds contaminate "sencelesse eares" (M1^{v}; H1^{v}). At one point, he even suggests the Catholic religion is nothing else but sound: "Their whole religion doth consist in singing day and night" (G4^{v}). Pinpointing Catholic friars who "laugh with a rowting noyse", Naogeorg describes "gaping jawes" that "crye" out in satanic ecstasy (D4^{r}). Similarly, John Panke preaches, Catholics pray to false idols "in an unkowen tongue" and "read the Scriptures" in a "vulgar" language (F2^{v}). An "English man in the English tongue", he continues, "shal not understand what they meane" (F3^{r}). Therefore, when preachers use phrases such as "Romish rabble" and "Antichristian rabble", they are associating Catholicism with what are essentially bad sounds (Wright B2^{r}; Abbot C4^{r}). Denoting aural dissonance, Catholic noises become sites of Protestant dispute. "The diverse-coloured soules of their Monkes", George Abbot spits, "such singing and chanting with Organs, such ringing of Belles" are signs of external pomp and serve only to magnify "fleshy and carnall imaginations" (E3^{v}-E4^{r}). It is feasible, then, to suggest Protestant audience members would have associated the onstage exchange between Miles and Bacon with satanic sounds.

Assuming a nervous stance onstage, the three doctors stare at the multiple relics scattered in Bacon's study. Imploring his colleagues to share their mind, the friar asks why they have disturbed him from theosophical ponderings. "Bacon, we hear", explains Doctor Burden, "That long we have suspect, that thou art read in magic's mystery;/ In pyromancy, to divine by flames;/ To tell, by hydromatic, ebbs and tides;/ By aeromancy to discover doubts, to plain out questions, as Apollo did" (1.2.12-16). Speaking of how a "brazen head [...] shall unfold strange doubts and aphorisms", the Doctor speaks of contemporary imaginings and medieval fables (1.2.22-23). "By the help of devils and ghastly fiends", he continues, "thou mean'st, ere many years or days be past, to compass England with a wall of brass" (1.2.25-26). Unsure of what to make of these questions, Bacon replies cautiously, "and what of this?" (1.2.28) In an unexpected display of joy, the Doctors congratulate the friar, explaining these ploys will strengthen the state.

Meanwhile, one Doctor remains unconvinced of Bacon's necromantic skills. Gesturing with his hands, the friar yells "*Per omnes deos infernales, Belcephon*" and a devil suddenly appears (1.2.105). Speaking Latin, the Catholic conjuror articulates dissonant reverberations that evoke occult provocations. Dumbfounded by the magical display, the Doctor soon recovers and mutters, "a pox on all conjuring friars" (1.2.124). Proving his supernatural talents and capacity to summon fiends, the doctor leaves the friar to his mysterious devices. Cementing Friar Bacon's Catholic magic in playgoers' minds, Greene proceeds to transport the audience to a new, undisclosed location.

King Henry III, the Emperor of Germany, the King of Castile, and Dr. Jacques Vandermast are walking together somewhere in England. Vandermast is a renowned German magician described by the Emperor as a gifted conjurer "pass'd into Padua, to/ Florence and to fair/ Bologna, to Paris [...] and stately/ Orleans, and, talking there with men of art, put down the chiefest of them all in aphorisms, in magic" (1.4.48-53). Talking of his conjurer's travels and enchanted proficiencies, the Emperor asks King Henry if there are any in England who can match the sorcerer's

talents. The King eagerly replies that the group will head to Oxford. Here, the king explains, Vandermast will encounter "a jolly Friar/ Call'd Friar Bacon, England's only flower" (1.4.59-60). This last word is perhaps a reference to Edmund Campion, the Jesuit martyr and resident scholar of the new Oxford college of St. John's. Studying philosophy and theology for several years, contemporaries regarded Campion the flower of Oxford. Travelling to the university to meet Henry's reputed conjurer, the troupe encounter Friar Bungay. "Now, English Harry", the Emperor roars, "here begins the game:/ We shall see sport between these learnèd men" (1.9.75-76). Unable to find Friar Bacon, Vandermast must battle the Catholic conjuror in lieu of England's best. Staring at the clergyman with an air of superiority, the German magician asks, "what wilt thou do?" Friar Bungay, a nervy fool whose supernatural capabilities are lackluster in comparison with Friar Bacon, waves his arms in trepidation (1.9.77). Summoning a golden tree ornamented with a fire-breathing dragon, the clergyman conjures otherworldly fiends reminiscent of Saint John's apocalyptic imagery. Waving his hand in a gentle motion, Vandermast raises Hercules to subdue the beast and destroy the tree. Forlorn, Friar Bungay leaves and Friar Bacon arrives onstage. "Now, monarchs", Henry applauds, "hath the German found his match" (1.9.124). Standing silently by the German doctor, Hercules is momentarily transfixed by Friar Bacon. Unable to regain control of his apparition, Vandermast grows increasingly amazed. "Never before was't known to Vandermast", he whispers in awe, "That men held devils in such obedient awe./ Bacon doth more than art, or else I fail" (1.9.145-147). As the drama comes to a close, however, the friar exhibits remorse and recants his mystic arts. "The hours I have spent in pyromantic spells", he sobs, "The fearefull tossing in the latest night of papers full of necromantic charms" and "Conjuring and abjuring devils and fiends" appear to have left him spiritually destitute (1.13.88-90). Announcing to those around him he will spend the remainder of his life "in pure devotion", Friar Bacon leaves the stage praying to God, asking for forgiveness (1.13.107).

Satanic conjuration is a notable characteristic of Catholics in the minds of Protestant preachers. Thomas Beard portrays the pope of Rome as a descendant of Simon Magus while the clergy are the babes who suckle "pestilent infection" from the papal bosom (Kk1^{r}). Preaching about a wealthy bishop who lately "flourished in the worlde", Leonard Wright explains how the clergyman began to swell in pomp and pride (B1^{v}). The more he dabbled in Catholicism the further he amplified vice. Abandoning the bishop, the Holy Spirit ultimately returned to the clergyman's quarters to destroy his body. If Friar Bacon had stayed on his supernatural path, which denotes Catholicism, then perhaps the clergyman would have suffered a similar fate. Renouncing the black arts in the play's final moments, Friar Bacon's decision to forsake magic can be seen as a Protestant ending to a play set in a time of Roman Catholicism.

As Bacon's drama demonstrates, papal clergy are habitually depicted as necromantic conjurors and magicians throughout Elizabeth's monarchy. Although it is often the pope that summons Lucifer, cardinals, friars, and bishops regularly attend in either the aiding of the pontiff's magic or opt to conjure Satan themselves. While some members of the papacy "came in by Simonie, some by Negromancie, and some by poysoning", Leonard Wright, a religious controversialist and moralist, identified specific figures committing incest and murder while chanting satanic liturgy amidst otherworldly execrations (B2^{r}). In Wright's mind, Popes Benedict I, Sylvester III, and Gregory VI had neglected the word of God in favor of "mens purses and their consciences", and in the doing so defaced "true religion" under the "cloke of

professed povertie" (B2^{v}). Tracing these fables one step further, John Legate's translation of George Sohn's *A Briefe And Learned Treatise Conteining a True Description of the Antichrist* (1592) recognizes that the pope "is indeed prophane, wicked, & an Atheist, because he getteth this kingdome by magique or Symonie, or else by threats, sedition, and tumult" (D5^{v}-D6^{r}). Labeling Gregory V and Sylvester II as especially wily magicians, Sohn explains, these men were "caried with a devilish desire of authority, did first by bribes obtain the Archbishoprick of *Rhenes"* before summoning Lucifer (D6^{r}). Submitting their corporeality to the devil, Gregory and Sylvester surrendered "both soule & bodie" to Lucifer in order to receive their "great promotion" (D6^{v}). Referring to Pope Hildebrand, "which by art of Magike danced in fire, raised up round about him without hurt", Deios warns English men and women the pope is a "new kinde of *Alchymist*" who will consume mortals with his devilish fire (B7^{r}-B7^{v}).

Identifying several popes as necromancers with a penchant for dice games, George Downame offers modern readers a clear example of popes who supposedly practiced the black arts. Declaring that Pope John XXIV, Alexander VI, Sixtus IV, Paulus III, Clement VII, Julius II and Julius III, Leo X, and John XII "call upon the divell", these men "have bin knowne sorcerers & necromancers" (M4^{r}). The preacher then explains how Benedict VIII would often enter neighboring "woods & mountains to sacrifice to the diuell, & by magicall art to allure women unto him" (M4^{r}). Recalling Wright's supposition of the pope's fondness for men's gold, he explains Benedict eventually "sold the Papacy to *Gregory* the 6 for 1500 pound" (M4^{r}). In an attempt to reclaim his position and recover his money, Benedict invoked Satan to aid in his plan. Lucifer proceeded to explain to the exiled pope that Gregory had already sold his soul, and so Lucifer entered Benedict's chamber to kill him rather than obey the former pontiff. Downame explains, however, he could add "some twentie more" names if the reader cared to know the depth of the pope's thirst for sorcery (M4^{v}).

Engaging with the public's fervent interest with magic, Elizabethan playwrights staged stories involving sorcery, Catholicism, and the occult. English communities' preoccupation with such motifs is evidenced by plays such as Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene's *A Looking Glass for London* (1589), and Richard Johnson's *Seven Champions of Christendom* (1596). Under James the juncture between magic, religion, and drama continued to captivate audiences, and by the early 1600s some of the most commercially successful plays (such as Shakespeare's *The Tempest*) emerged. In the case of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Greene offers audiences the story of a repentant papal necromancer that abandons Catholicism's supposed obsession with magical arts in favor of pursuing a refined Christian life that prefigures the rise of Protestantism throughout Europe. Although *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* is not a vehemently anti-Catholic drama that champions the death or destruction of popish characters, it nevertheless embodies cultural perceptions surrounding the Elizabethan identification of the papal body practicing satanic rituals. In the years immediately following Green's staging of thaumaturgical friars, Christopher Marlowe incorporated magic and Catholicism into his production *The Tragicall History of Doctor Faustus* (c. 1590), albeit in distinctly comedic manner.

Personifying ignorant Catholics, devils, and religious conjurors, *The Tragicall History of Doctor Faustus* stages a comedic exchange between occult theosophy, the Roman clergy, and the beginnings of a new papal stereotype: the Catholic fool. Performed by the Admiral's Men over twenty five times in the space of three years, Marlowe's drama was one of the most popular plays of the 1590s. Summoning demonic fiends and reveling in the black arts, Dr. Faustus conjures a

devil from the depths of hell. Disgusted by the sight of the hellish monster, Faustus turns his head and gestures, "I charge thee to return and change thy shape/ Thou art too ugly to attend on me/ Go, and return an old Franciscan friar/ That holy shape becomes a devil best" (1.3.24-27). In contrast to other plays that stage the papacy, Marlowe's drama personifies foolish Catholics who function to produce cheap laughs within the audience. Commanding Mephistopheles (who has donned a friar's habit) to transport them around the world, Faustus soon discovers he is standing on popish soil: "tell me now, what resting place is this?/ Hast thou, as erst I did command/ Conducted me within the walls of Rome?" Nodding his head, Mephistopheles replies, "This is the godly palace of the Pope/ And cause we are no common quests/ I choose his privy chamber for our use" (3.2.22-28).

Rendering the pair invisible, the demon beckons Faustus to follow him so the two can carry out mischief in the Pope's domain. "In this show let me an actor be", begs the German magician, "that this proud Pope may Faustus' cunning see" (3.2.76-77). Acknowledging his master's command, Mephistopheles agrees to let Faustus dress like a clergyman and meddle with the pontiff. "But first stay", states the demon,

> And view their triumphs as they pass this way.
> And then devise what best contents thy mind
> By cunning in thine art to cross the Pope,
> Or dash the pride of this solemnity,
> To make his monks and abbots stand like apes,
> And point like antics at his triple crown,
> To beat the beads about the friars' pates,
> Or clap huge horns upon the cardinals' heads,
> Or any villainy thou canst devise,
> And I'll perform it, Faustus. Hark, they come!
> This day shall make thee be admired in Rome (3.2.78-89)

Entering with cardinals, bishops, monks, friars, the imprisoned sovereign of Hungary and enslaved Bruno Giordano, the Pope solemnly strides toward Saint Peter's chair. Two cardinals exit the stage, and as they leave Faustus quickly beckons his demonic companion. "Go, haste thee, gentle Mephistopheles/ Follow the cardinals to the consistory", he urges, "and as they turn their superstitious books, strike them with sloth and drowsy idleness/ And make them sleep so sound that in their shapes/ Thyself and I may parly with the Pope" (3.2.114-120).

Labeling the pontiff a proud fool, Faustus silently listens to the Pope's claims of temporal strength and divine succession while Mephistopheles attends to stealing popish apparel. Directing his words at Bruno the pontiff drones, "as Pope Alexander our progenitor/ Stood on the neck of German Frederick [...] That Peter's heirs should tread on emperors/ And walk upon the dreadful adder's back [...] So will we quell that haughty schismatic" and depose the regal government (3.2.138-147). Considering the inaugural performance of Marlowe's drama in its immediate context, which occurred in the years following the unsuccessful mission known as the Spanish Armada, audience members surely would have jeered at the Pope's ostentatious display of political muscle and military strength. For many Catholic sympathizers and crypto-Catholics alike, the botched invasion of 1588 resulted in voluminous converts to Protestantism because the fleet targeted England rather than religion. Requesting Bruno be escorted to a prison cell, the Pope summons the disguised Faustus and Mephistopheles to accompany the captive. Faustus and his demon, however, release the incarcerated Bruno and return their popish apparel to the sleeping cardinals. The two cardinals awake some time later and return to the Pope's court unaware their

vestments were used for novel entertainment. Demanding the cardinals explain where Bruno has been imprisoned, the Pope impatiently barks at the clergyman. Staring at one another with quizzical expressions, the cardinals request the Pope inform them of the prisoner's location. In response, the Pope screams, "By Peter, you shall die/ Unless you bring [him] forth immediately/ Hale them to prison, lade their limbs with gyves!/ False prelates, for this hateful treachery, cursed be your souls to hellish misery" (3.3.50-54). Confirming his penchant for power and torture, the Pope dishes out an excessive reaction, turning on his kin in a fit of rage.

Invoking a magical spell that will once again transform the pair invisible, Mephistopheles and his earthly master reappear onstage and begin to taunt the pontiff. Whacking the Pope behind the ears, the German magician pokes and prods the papal figure. "Oh, I am slain", yelps the Pope, "help me, my lords. Oh come, and help to bear my body hence/ Damned be this soul forever for this deed!" (3.3.88-90) Rushing offstage, the Pope and his attendants squeal with baffled apprehension. Mephistopheles jokingly coos, "now, Faustus, what will you do now?/ For I can tell you, you'll be cursed with bell, book and candle" (3.3.91-92). Discrediting Catholic ritual and mocking papal tradition, Faustus cries, "bell, book and candle, candle, book and bell/ Forward and backward, to curse Faustus to hell" (3.3.93-94). On cue, a group of friars reenter and begin to chant a cleansing dirge. "Come, brethren", sings the first friar, "let's about our business with good devotion/ Cursed be he that stole his Holiness' meat from the table" (3.3.95-96). Cursed "be he that took his Holiness a blow on the face" and "he that took away his Holiness' wine", the friars repeat monastic chants (3.3.100-104). An overtly comical scene that reduces Catholic rites to jovial farce, Marlowe's script then calls for Faustus and Mephistopheles to harass the friars until they flee the stage.

A common theme in Protestant diatribes, the foolish pope character appears in a story Thomas Bell told his congregation in 1596. Unfolding the tale of a French monk named Gilbertus, Bell describes in *The Survey of Popery* (1602) how this popish limb became the Catholic Church's head. Selling his soul to the devil in order to be crowned with the triple diadem, Gilbertus eventually became Pope Sylvester II. Said to be an exceedingly ambitious, sneaky, and proud figure, the friar would often meet with the devil and explain his desires to Satan whilst paying homage to hell's fiends. The devil rewarded the Catholic by first making him the archbishop of Rhêmes and Ravema. Finally, the cardinal became the pope in the year 1007. Wondering how long his pontifical glory would last, the Pope would daily entreat the devil by asking the fiend the duration of his life. The devil explained to the Pope, Bell reveals, he would live forever as long as he did not perform mass in Jerusalem. The Pope rejoiced and "was verie joyfull within himself: hoping to be so farre from dying, as he was farre in mind from going to say masse in Jerusalem beyond the sea" (Nn6^{v}). Enflamed with pride, the Pope that year said mass during Lent in the Sanctae Crucis Church. Often called Jerusalem, the Sanctae Crucis cathedral was the place the devil was referring to in his earlier declaration to Sylvester. Appearing to have forgotten the name, the Pope said mass and all of a sudden a great noise sounded and a gathering of devils appeared. Remembering the devil's promise, the Pope realized his death was at hand. Weeping and telling the congregation of his sins, Pope Sylvester II asked his fellow Catholics to cut his limbs as they "had done sacrifice to the divell" (Nn7^{r}). Obeying his command, the congregation were said to dismember the pontiff's limbs from his body. Losing a profuse amount of blood, the Pope died in the church prior to Satan's arrival. Indeed, the topic of blood appears frequently in the writings of Protestant polemicists.

Using anti-papal motifs of murder and gore common in reformers' sermons, Christoper Marlowe's *The Massacre of Paris* (c. 1590) is responsible for staging the inaugural personification of bloodthirsty Catholics. During the years of the drama's first performances in the 1590s, Leonard Wright preached of "the filthie detestable doings of that Romish rabble, from the time of their first corruption" (B2^{r}). Describing papal superstition, heresy, vices, and religious hypocrisy, Wright argues Catholicism has been responsible for a countless number of "bloudie warres" where corpses have infected "the verie ayre" of Christian nations (B2^{r}). Meanwhile, George Abbot claims Catholics pervert the Christian conscience and instill disobedience in men, women, and children's hearts. The "body-killing, & soule-murthering" of these "spiritual enemies", he preaches, "destroy many a weake woman and unadvised rash young man" (I6^{r}). Considering Bridget of Sweden (1303–1373), a proto-protestant known for her vocal critiques of the pope, Abbot asserts, "papistes helde [her] for a famous Prophetesse, and by the Pope she is Canonized for a Saint" (T7^{r}). Suggesting many Catholics agree with Bridget's papal criticisms, the English preacher quotes the nun, stating, "she calleth the Pope a *killer of soules*, *the disperser & tearer of the sheepe of Jesus Christ*" (T7^{r}). "Shee saith that hee *is more abhominable then the Jewes*", he continues, "*more cruel then Judas, more unjust then Pilate, worse and viler than Lucifer himselfe*" (T7^{r}).

Oliver Ormerod enlightens his congregation of bloodstained Catholic stories through descriptions of historic murders and gory assassinations. Enumerating histories of popish atrocities, Ormerod focuses on Catholics murdering Catholics. "Gregorie the 7 poysoned sixe Popes to make himselfe a way to the Papacie", he argues, "and fought to murther Henry the Emperour as he was at his prayers in the Church" (V4^{v}). Stating Pope Innocent IV "fought to poyson Conrade the Emperour" and plotted "a massacre intended in the Church of Florence", the preacher laments that "Julianus Medices [was] murthered by the appointment of Pope Sixtus the 4" (V4^{v}-X1^{r}). Pope Urban VI, on the other hand, "put five of his Cardinals into sackes, and drowned them, because they favoured Clement the 7" (V4^{v}). Reserving the vilest pope for his final illumination, Ormerod reveals how Pope Alexander VI commanded "Antonius Mancinellus his tongue, and both his handes to bee cut off, because he made an invective oration against his impure life" (V4^{v}). This Roman Bishop, the preacher argues, promised heaven to Catholic congregations while damning himself to hell because of "his villaines and murthers" (X1^{r}).

Returning to papal atrocities committed against Protestants, Thomas Beard speaks of contemporary slaughters where many "Rivers of this Kingdome" have been "stayned with the blood of those that made prosession of the truth of Gospell, shed by the instigation and solicitations of the Popes" (E3^{r}). Accusing "the whole Nation of Papists" as bodies "infected with the same serity", Beard preaches, "the more a man is addicted to their religion, the more fierce and bloody minded he is" (Ff3^{r}). The Catholic religion, he finds, "breathes nothing but blood" and "massacres" (Ff3^{v}). The first gory history the preacher recounts to readers is the Massacre of Mérindol. Occurring midway through the sixteenth century, the French massacre saw over ten thousand executions "of simple minded people, armed with nothing but prayers and teares" (Ee4^{r}). Unfolding how "women great with child were miserably murdered" while "young infants *Herod*-like thrust through with speares, and swords" were slain, Beard goes on to narrate the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day (Ee4^{r}). Aside from the failed Gunpowder Plot of 1605, the massacre at Paris typified Catholicism's innate malevolence and thirst for religious conflict. "In joy", the preacher writes, the pope "caused a certaine coine to be stamped, wherein on the one side was the picture

of Gregory the thirteenth [...] and on the other was represented an Angell" (Ee4^{v}). Bearing a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, the angel is depicted as murdering men and women. Above this picture was said to be the inscription: "the massacre of the Hugonots " (Ee4^{v}). Otherwise known as the Paris massacre, this bloody event is memorialized in Christopher Marlowe's *The Massacre of Paris*.

Performed by the Admiral's Men on over ten occasions in 1594 alone, Marlowe's drama portrays the gory exploits of a murderous papal force. Based on the infamous St. Bartholomew's day massacre of 1572, the play shows an exceptionally vicious event in the history of religious battles. Considering Marlowe perhaps travelled throughout Canterbury in the 1580s it is likely the playwright received first hand accounts of the event as the city was home to a large amount of Huguenot refugees. Migrants perhaps offered images of Catholic butchers to the curious playwright, providing stories of papal villains and bloodthirsty fiends. In any case, cruel Catholics account for most of the drama's action. Prior to witnessing the extermination of French Protestants on foreign soil, audiences first observe Catholic treachery during a scene involving the Queen of Navarre and a pair of poisonous gloves. Brother to Cardinal of Lorraine, the Duke of Guise has sent these deadly materials to the Queen because she dishonored him in the previous scene. A messenger delivers the gift and the Queen slowly unwraps the delicate packaging. "Methinks the gloves have a very strong perfume", she comments, "the scent whereof doth make my head to ache" (1.3.6-7). In the moments following this observation, the monarch screams, "help, son Navarre! I am poison'd!" (1.3.11) Her children, physicians and servants attend to the monarch and offer their opinions: "I hope it be/ Only some natural passions makes her sick" (1.3.16-17). The queen, however, realizes a noxious fume has infected her body. "The fatal poison", she gasps, "works within my head; my brain-pan breaks;/ My heart doth faint; I die!" (1.3.19-21). In chapter four, I explore in detail the historical connection between smell and anti-Catholic sentiment, but for the moment it is suffice to say that sensory phenomena is deeply connected to anti-papal discourse.

Dying a truly agonizing death, the Queen is among the cardinal's many victims in the drama. In the following act, playgoers observe Guise plotting the imminent carnage of French Protestants with several Catholic soldiers. Commanding his men to kill anyone they suspect of unorthodox behavior, Guise grows increasingly excited at the sound of his troop's ecstatic voices. "I swear by this, to be unmerciful", pledges one soldier while another explains, "I am disguis'd, and none knows who I am/ And therefore mean to murder all I meet" (1.5.4-6). Guise then commands the militia to enter the Admiral's townhouse. Suspected of heresy and bearing Luther's cross, the Admiral will be the first Huguenot Guise slays. Ordering his men to murder the Admiral as he sleeps in his bed, Guise edifies his soldiers and beckons forth his cousin. Anjou rushes to the Guise's side and explains, "the captain of the Admiral's guard/ Plac'd by my brother, will betray his lord/ Now, Guise, shall Catholics flourish once again/ The head being cut off, the members cannot stand" (1.5.20-23). Entering the Admiral's home, the soldiers rush into the unsuspecting Protestant's bedroom. The citizen awakes and screams: " O, let me pray before I die" (1.5.28). One of the soldiers presents a statue of the Virgin Mary and commands the Admiral to kiss the papal vestige. Refusing to partake in popish superstition, the Admiral declines and the soldier stabs his victim in excited rapture. "Away with him", bellows Anjou, "cut off his head and hands/ And send them for a present to the Pope" (1.5.44-45). This scene confirms the cruel and explicitly brutal nature of papal forces in playgoers' minds. "When this just revenge is finished", the soldiers chuckle, "unto Mount Faucon will

we drag his corpse/ and he, that living hated so the Cross/ Shall, being dead, be hang'd thereon in chains" (1.5.46-48).

The ensuing acts in the drama emphasise Catholic cruelty and the manifold deaths of innocent victims. Act One Scene Six begins with Guise and the soldiers chasing Protestants down bloodstained streets. Exclaiming "*Tue, tue, tue*!" Guise screams to his fellow Catholics, "let none escape! Murder the Huguenots!" (1.6.1-2) Cheering accompanies his cries: "Kill them! Kill them" all reply (1.6.3). Emerging from a smoldering parish, a Lutheran preacher attempts to escape. Guise and the soldiers pursue the minister until one of the Catholic soldiers grasps the Protestant's neck. "Sirrah", Guise taunts, "are you a preacher of these heresies?" (1.6.4-5) The minister responds he is a preacher of God's word and the soldiers begin to heckle him. As Guise stabs the preacher, one of the soldiers enters a nearby home. Discovering a lone Protestant weeping, Mountsorrell approaches the desolate figure like a wolf circling its prey. The frightened Protestant wails at the sight of the Catholic soldier and begs, "O, let me pray, before I take my death!" (1.6.17) Mountsorrell agrees, urging the Protestant to send one brief prayer to canonized Saints. Bowing his head, the Protestant mutters, "O Christ, my Saviour" before he is cut off by the solider: "Christ, villain!/ Why, darest thou the intercession of some saint?/ *Sanctus Jacobus,* he's my saint; pray to him" (1.6.19-23). Begging the solider allow him a final prayer dedicated to Christ, the Huguenots response arrives via a sword to the gut.

Shortly after this bloody exchange, a group of timid Protestants enter the stage. Guise and his soldiers soon arrive. "Down with the Huguenots! Murder them", the papal instigator bellows (3.3.1). A Protestant pleads with a Catholic solider to let her live, but the villain ignores her demands. "Villain", accuses Guise, "that tongue of thine" has "blasphem'd the holy Church of Rome", it "shall drive no plaints into the Guise's ears/ To make the justice of my heart relent/ *Tue, tue, tue*! Let none escape" (2.3.3-11). Unlike other scenes in the drama, the Protestants in attendance do not pray nor do they participate in the dialogue. Instead, Protestant bodies become gruesome sites of corporeal dismemberment and their deaths are ocular constructions of religious vengeance. Described by onstage characters as he "that draw a sort of English priests/ From Douai to the seminary at Rheim/ To hatch forth treason 'gainst their natural queen", Guise is labeled the ringleader of "the king of Spain's huge fleet" (5.2.109-113).

A distinctively rebellious, vicious, and religious megalomaniac, Guise becomes the forerunner of the Antichrist and the leader of Spain's infamous armada that typified popish mutiny in 1588. Rejoicing at the news of Guise's plan "to kill the Puritans", the Cardinal of Lorraine desires the "common profit of religion" before championing his brother's decision to execute Protestants (3.2.56-60). Eventually, the play's Protestant sovereigns hire a pair of assassins to extinguish the cardinal's repugnant flame. Dragging the clergyman by his hair, one of the dispatchers spits on the Catholic while he begs, "murder me not; I am a Cardinal" (5.3.1). Scoffing, the first assassin hisses, "wert thou the Pope, thou mightst not 'scape from us" (5.3.2). Pleading and crying, the cardinal's display of grief mirrors the unjust treatment of Protestants in the previous scenes. In contrast to the Huguenots who begged their killers to allow them a final prayer to God, the cardinal reveals his Catholic temperament at knifepoint. "Yet lives my brother Duke Dumaine, and many more", he warns, "to revenge our death upon that cursed king/ Upon whose heart may all the Furie gripe/ And with their paws drench his black soul in hell!" (5.3.7-10) The first

murdered replies, "yours, my Lord Cardinal, you should have said" and proceeds to strangle the clergyman (5.3.11-13).

The play eventually ends with a symbolic vision of Protestant justice sanctioned by both God and state. Emerging from a crowded street, an unnamed friar walks toward the drama's chief Protestant hero: King Henry III. The clergyman feigns political support in order to speak with the sovereign and so Henry beckons the Catholic to enter. The friar bows his head and draws a poisoned poniard: stabbing the king with the envenomed dagger. Realizing his death is at hand, Henry calls for an English agent to enter the stage to receive the following message. "Agent for England, send thy mistress word", the dying monarch requests, observe, "what this detested Jacobin hath done. Tell her, for all this, that I hope to live/ Which if I do, the papal monarch goes/ To wrack, and th' antichristian kingdom falls" (5.5.56-60). Speaking to his onstage audience, King Henry cries that England's "bloody hands shall tear his triple crown, and fire accursed Rome about his ears/ I'll fire his crazed buildings, and enforce/ The papal towers to kiss the lowly earth" (60-65). Promising the crowd that has formed around the dying king that Protestantism shall conquer Catholicism, Henry swears that England will "ruinate that wicked Church of Rome/ That hatcheth up such bloody practises" before exalting Queen Elizabeth I with "Whom God hath bless'd for hating papistry" (65-70). Dying from a toxic wound, the sovereign's death symbolises the height of Catholic treachery. The monarch, who represents the Protestant body politic, is infected with a poison administered by a Catholic body. Comparing Catholicism to infections that pervade the skin and contaminate the internal body, Marlowe stages ideas connected to popish infection and religious contagion. In chapter six, I examine this more closely in regard to sound operating as a pathogenic device in *Lusts Dominion* (c. 1600), but for the moment I will touch on how medical conceptions surrounding plague are responsible for shaping Catholic characters throughout anti-papal dramas under James I.

Catholic Disease and the Contaminated Body: Anti-Catholic Drama under James I

As the 1590s came to a close, the first decade of the seventeenth century signaled a shift in Catholic representation and papal spectacle. Playwrights' earlier fascination with presenting antichristian sagas, papal conjuration, and popish buffoons began to wane, and somber visualizations of religious disease and corporeal infection replaced visions provoking slight reactions or fits of laughter in playgoers. Triggering impassioned dialogue on the causation and transmission of plague, the outbreak of epidemic in 1603 had a profound influence on the dramatic representation of Catholicism. In the year following the plague, James established himself as England's sovereign, and it was under his rule that anti-Catholic drama continued to develop into a visceral phenomenon that forced audience members to unite corporeality and disease through onstage experience. By 1620, however, these motifs were all but gone except in the odd dramatic production. As I touched on in the previous chapter, the death of the militantly Protestant Prince Henry of Wales coincided with a decline in fervently anti-papal motifs that connected Catholicism with political dissonance, plague, and musical discord, perhaps because such motifs were cultivated under his direction. In the proceeding chapters, I argue that several dramas performed in the early 1600s promoted groundbreaking motifs that combine pathogenic models with cultural designs in a sensory framework. For the moment, I wish to briefly explore two plays that dramatize aspects of these motifs in their staging of Catholic villains.

These dramas, John Webster's *The White Devil* (1612) and *The Duchess of Malfi* (1614), deserve analysis because they embody burgeoning anti-Catholic ideas. More than this, they exemplify how nascent motifs in early 1600s continued to resonate (albeit briefly) in the proceeding decade.

The White Devil (1612) and *The Duchess of Malfi* (1613) criticize Catholic governance through allusions to corruption, pollution, and sickness. Neither play stages Catholic clergyman as nourishing figures in the domains they occupy. Instead, Catholic ecclesiastics personify religious pollutants that infect the body politic. In both dramas, the leading villains are cardinals. In the former of these theatrical pieces, Monticelso is the play's conceited clergyman who eventually becomes Pope Paul IV. Originally performed by Queen Anne's Men at the Red Bull Theatre, *The White Devil* depicts Monticelso as a figure who condemns other characters based on no evidence other than his corrupt conscience. A chief example of this occurs during a scene involving the main character, Vittoria, facing court for a murder she has not committed. The Cardinal Monticelso is the Venetian lady's judge, and he condemns her to an establishment for repentant whores. "Do the noblemen in Rome erect it for their wives, that I am sent to lodge there?" She shrewdly asks the clergyman (3.2.268). Unable to prove her innocence, Vittoria becomes a plaything of the corrupt court. Vowing she will have vengeance, the Venetian lady remarks, "I fain would know if you have your salvation by patent, that you proceed thus" (3.2.271). Angered by Vittoria's speech, the cardinal beseeches the guards to escort her to the whorehouse immediately. The cardinal's men advance toward her and Vittoria screams, "a rape, a rape!" (3.2.273) Appearing confused, the cardinal asks what she means. "You have ravished justice", she accuses, "forced her to do your pleasure" (3.2.274). Scoffing, the cardinal remarks, "Fie, she's mad" (3.2.275).

In *The Duchess of Malfi*, on the other hand, Webster's allusions to religious corruption are apparent through the playwright's references to illness and pollution. "A prince's court", chimes a steward in the play's opening scene, "Is like a common fountain, whence should flow/ Pure silver drops in general; but if't chance/ Some cursed example poison 't near the head [...] diseases through the whole land spread (1.1.11-15). Immediately following this line the Cardinal of Aragon enters the stage and playgoers instantly connect the steward's prognostications with the Catholic clergyman. Going on to associate Catholicism with occult habits, Webster stages a dialogue between the cardinal and a spy that focuses on demonic possession. In the company of friends, the papal emissary discusses how "Some fellows, they say, are possessed with the devil, but this great fellow were able to possess the greatest devil, and make him worse" (1.1.43). Recalling plays from the Elizabethan period, Webster draws on anti-Catholic polemic that associates Catholicism with sorcery. Conversing about the cardinal and his brother, the spy claims the pair "are like plum-trees that grow crooked/ Over standing pools; they are rich, and o'erladen with fruit, but/ None but crows, pies, and caterpillars feed on them" (1.1.47-49). This description of papal agents elicits Leonard Wright's conviction of Catholic infection. "The Popes honour", he preaches, was

> first begotten by presumption, borne by ambition, nursed up by superstition, increased by violence, and defended by false wrestling the Scriptures. And from a rotten roote arose rotten branches, which sent theyr rottennesse into everie twigge: whose contagious infection, flowing continually from one to another, is conveyned from the ancestors to the posteritie. Whereby Rome of a schoole of vertue, became a sinke of all vice: of a daughter of peace, a beldame of debate: of a loving mother, a hatefull stepdame, or rather a

> proude frantike whoore delighting in murther and bloudshed whose Pilots are turned to cruell pirates, rakers of riches, & contenders for worldly mastership (B3^{r}-B3^{v})

Interested in the spy's argument, Delio asks the cardinal a string of moral questions. "Now, sir, your promise", he probes, "what's that cardinal?/ I mean his temper? They say he's a brave fellow/ Will play his five thousand crowns at tennis, dance/ Court ladies, and one that hath fought single combats" (1.1.145-148). Replying these are apt descriptions of the cardinal's superficial qualities, Antonio asks Delio to "observe his inward character" (1.1.150). Accordingly, Antonio describes the clergyman's internal physiology: "he is a melancholy churchman" (1.1.150). A fellow suffering from an inward distemper caused by religiosity, the cardinal's face "is nothing but the engendering of toads" (1.1.151). In grips of jealousy, he "lays worse plots for them than ever was imposed on Hercules, for he strew in his way flatterers, panders, intelligencers, atheists, and a thousand such political monsters" (1.1.152-155). Based on this, Antonio asserts, "He should have been Pope; but instead of coming to it/ By the primitive decency of the church, he did bestow bribes so/ Largely, and so impudently, as if he would have carried it away" (1.1.155-157).

Overwhelmed with tales of ecclesiastical corruption and inward maladies, Delio responds, "You have given too much of him" but what of "his brother?" (1.1.159) The cardinal's sibling is described with similar vigor. He is a "most perverse, and turbulent nature", Antonio explains, "what appears in him mirth, is merely outside—If he laughs heartily, it is to laugh/ All honesty out of fashion" (1.1.160-161). This leads Delio to the conclusion the pair are twins "in quality" (1.1.163). Likewise, the cardinal's mistress adopts diseased imagery during a monologue in the following scene. "You told me of a piteous wound i'th'heart", she softly recalls, "and a sick liver, when you wooed me first/ And spake like one in physic" (2.4.37-38). Speaking to the cardinal, the mistress accuses the clergyman of feigning lovesickness whilst blurring distinctions between a Catholic body and corporeal sickness. Further evidence of Catholicism's innate disease, Bosolo charges the cardinal's brother, proclaiming, "Your brother and yourself" have "hearts as hollow graves/ Rotten, and rotting others; and your vengeance/ Like two chained bullets, still goes arm in arm/ You may be brothers; for treason, like the plague/ Doth take much in blood" (4.2.310-315). Shortly after this exchange, a physician enters the stage to attend to the cardinal's brother. Exhibiting illness, the clergyman's kin is "sick", perhaps of "apoplexy", "frenzy" or some "very pestilent disease", and he rapidly weakens for no discernable reason other than the fact he is Catholic and thus diseased (5.1.57-58; 5.2.5).

Calling on social disturbances and contemporary incidents to elucidate anti-Catholic orthodoxy, *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi* exhibit contemporary religious discussion surrounding anti-Catholic sentiment and disease. In the 1590s, Laurence Deios went to great lengths to align the "noysome and grievous sore[s]" of the antichrist's mark with "the French disease" (C3^{r}). Believed to have originated during wartime between France and Spain toward the end of the fifteenth century, this disease "came by the companie of harlots in the campe, and from thence was spred to most countreys" (C3^{r}). "Other writers", the preacher states, "expound it of the plague, which in the time of poperie flourishing, was more fierce and more generall in all these quarters then almost at any time before or since" (C3^{r}). Illustrating that disease and religious belief become analogous sites in the Protestant imagination since both rely on occult movements within the body, both dramas exemplify Catholic stereotypes.

Represented in religious diatribes, laws, sermons, and dramas, anti-Catholic rhetoric offered English men and women hagiographical accounts of Protestantism, cheap laughs over idiot popes, and horrific moments of religious bloodshed that would have unnerved the most steely of playgoers. The Catholic body in the plays I have discussed throughout this section, with its horrifying actions, evil noises, and contaminated physiology, illustrates an intersection between performance, cultural imaginings, social understanding, and corporeality. It then follows that understanding the significance of this social transaction between discourse and embodiment not only impacts how we comprehend the function of popular discourse that engages with the body in culture at the time, but relates more broadly to a historical exchange of knowledge between the personification of historical motifs and early modern belief structures surrounding how one experiences the Catholic body.

In the following chapters, I will argue that theatrical interpretations of papal bodies reflect moments of embodied discourse relevant to religious, politics, and medical concepts. Incorporating new themes and reconfiguring old arguments in order to satisfy the community's growing hunger for experiencing Catholic villains, playwrights embodied contemporary discourse in a sensory paradigm. By the early 1600s, experiencing Catholicism in the London playhouse was a somatically assaultive phenomenon. While the printing press saw the creation of countless diatribes on the evils of Catholicism as supported by Protestant polemicists, and political and cultural realities supported broadening definitions of the papal body, it was the playhouse that was able to stage (and thus transform) anti-Catholic sentiment into a pragmatic phenomenon that emphasized a culturally informed knowledge of anti-Catholicism. As I will demonstrate, a set of unique texts—*The Devil's Charter*, *The Whore of Babylon, Lust's Dominion,* and *Hamlet*—offer modern readers vivid experiences of Catholic bodies, communicating visions of the hellishly enfleshed. By using smell and sound in particular, these dramas affect the body through sensory stimuli, molding playgoers' experiences of anti-Catholic sentiment through experiential exchanges.

Chapter 5

"I feele a foule stincke in my nostrells": Smelling the Antichrist Pope in *The Devil's Charter* (1607)

In the final scene of Barnabe Barnes's vehemently anti-Catholic drama *The Devil's Charter* (1607), audiences witness the onstage amalgamation of scientific opinion, theatrical representation, and Protestant propaganda. Exemplifying the bodily effect of antichristian sickness, Pope Alexander's envenomed corpse is the focal point for theatregoers. "Behold his bodie puffed up with poyson", sighs a Cardinal in the Italian court, "his corpse shall be convaied to saint *Peeters*/ Open for all beholders, that they may/ See the reward of sinne, amend and pray" ($M2^{v}$-$M3^{r}$). Referencing medical knowledge surrounding pestilence whilst figuring the pope as the victim of a deadly infection, Barnes combines the social realities of epidemic disease with anti-Catholic discourse on the London stage. Re-thinking ideas surrounding anti-papal sentiment at the beginning of the seventeenth-century in England, I will demonstrate how the playwright's drama propagates notions specific to both religious and medical conceptions surrounding pestilent vapor. Performing the papal antichrist, I will argue, represents moments of diseased corporeality, infectious agents, and religious contagion through the sense of smell.

Barnabe Barnes: Poison, Drama, and anti-Catholicism

Few studies of Barnes's vitriolic drama exist in modern scholarship, and the readings that do forgo the play's phenomenological imagery. Examining the mythical aspects of Barnes's literary sources, Jeannette Fellheimer performed an in-depth analysis of the playwright's use of Geoffrey Fenton's *Historie of Guicciardin* (1597). The drama, which stages Francesco Guicciardini as the chorus figure, has a distinct Italian dimension that supports historical authenticity with fictitious overtones. Rather than spurring on further discussion, Fellheimer's study is the only scholarship on Barnes prior to the 1990s. Some years later, Jeffrey Nelson examined the playwright's poems in lieu of his dramatic offerings. An accomplished poet, Barnes was the son of the Bishop of Durham Doctor Richard Barnes, and prior to staging *The Devil's Charter* he was best known (and perhaps still is) for *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* (1593), *A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets* (1595) and the *Foure Bookes of Offices* (1606). These collections, which reveal Barnes's fascination with Italian culture, are written in varying poetic styles. The former collection showcases Petrarchan sonnets while the latter exemplify Renaissance prose, written for the benefit of Christian monarchs and a Protestant kingdom. Examining Barnes's use of spiritual vernacular in poetry, Anthony Earl asserts the writer's poems echo Calvinistic sentiment whilst remolding Puritan sensibilities within a more moderate paradigm (226).

While most scholarship surrounding Barnes focuses on the writer's poetic efforts, a small cache exists on *The Devil's Charter*. Jocelyn Hillgarth, for example, studies Barnes's portrayal of the Borgia family, observing how Pope Alexander Borgia and his children Lucretia, Caesar, and the Duke are the play's archetypal villains. Rising to prominence in Italy during the fifteenth century, the Borgias are a Spanish family whose history is clouded with scandalous imaginings and lewd tales. In their lifetime, the family experienced frequent accusations of committing murder, adultery, and treason. In the decades following the family's death, European reformers narrated the Borgias past in graphic detail, arguing the papal family

represented Catholicism's innate iniquity. The Borgias, they argued, regularly committed incest and practiced the black arts.

By the early 1600s, virtually every anti-Catholic diatribe in England mentioned the immoral dealings of the Borgia household. Concerned with the fables and Protestant mythology surrounding the family, Hillgarth examines the distorted accounts of the Borgias, analyzing stories involving treason and poison surrounding Alexander VI and his son Caesar (119). Likewise, Michael Mallett has discussed how the inverted image of the Borgias demonstrates the disintegration between real and unreal in contemporary history tracts (13). Contending that the many English legends surrounding the family tend to revolve around Alexander's supposed pact with the devil, Hillgarth argues the imaginative history of the Borgias came, in part, to represent Catholicism's connection to Lucifer (119-120). The overt presence of demonic forces in *The Devil's Charter* has led John D. Cox to research how the theatrical tradition of staging devils evolved over several historical periods. Analyzing the ways earlier eras are responsible for sculpting Barnes's dramatic conventions, Cox argues Barnes's personification of Lucifer aligns with the medieval tradition of stage devils albeit in an unprecedented manner ("Stage Devilry" 934).

Unlike his contemporaries that injected unbridled ambition into demonic figures (borrowing from the medieval tradition of stage devils), Barnes opts to include devils that are of a distinctly early modern composition. Arguing the dramatist uses devils to achieve allusions to power, coercion, and intelligence—reminding readers of Niccolò Machiavelli and the Machiavellian emphasis on civil secrecy and political cunning—Cox finds that *The Devil's Charter* portrays an intricate view of devils, transforming a once unvaried device of liturgical drama to convey foolishness into a complex personification of temporal and spiritual influence. Suggesting that this originality paved the way for new theatrical ground regarding stage devils, Cox asserts Barnes undoubtedly draws on contemporary rhetoric ranging from historical tracts to German texts of an anti-papal persuasion. Nonetheless, Cox ultimately finds Barnes utilizes his "own imagination" with respect to devilish formulations (935). Although Barnes is indeed a unique writer, staging devils in remarkable ways, it is important to consider how other cultural formations shape the early modern imagination. Ranging from medical discourse and religious polemic to plague literature, *The Devil's Charter* repeatedly returns to images of disease caused by conviction.

To the best of my knowledge, Tanya Pollard is the only scholar to approach *The Devil's Charter* from such angles, studying the nexus between Barnes's playtext and sickness. As she notes, corrosive material features heavily throughout the drama. In total, six characters die from poisonous materials in the play. In a particularly visceral scene, one character applies a poisoned cosmetic that eats away at the flesh, melting the face and transforming a once beautiful visage to a striking mass of bloody liquid. Arguing onstage face paints "create a crisis of permeability, penetration, and contagion", Pollard is the first scholar to discuss Barnes's use of pathogenic imagery (*Drugs and Theater* 83). Speaking to religious and social ideas surrounding face-painting in culture at the time, she envisions cosmetics not only as a device used to maim and adorn but also one that dissolves boundaries of the material and immaterial: corroding the body's outsides to reveal what appears to be a morally diseased interior. There is yet to be, however, a historical examination of Barnes's palpable engagement with plague discourse and his play's treatment of Roman Catholicism. Before exploring connections between the body, disease, and anti-Catholic discourse, I will

provide a succinct overview of the dramatist's fascination with toxic materials poisoning corporeality.

Tales of political intrigue, civil conspiracy, and fashionable clothing routinely appear during a historical investigation of Barnabe Barnes's life. Educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, he was at one time a roommate with London printer John Wolfe and a close friend of the writer Gabriel Harvey (Barnes "Barnabe Barnes"). This friendship, it would seem, became a point of attack in Thomas Nash's scholarly parley with Harvey in the 1590s. Criticizing Barnes repeatedly in *Have with You to Saffron-Walden* (1596), Nash accused the poet and playwright of succumbing to vain pleasures and avaricious urges, repeatedly accusing Barnes of self-vanity (G1^{r}; K4^{v}). Assuming Barnes "was certainly a man of […] hollowness and vain ambition", Cox describes the playwright as a figure consumed with image and popular trends ("Stage Devilry" 947). In the years following Nash's attack on the writer's character, Barnes faced charges for the attempted murder of a fellow called John Brown. Planning to murder Brown (first by a corrosive sublimate in the form of a glass of lemonade followed by a flask of poisoned wine), Barnes faced the Star Chamber in 1598. Edward Coke, Attorney General at the time, led the hearing. While some authors suggest that Barnes's motives may have been passed down to him from a political diplomat, the precise details surrounding the attempted homicide remain unclear (946). Although he was never imprisoned, Barnes once again found himself at court in the years following the trial, albeit for a markedly different reason: the staging of his drama for James I.

Performed by the Kings Men at court in 1607, *The Devil's Charter* reflects contemporary religious opinion regarding the papacy. Clearly written with a Protestant audience in mind, the drama nonetheless prepares onlookers with a caveat akin to a modern day viewer discretion warning. "*Gracious spectators*", Francis Guicciardine warns in the prologue, "*doe not heere expect/ Visions of pleasure, amorous discourse*", clarifying, "*Our subject is of bloud and Tragedie/ Murther, foule Incest, and Hypocrisie*". Pausing for a moment, he demands spectators "*Behold the Strumpet of proud Babylon/ Her Cup with fornication foaming full/ Of Gods high wrath and vengeance for that evill/ Which was imposd upon her by the Divill*" (A2^{r}). The succeeding point of attack is the name change that cardinals undergo when ascending to the position of pope. Briefly relaying how Rodrigo Borgia eventually transformed into Alexander VI, Guicciardine's seemingly throwaway comment recalls the stringent rhetoric of 1590s anti-papal literature. Describing "certaine odd Popish superstitions" with reference to the "changing [of] the Popes name", Thomas Bell scoffs, "Pope Sergius the second" was "somewhat ashamed of his ancient name, because it sounded not pleasantly in mens eares" (Ll1^{v}). According to Bell this unpleasantly derived from the title "*Os Porci*": or, pig face. Seeking to hide his embarrassment, "Swine-mouth", Bell declares, "changed his old name and tearmed himselfe Sergius". From this time, he settles, popes have changed "their name so soone as they aspired to the popedome", and it is "with the like spirit of pride […] other Popes since do imitate the same maner" (Ll2^{r}). Implying the Catholic tradition of papal name changing derives from vice, Guicciardine begs the offstage crowd to witness the "faithlesse, fearelesse, and ambitious lives" of the Borgia family (A2^{r}). The family, however, require little visual attention in order to experience their intrinsic evil. In particular, Alexander's perceived qualities are physically unavoidable—a point that I will return to shortly. The topic of considerable interest in religious circles from the fifteenth century onwards, the Borgias loom large in the cultural imagination of English writers.

Indeed, the Borgia family regularly comes under attack by English preachers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Identifying Alexander as "a vile Pope", Thomas Beard possibly has the subtlest opinion of the pontiff amongst his Protestant cohort (*4^{r}). Describing Alexander's posthumous epitaph, said to be inscribed on his tombstone, one preacher translates the message for readers: "*Here lies wickednesse it selfe"*. Lucretia, he declares, "was his Daughter, his Whore, [and] his Sonnes Wife" (Adams *The White Devil* H4^{r}). George Sohn jokingly adds, "how great was the chastitie and honestie of Alexander the sixt", before delivering the punch line, "it appeareth by his epitaph made for his daughter. Here lyes entombd Lucretia by name but wee her sawe *Thais* in life; Alexanders childe, spouse, daughter in lawe" (E2^{r}). Similarly, another preacher asks his congregation, was "*Alexander* the 6 hee not being contented with diverse other strumpets" that adorned his bed? It would appear not, he declares, informing audiences how "he had 6 bastards [and] committed incest with his owne daughter *Lucretia*" (Ormerod Y1^{v}). On a similar note, George Downame describes how Alexander "also gave leave to Cardinall *Mendoza* to abuse his owne bastard sonne in incestuous Sodomy and Sodomiticall incest" (N3^{v}). The preacher ends his attack by affirming that one cardinal—growing weary of committing incest with his nieces—"prostituted one of his sisters to Alexander 6 to get a Cardinallship, and poisoned another because shee affected some other of her lovers more then himselfe" (N3^{v}). Published in the year prior to the *The Devil's Charter,* Oliver Ormerod's *The Picture of a Papist* contains similar tales.

Declaring Alexander is the foulest Catholic to become pope in recent times, Ormerod ends his pamphlet with a critique of the pontiff's life. Again, Alexander's relationship with his daughter is the subject of impassioned rhetoric. Alexander, Ormerod suggests, eventually grew tired of Rome's strumpets after producing several bastard children to different women. Turning his attention to Lucretia Borgia, the Pope committed incest with his daughter over the period of several years before allowing his son Caesar to also rape her. Providing evidence of Alexander and Caesar's incestuous behavior, the preacher asserts, Johannes Lovinianus Pontanus witnessed Lucretia's epitaph. The inscription, he declares, read: "Heere lieth Lucretia in name, indeede a shamelesse whore; the daughter of Alexander, her father's and brother's harlot" (Y1^{v}).

Similar to Downame's claim that cardinals share the beds of their loved ones with the pope in hopes of an ecclesiastical promotion, preachers discuss how members of the papacy showcase an apparent fondness for incestuous conduct. Pope Paulus III, Ormerod preaches, "committed incest with two of his *Nieces*, prostituted one of his sisters to *Alexander* the 6. to get a *Cardinalship*, and poysoned another, because she affected some other of her lovers more then himselfe" (Y1^{r}-Y1^{v}). Arguing such "vile lusts" represent the sin-ridden nature of the papacy, preachers repeatedly associate acts of sexual deviancy with cardinals, monks, friars, and pontiffs. "It is said", Ormerod declares, that "Sixtus [...] the 4 [...] was a filthy Sodomite, and that to incite and encourage others to the same filthinesse, hee built a sumptuous Stewes in Rome, appointing it to bee both masculine and faeminine" (Y1^{v}). Prone to poison, incest, and sodomy, popes, it would seem, were monstrous creatures with seemingly limitless sexual needs. Relaying the confession of "Nicholas of Bebrach" to congregations, Thomas Beard preaches the author "hath certified to the world by publick writing, that being at Rome in the time of Pope Martine the fourth [...] hee was solicited by him, to yield himself to serve him as his Ganimede in his pleasures" (E3^{r}-E3^{v}). Staging preachers' visions of the immoral urges maintained by papal figures, Barnes's characters embody the contemporary climate of anti-

popery, representing sexualized motifs that express the carnal desires of popish behavior.

Audiences witness Alexander's sexual rapacity on several occasions throughout *The Devil's Charter*. In Act Three Scene One, playgoers encounter two lone characters pacing back and forth in what appears to be a hidden chamber, or sex den. These figures, Astor and Phillippo Manfredi, are young brothers whose sole function in the drama is that of sexual gratification and erotic stimulation for Alexander. A libel posted on a Greek statue at the beginning of the play accuses Alexander of routinely sodomizing prisoners of the Italian court, and Astor and Phillippo are no exception. Certainly, the brothers are boys who have been "made prostitute" by the pontiff on a regular basis. Alone and dejected, Phillippo bemoans how he and his brother have been subjected to "wild, brutish and unkindly lust" ($E1^{v}$). On cue, Alexander emerges from an onstage transom, beckoning the brothers with hushed whispers. "*Astor?* What *Astor*", the pontiff murmurs, searching for one of the brothers. Eventually finding Astor cowering in a secluded corner, Alexander strokes his face while sighing, "My starre, my triumph, my sweet phantasie/ My more then sonne, my love, my Concubine" ($E2^{r}$). In reply, Astor sobs, "To call you friend were too familiar/ To call you brother sorts not with our yeares/ To call you Father doth import some feare/ Due to that age your Holinesse doth beare". Shushing him, Alexander answers, "tell me not of mine age […] Thy sight sufficeth me to make me young" ($E2^{v}$). Leaving the brothers to sleep, Alexander is soon confronted by his disgusted son. "Have you not (which is most abhominable)", Caesar yells, "Commited incest with your onely daughter" and "Have you not kept the Pearle of *Italie/ Astor Manfreds* that young Prince/ In beastly lust, and filthy *Sodomie*" ($G3^{v}$-$G4^{r}$). Turning away from his son, Alexander does not respond to such accusations, and instead dismisses the statement in a display of insincere disgust. Perhaps reaching toward his father's robes, Caesar attempts to snatch Alexander's papal clothing, stating, "your robes conceale" sins and "cloake your vile impiety" ($G4^{r}$).

Often figured as habits that function to maintain a concealed being, the pope's vestments are repeatedly brought up in Protestant attacks on the Catholic Church. Thomas Adams and Thomas Naogeorg exemplify this tradition in *The Divells Banket* (1614) and *The Popish Kingdome* (1570) respectively. "These men", the popes, Naogeorg declares, "'"with hypocrisie, and cloke of holinesse, have brought the people, kings, and Dukes, unto such foolishnesse, That they suppose them chaste and good, and farre from worldy men" ($G4^{v}$). It is under this cloak of professed truth he is able to "passeth cleene" while "poyson[ing] all the soyle" with his footsteps ($D1^{v}$; $S4^{v}$). Correspondingly, Adams finds, "under *the forme of Godlinesse* […] Many superstitiously adore the Crucifixe", labeling these worshippers as "*enemies to the Crosse of Christ*" ($H4^{r}$). Recalling Woodes's personification of the papacy in *The Conflict of Conscience*, who require "Cloake[s]" in order for the "partes" they "should playe" ($B4^{r}$), Caesar Borgia in *The Devil's Charter* infers, "Many crimes/ Lurke underneath the robes of Holinnese" ($F4^{v}$). Although Caesar appears to be a morally centered character he is, alongside Alexander's other children, no less immoral than the Pope.

Alexander's children embody sin and typify disloyalty. In Act One Scene Five, playgoers are confronted with Lucretia moments before she plans to carry out the murder of her husband. Lucretia's spouse, Gismond di Viselli, wanders onstage before his murderous wife promptly binds him. Reduced to a sniveling mess, Gismond demands his wife explain her actions. In response, Lucretia begins a long-winded tirade of her husband's jealousy and wanton looks, and demands he sign a

libel that details his supposed sexual indiscretion in order for Lucretia to terminate their marriage. Held at knifepoint, Gismond hurriedly signs the parchment without pursuing the paper. If he had, he would have noticed the paper is, in fact, a forged suicide confession. Concealing the note, Lucretia proceeds to murder her husband, stabbing him repeatedly in the chest. Declaring she has revenged "thy self upon thy jealous husband", Lucretia then performs the role of the mourning widow struck by grief and loss to those around her (C1^{v}). Her act of mendacity appears to be successful, and nearby clergymen, councilors, and attendants offer their heartfelt consolations to the grieving widow. Lucretia's perceptive brother (the Duke of Candy), on the other hand, suspects something is amiss. After questioning his sister, the Duke leaves Lucretia to take in the night's air. "My trembling liver throbs", he shivers, "my cold hearts heavy/ My mind disturbed and I know not why" (F1^{v}). Unable to find any evidence of Lucretia's wrongdoing, the Duke is nevertheless disconcerted by his sister's performance.

Wandering through the back streets of Rome and ruminating over Gismond's death, the Duke's thoughts are cut short by two mysterious figures. Approaching the Duke from both sides of the street, the figures stab the lone character before dumping his body in the adjacent river. The mysterious figures, it is revealed, are the Duke's brother Caesar and a ruffian he has hired. Carrying out the murder in order to replace his brother as the next of kin, Caesar desires to ascend the family (in addition to the religious, political and social) ladder, craving wealth, power, and strength. Speaking to a conceivably horrified audience, Guicciardine narrates,

> Death and bloud [...] onely lengthen out our Scene
> These be the visible and speaking shewes
> That bring vice into detestation
> Unnatural murthers, cursed poysonings
> Horrible exorcism, and Invocation.

The purpose of these scenes, he states, is to "examine the rewarde of sinne/ What followes, view with gentle patience" (F4^{v}). Unnatural deaths, poisons, and religious pleas, however, culminate in relation to a single phenomenon: plague. Recognizing the presence of pestilence throughout the drama, I will argue, requires an approach that extends beyond a purely textual approach to performance.

The Stinking Body in Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1607)

Employing contemporary approaches to disease and infectious air, Barnes represents the milieu of early modern plague culture throughout *The Devil's Charter*. Relying on language, stage artifice, and olfaction, the playwright accomplishes the reality of plague whilst figuring the pope as the source of pestilent infection. Staging culturally resonant smells, Barnes reveals that smelling the Antichrist in early modern England was both a visceral and common theme amongst Protestant preachers who were on differing levels indebted to scientific opinion. Appearing in the play's opening act, exhalations of smoke first appear during Pope Alexander's satanic conjuration. Stressing that smell is integral to reading this scene, I argue, Barnes is one of the few playwrights to not only use smoke in the stage directions, but also to explicitly reference the action of smelling foul air.

Engendering notions pertinent in early modern culture's phenomenological landscape, squibs were an early modern firework used to generate smoke (or rotten air) in plays like Christopher Marlowe's *Faustus*, William Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, and Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*. Considering theatergoers' experience of odour in

relation to the body's physiology, Jonathan Gil Harris has discussed the nexus between olfaction and early modern culture. Employed in a small handful of plays, squibs were culturally synonymous with bad air, most likely due to their two pungent materials: gunpowder and animal dung. Their stench, as Harris has argued, was at the best of times a distanced experience when detonated in large theaters, or it was an unavoidable one when discharged in more intimate settings ("The Smell of" 466). For example, the detonation of squibs in *Macbeth*, which is the principal text of Gil Harris's analysis, occurred during a performance in the unroofed Globe theatre and so its stench, to some extent, would have dissipated before affecting audience members. The squibs used in *The Devil's Charter* original performance, on the other hand, happened in the closed quarters of King James's court. Their smell would have been both overwhelming and unavoidable for those in attendance. Forcing audience members to confront odours reminiscent of dead bodies in plague time lying on the streets, fecal matter that overwhelmed English gutters, and gunpowder treason from the years beforehand, *The Devil's Charter* is a dramatic tapestry of the culturally rich, politically relevant, and historically nuanced.

Mapping the Protestant trajectory of ill-perfumed scents often leads to the malodorous body of Catholicism embodied in the papacy. It would appear that Martin Luther was the first to discuss the antichrist's pungent smell. In his study of the German reformer's use of scatological language to condemn the papacy, Heiko Oberman argues that by 1515 Luther was incorporating fecal imagery as polemical weapons against the devil (435). Focusing on Lucifer's excrement, the German theologian urges his congregation to fling their filth at the devil before arguing the pope "has produced stinking shit laws that smell to heaven" (444). Employing Philipp Melanchthon (a German reformer and close friend) to illustrate these imaginings, Luther went to work on constructing the *Papstopbilder*. This woodcut series, which opens with the birth of the antichrist pope emerging from the bowels of Lucifer, ends with Reformers farting on the pope whilst propelling fecal matter toward his face. Recalling comparisons between the pope's body and "a rotten and stinking carkasse", preachers throughout the early modern period often dwell on the papacy's penchant for producing unpleasant aroma (Adams *Mystical Bedlam* H2^{r}).

Recounting a story of filthy Catholics, Church of England clergyman George Abbot details an exceptionally noxious event in the historical imagination of Protestantism. "For love of true religion", he begins, did a Christian woman travel to England in the days of King Edward. Enjoying a most chaste and pure life in the country, she passed away peacefully in her quarters steeped in religious devotion. Somewhat of a local Protestant celebrity, she was the topic, Abbot declares, of impassioned discussion within popish circles. Learning of her burial plot in a nearby churchyard, a motley crew of Catholics dug up the woman's bones. An abhorrent act in itself, Abbot writes how this action extended beyond simple vandalism, with those involved reburying her remains "in a doung-hill" (I8^{v}). This apparent Catholic proclivity for bad odours, it appears, extended to contagious smells. Discussing popish odours, preachers warned congregations to stop "their mouthes and nostrils with their fingers" in fear of consuming metaphysical contagion (Beard *The Pope* Kk2^{v}). Condemning the smells of religious ceremonies, Thomas Naogeorg and Robert Parker, the former in his 1570 tract while the latter in his 1607 treatise, describe both baptism and the sign of the cross as "smelling of Idolatrie" (Parker Q4^{v}). Sympathizing with vulnerable babies about to undergo baptism, Naogeorg discusses a Catholic priest anointing an "infants tender eyes, and ears, with stincking spittle" (K3^{r}). Catholics, he records, "bring in [...] the stinking and contagious mistes of false

and idolatrous religion" (S1^{r}). It is with this "stinking ayre" Catholics are "dull[ed] [in] the mind" and from hence "great diseases breede" (Bbii^{v}).

Recognizing these satanic scents in the early modern culture, poets sought to capture the pope's smell in contemporary prose. Associating the "smoake of scornfull pride" with the transmittable disease of pride and the immateriality of religious contagion in 1606, Robert Pricket figures vice as a stench that consumes one's senses, describing "clouds of stincking smoake" as "infectious drops" (E2^{v}; C3^{v}-C4^{r}). Pricket, who many recognized as a poet for hire during Elizabeth's reign, was an occasional bard that continually wrote against nonconformist Christians. In the same year, an anonymous author purporting to be the fourteenth century poet Geoffrey Chaucer declared, "pride before God doth stinke" (B4^{r}). Dwelling on papal stenches, Barnes poeticizes Catholic smells in sonnets published in the year prior to *The Devil's Charter*. Sniffing out the "loathsome spirite of vayne stinking pride", and referring to "that filthy dragon [...] which in foule pit of dreadfull darknes lives, repleat with horrour and contagious smell: whose shadow, noysome mist and blindnes gives, raysde from th'infectious damps of ugly Hell" in *Foure Bookes of Offices* (1606), Barnes aligns scriptural exegesis with anti-Catholic rhetoric whilst fashioning medical concerns that are at the core of Protestant sermons against the Catholic church (G1^{v}; C3^{r}).

Religious contagion, spiritual infection, and olfaction are recurrent motifs in Thomas Adams's addresses to congregations. A self-declared transcendent physician whose divinations operate as medicinal rhetoric for reader's souls, Adams declares, "physitians cure the body; Ministers the Conscience" (*The Divells* Dd4^{v}). Arguing sin is the cause of plague throughout *The Divells Banket* (1614) he simply states, "sicknesse naturally goes before death" (Dd2^{v}). Sickness, he believes, is the product of "dead carkases infecting the aires". The result of war, corpses stain the air with their contagious gas, "breathing about plague and pestilences, and sore contagions". Entering through corporeal apertures, septic air clings to the soul and transforms the body into a "crazy, sickish" and "rotten cabinet" (Dd3^{r}). Locating these fumes in Italy where, "groning under the slaverie of Antichrist", Catholic soil appears to teem with plague and emits poisonous odors, Adams cautions his congregation not to travel to Catholic countries as they "infect the soul worse than the Turke infects the body" (Kk1^{r}).

Likewise, *Englandes Sickness* (1615) provides readers with descriptions of Catholic pestilence and religious pong. In the former pamphlet's first lecture, the minister begins by describing Lucifer. "He hath two infirmities", Adams declares, "nay enormities that betray him: a stinking breath, and a halting foot. For his breath, though it smell of sulphure, and the hote steame of sinne [...] he hath art to sweeten it". Laboring "to conserve his lungs from stinking", the devil is unable to discharge repugnant smells before they stimulate inward malaise (C4^{v}). Associating olfaction with infection, Adams goes on to describe how Satan "is troubled with a thousand diseases, and is attended on with more plagues, then ever was *Galens* study" (D1^{r}). Declaring, "it is a false rumour [...] there is no sound ayre but the Romish", he asks, "is it not rather true that thence comes all infection?" (H4^{r}) Singling "out some speciall disease" or "*sickenesse* of the *soule*", Adams associates moral disease with physical infection, selecting "the plague of [...] *Leprosie*" to bridge connections between the supernatural and natural, metaphysical and ontological. Adams talks of biblical pestilence where "Leprosie infected [...] *garments* and *houses*, sticking contagion in the very wool and wals". In comparison, he describes seventeenth century pestilence as a force that has "infected the Elements, Ayre, Earth, beasts [and]

plants" (N2^{r}). For Adams, leprosy is evidence of religious corruption, and it "admits not man as Physician" for men and women are "diseased in Soule not in body" (N2^{v}-N3^{r}). Rather, "the medicine is supernatural; the *Bloud* and *Water* of [...] God" is capable of curing sin-diseased passions (N2^{v}).

Similarly applying religious remedies to bodily indispositions, Samuel Harsnett develops Adams's imagery in relation to Catholic constitutions. The Archbishop of York, Harsnsett's anti-Catholic rhetoric aligns more with scientific attitudes than Adams's transcendent prescriptions. Known for his passionate attacks against both Puritanism and Catholicism, Harsnett does not share the aforementioned preacher's Calvinistic sympathies. Although the two men do not share religious values, both figure Catholicism as an innately diseased religion. Labeling the pope "that Monster of Rome" and "the head of all unnatural and detestable rebellion", Harsnett opens *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (1603) by announcing that his discourse "might be free from the carpe, and evil of ill-affected, or discomposed spirits" (A4^{r}). These visions soon take on sickly forms, and by the fifteenth chapter the Archbishop details how "*cerebrum melancholicum*", otherwise known as brain melancholia, affects Catholic bodies (S3^{r}).

The result of inward disorder, melancholy was a pervasive disease that on occasion derived from infection or occurred during fluxes of emotion. Responding to Joseph Justus Scaliger, a Dutch scholar enthralled by classical medicine, who asks, "*why men of melancholik constitution be more subject to feares, fancies, and imagination of devils, and witches, then other tempers be*?" Harsnett, who oddly enough responds to Scaliger's question with the writer's answer, observes, "blacke & sooty blood" and "gloomie fuliginous spirits" do abound in bodies with this disease (S2^{r}-S2^{v}). Inward spirits, Harsnett argues, "fume into their braine, which bring black, gloomy, and frightfull images, representations, and similitudes in them, wherewith the understanding is troubled and opprest". Individuals "with this duskie, turbulent, and fantasticall disposition", he continues, are "absolute in their owne apprehension". For Harsnett, this fear can be explained using medical discourse rather than focusing on metaphysical explanations, contending, melancholia "grow[s] from the earthy dry stiffnesse of the discursive melancholike spirits, that doe possesse theyre braine" (S2^{v}). Arguing melancholy is an inward distemper heralded by hallucinations of supernatural beings in lieu of material images, Harsnett posits a Catholic's physiology triggers disease.

In this context, a Catholic mind differs from a Protestant mind in that papal bodies naturally produce an occult malaise that in turn induces diseased phantasmagorias. Religiosity, Harnsett argues, modifies cognition and provokes sickness. Proposing an innately diseased Catholic corporeality in order to explain cases of demonic possession, the preacher judges that incorporeal explanations of ghosts validate popish ceremonies including mass, transubstantiation, and exorcism. Thus, "a melancholike braine is the chaire of estate for the devill" since satanic imaginings are nothing more than mental visualizations rather than genuine visions of witchcraft (S2^{v}). Therefore, when he writes, "the devil comes from a smoakie blacke house [...] with ougly hornes on his head, fire in his mouth, a cowes tayle in his breech, eyes like a bason, fangs like a dogge, clawes like a Beare, skinn like a Neger, and a voyce roaring like a Lyon", Harsnett is describing routine visions of a Catholic disease rather than propagating cases of witchcraft (S3^{v}). Demonic possession, he argues, offers incorporeal explanations that merely serve to legitimize cases of popish practice and affirm Catholic tradition. "They that have their braines baited and their fancies distempered with imaginations", he writes, "and apprehension of Witches,

Conjurors, and Fayries, and all that Lymphatical Chimera" are "marshalled in one of these five rankes, children, fooles, women, cowards" or the "sick" (T1^{r}). Likening Catholics to Melancholic sufferers, with their "Popish brainsick imagination", the minister believes disease is an inward malady born from the discomposed wits of Catholics (X4^{r}). In this configuration, anti-papal rhetoric and scientific discourse become interchangeable locales where theories of sin and disease shape early modern conceptions of plague.

Plague and Olfaction

During an era of frequent plague epidemics, preachers such as Adams and Harsnett imagine Catholicism as a bodily disease. As Darryl Chalk notes, the number of epidemics within England "during this period created a culture that was periodically consumed by a conscious fear of contagion, and perhaps constantly moved by a subconscious fear of it" ("To Creep In" 175). Accordingly, plague outbreaks led preachers and doctors alike to speculate upon the origin of disease. While Harsnett drew on Galen's theories of bodily infection—maintaining disease is a self-contained disorder—other writers began to argue for a penetrative force that invaded the body's interior through corporeal openings. The eyes, ears, and nose became sites of pestilent invasion, and it was this shift within the burgeoning early modern medical movement that saw, as Chalk notes, disease became "an exogenous phenomenon" in contrast "to a predominantly endogenous one" (176). During Elizabeth's sovereignty, authors realized that plague entered corporeality in contrast to originating from within the body, and this led plague pamphleteers to concentrate on growing definitions of contagion.

Scientific accounts of plague between the 1590s and 1600s describe bad smells provoking corporeal disorders. Arguing pungent aromas "infect and weaken the spirites and principall members, as the braine and the heart", Johann von Ewich argues olfaction is a bodily experience capable of engendering physical disorder (E4^{r}). "Infected scenes, lakes, dennes, caves, the carkases or dounge of men and beastes, or some other more stronge savors", he finds, summon "pestilent and evil agues" (*6^{r}). Consequently, plague often arises from "corrupt, rotten, and infected ayre", and requires fire to evaporate its smell: "let us rather use fire" on "these contagious stenches [...] Let our streetes shyne with fier, let our ayre burne with fire" (E8^{r}). Paraphrasing the Dutch physician Levinus Lemnius, Ewich argues when "the ayre is better [...] the minde is better" (O6r).

For Roger Fenton, sin is the cause of the body's aromas. "Our odours stinke" he simply states, "our sinnes have made such a thick cloud" (B10^{r}; C11^{r}). Fenton preached the aforesaid sermon during the 1603 outbreak of plague that decimated London's population. An accomplished author and Protestant clergyman, he was a theological translator for the 1611 edition of the King James Bible. Speaking to a congregation of citizens who had only just experienced the traumatic events of pestilence, Fenton, undoubtedly spurred on by divine utterances, grounds his religious belief on groundbreaking scientific theories.

Attributing smell to disease in 1593, Simon Kellwaye provides readers with elaborate instructions regarding the removal of ill fragrances. "In sommer season", he offers, "decke your windowes, and strawe your floores with sweete and holsome herbes". These herbs include, "floures and leaves as Mintes, Balme, Pennyriall, Lavender, Time, Marioram, Red Roses, Carnations, [and] Gellefloures". For floors, he advises, lay down straw or "Greene Rushes, and Mynts, Oken and willow leaves,

Vine leaves and such like". Discussing windows "toward the North and Easte" of one's home, Kellwaye advises, "alwayes keep [them] open in the day time" provided "the aire be cleare and that no infected and unsavery smell" be detected. Claiming contagious smells are most common in "fogs, doonghills, and such like", Kellwaye cautions readers to stay away from harmful scents and opaque air, suggesting they do not "join in the fume or smoke thereof". Warning that both stench and wind infiltrate textiles, the author warns readers that if they smell anything slightly repugnant they must "breathe and perfume the clothes which [they] weare" (B3^{r}). Arguing infectious scents originate from an array of sources, Stephen Hobbes, an early modern physician, in 1603 characterizes pestilence as a "corruption of the ayre, which being corrupted is apt for infection of mans body". Observing how "all living creatures drawe their breath from the ayre that is round about them", he argues that air, "if it be stinking, venemous and corrupt" then "the bodie of mans living therein is in danger to be corrupted: whereby often times the pestilence is ingendred" (A2^{v}).

Discussing pathogenic odors and rotten air, Philip Barrough and Christof Wirsung expound corrupt air theory in their respective medical tracts. Barrough's *The Method of Phisick* (1601), which had undergone several editions by 1652, approaches disease holistically. In chapter thirteen, the physician describes at length two fundamental causes of pestilence. "See that at this present time and day, there be everywhere treatises of the pestilence made of diverse new Authors", he begins, "I neede not now long dispute here of it: but it shall be sufficient, if we do briefly declare the causes, signes, and curing of it". The first of these causes "is an infected, corrupted and rotten ayre" (R3^{v}). It is this rotten air that creates disease. "Therefore the chiefest cause why men are infected", he writes, "is breathing of aire [...] For it beginneth for the most part of breathing in of aire which corrupted of a putrifying and rotting evaporation" affects the humors (R4^{r}).

According to a number of early modern writers, then, unpleasant fragrances elicit corrupt air. Bad air can be, for example, "a multitude of dead bodies not burned or buried, as it chaunceth in warres, or the evaporation of some pooles, fennes or marshes in the sommer time". The most permeable of these, however, is an "immoderate heate of the aire" that occurs "when the temperature [...] is chaunged from this naturall state to immoderate heat and moisture" (R4^{r}). It is this heat that affects vapor and provokes pestilence. In *The General Practise of Physicke* (1605), Wirsung identifies a reeky air dispersing plague. "It is generally concluded by all learned men", he argues, "that forasmuch as the heart requireth a sweete, cleane, and healthy ayre, like as the body requireth meate and drinke: also that nothing is more venemous, noysome, nor hurtfull for the same, than a foule stinking ayre" (Ss7^{v}). A German physician, pharmacist, and counselor whose works appear to have been popular in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Wirsung describes the smells that incite pestilence as a "most noisome, terrible, and perillous malady". Tracing both the natural and divine causes of plague, he argues,

> [there are] many opinions amongst the Philosophers as there are causes that procure it; as namely of venemous vapors of the earth that are infected by some earthquakes: or if a countrey be hot, moyst, full of stenches, full of lakes […] but especially if the aire infected as is abovesaid through sinne, whereby it may diversly be venomed […] this is the most certaine cause of this sicknesse, that God the Lord for our manifold sinnes and wickednesse, to wit, idolatrie, incredulitie, and ingratitude, hath used this Plague and many afflictions more, as hunger, warre, and shedding of blood, to punish the aforesaid sinnes and transgressions. These are his rods and scourges (even

> the ministers of his wrath) to chastice the wicked world, as (through his Prophets) he hath foresaid and threatned the world, and as both Holy Scriptures and heathen writers testifie, that it hath afterward ensued accordingly. (Ss7^{r})

Warning that spoiled air destroys the body and corrupts the soul through miasmic smells, the physician records personal visions of animate objects rendered lifeless by disease.

Realizing definitions of corrupt air maintain ambiguous connotations for some readers (often labeled the simpler sort by scholars and philosophers in the introductions of these pamphlets) Peter Lowe attempts to clarify medical meanings. A surgeon and founding member of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons in Glasgow, Lowe's travels throughout Europe in the sixteenth century led him to witness events ranging from outbreaks of syphilis in France to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's in 1572 (Dingwall). Returning to London in 1596, he published his major work *The Whole Course of Chirurgerie* the following year. Containing a conversation between the author and a quasi-fictional student, the book's first chapter attempts to clarify definitions surrounding corrupt air. "Of the air", the student catechizes, "how many sortes [...] is there" (D4^{v}-E1^{r}). Responding there are two varieties: good and evil, Lowe simplifies descriptions pertaining to the former. "That which is pure, cleane, thinne, exempt from evill inspirations", he explains, "deep valleis, cloudes, rotten smells, farre from stanckes, mosses, aernes, carrions and all corruption, upon knowes, such ayre is best against all sicknesses". Sensing the subsequent query, Lowe responds to questions on evil air, asserting, it is "thicke, rotten, neare hilles, mosses, stankes, dubbes, the sea" or "townes that be lowe and close, infected with evill favours, or situated betwixt two hilles or places, where passeth the filth of townes, also that which is nebulous and commeth from stincking breathes". It is this evil air that produces plague, "for it entereth into our bodies by the mouth and nose" (E1^{r}). Pestilent air, he continues, "goeth by the nose to the braine, by the mouth to the heart, by the pores of the skinne, and moving of the arters through all the bodie" until it "not onely alter[s] and chaunge[s] the body, but also the spirite" (E2^{r}).

Thomas Lodge in *Treatise of the Plague* (1603) also connects disease with olfaction. "Man may know the infection of the aire which threatneth us with Pestilent sicknesses", he asserts, when it is "accustomably troubled with thicke, cloudy, moyst, and ill smelling vapours [...] fogges and vapours, making a thowe of raine without any showers". For Lodge, "when the aire [...] chaungeth from faire to foule, and from cleare to cloudy [...] it is a signe that the temperature of the aire is altered" (C2^{v}). Suggesting curative solutions for air of this disposition, the plague writer recommends readers, "bedeaw your foreheads, nostrils, and the pulces of your armes, for such an odour and of so wholesome a qualitie, vehemently repulceth the venome that assaileth the heart". Good smells, he assures, "altereth the pestilence of the ayre" (C4^{v}). Maintaining "contagion is no other thing but an infection proceeding from one unto an other by communication of a pestilence and infected vapour", Lodge speaks to contemporary fears surrounding the immateriality of air and transmittable nature of pestilence (C1^{v}). In *The Devil's Charter*, anti-Catholic rhetoric and scientific discourse become analogous locales where religion and contagion collide into one another. Splintering conceptions of the past, this paradigm generated culturally informed experiences in the playhouse.

Smelling Catholicism in *The Devil's Charter*

The opening scene of Barnes's play accentuates disease, pestilence, and infection. The first papal character to enter the stage is Cardinal Roderigo Borgia. A short while later, a hooded monk appears. Holding a magical book and presumably chanting satanic liturgy amidst occult imprecations, the monk begins to draw a conjuring circle on the stage. After reading what would appear to be Latin exorcisms, a devil "in most ugly shape" manifests onstage. Dissatisfied with the demon, Roderigo turns his head in dismay. Conjuring a second fiend that appears "like a Sargeant with a mace under his girdle", the monk is, once again, faced with a disappointed Roderigo. Finally, the monk summons a devil "in robes pontificall with a triple Crowne on his head, and Crosse keyes in his hand". Excited by the sight of this richly attired and most decorous demon, Roderigo gestures to the monk to end his conjuring. Handed the devil's charter, the Cardinal peruses the piece of paper and appears content at the sight of its inscription. Taking Roderigo's demeanor to signify an agreement to the parchment's terms and conditions, a second popishly dressed devil appears, ripping the sleeve of the cardinal's shirt, exposing his flesh. Piercing the Cardinal's skin, perhaps with his fangs, the devil allows Roderigo's blood to collect in a saucer. Requesting that Roderigo sign the parchment with his blood, the devil "seemeth to suppe up" the remaining plasma. Disrobing himself, the devil places "the rich Cap, the Tunicle, and the triple Crowne" upon the Cardinal's head. The "Cross-keyes" is "delivered into his hands" alongside "a magicall booke" ($A2^{v}$). Entering as Roderigo Borgia, the Cardinal transforms into the Alexander VI: the antichrist pope.

The drama's first scene suggests several pathogenic themes. For Adams, this sight would have been one of satanic disease and infectious smells associated with sin. Considering the preacher charges the pope in *The Black Devill* (1615) as "a rotten and stinking carkasse [that] is hid in a Sepulcher painted over with vermillion", it is a feasible conclusion that the Episcopalian would view the onstage exchange of papal garments as mannerisms that inspire pestilent realities and celestial affliction ($H2^{r}$). Moreover, he considers the pope hungrily reaching for clothing in order to "cloake" and "hide his Leprosie" ($P4^{r}$). Advocating a similar premise in relation to plague and infectious vestments, Johann von Ewich and Simon Kellwaye discuss plague-ridden apparel. Reflecting on both the nature of plague and the ways it disseminates throughout communities, Ewich finds is "the corruption of the aire about us". This dangerous air with its "poysoned qualities dooth cleave unto garmentes", most often and "chiefly woolen", and "the breath in fetching the wind doth infect, and as it were with a secrete flame set on fire the veines and arteries" ($C2^{v}$). Meanwhile Simon Kellwaye claims plague proceeds from an "unnatural heate" or "for the most parte it doth come by receaving into our custody some clothes, or such like things that have been used about some infected body, wherein the infection may lye hidden a long time" ($B1^{v}$).

Again, olfaction is the means by which disease enters the body. "You must have care", Kellwaye urges, "that your houses bee kept cleane and sweete", do not suffer "any foule & filthy clothes or stinking things to remaine in, nor about the same" ($B3^{r}$). Considering Adams paints Satan as a disease-ridden vessel who pollutes bodies with his contagious smell we can then assume that Alexander, when undergoing his religious transformation at the beginning of the play, contracts sickness upon receiving his infected garments. In contrast, Harsnett would more than likely view the opening scene of *The Devil's Charter* in a different light. Although he agrees plague and infection cling to garments, the Protestant divine believes

individuals who claim to see devils are suffering from melancholia. Therefore Alexander, who undeniably imagines himself as both a heavenly and temporal king of sorts, could be experiencing nothing more than a hallucination. Labeling Catholics brainsick patients, Harsnett argues otherworldly visions are the result of a distempered imagination. Rather than staging a Catholic delusion Barnes, I argue, explores pestilent contagion through onstage interaction between characters.

The death of every major character in *The Devil's Charter* reveals diseased moments informed by contemporary experiences of plague. Emphasizing contagious smells and pestilent air, Alexander's daughter Lucretia perishes from poisoned makeup that her father has laced with corrosive material. Applying the fatal cosmetics in Act 4 Scene 3, Lucretia wails, "I feele a foule stincke in my nostrells, some stinke is vehement and hurts my brain [...] My braines intoxicate[d] [with] rancke poyson [...] I feel the venome boyling in my veines". Her attendant, Motticilla, desperately cries, "my deere Lady; what strange leprosie" ($H1^{v}$). Unable to determine the cause of her rotting flesh and putrid scent, Lucretia calls for a physician, screaming, "my braines are feard up with some fatall fire [and] a foule unsavourie loathsome stinke choakes up My vitall sences". Shrieking that a "boyling heat Suppes up the lively spirit" of her "lungs", Lucretia's death evokes contemporary plague vernacular ($H2^{r}$). In a display of poetic justice, Barnes then stages the death of Rotsi (the character who composed Lucretia's toxic powders at the Pope's request) in a manner akin to that of his victim. Solicited by his master Alexander to assassinate the poison-maker in fear that he will expose the Pope's sinister actions, Baglioni fatally wounds Rotsi with a poisoned bullet. However, Baglioni is unaware that the Pope beseeched his poison-maker in the previous scene, requesting Rotsi contaminate Baglioni's drink with poison. Feeling the effects of the fast-working toxin, Baglioni is unable to find the cause of his sickness. Unaware that he has drunk corrosive material, the henchman groans of "venemous worship" in the papal court before pointing his finger at Rotsi's corpse. "Thou infectious slave", he grunts, "thee hast poysoned mee with thy stinking breath" ($K4^{r}$).

In contrast, King Charles's death occurs offstage. At a glance, the circumstances surrounding the monarch's death seem random. In spite of the fact that the sovereign's death is skimmed over in the drama, the moments leading up to the sovereign's demise, I will show, suggest he is a plague victim of the papal court. The audience first encounters King Charles in Act Two Scene One. Accompanied by Cardinal Saint Peter, Ascanio, Lodwick Sforza and Mompansier, Charles has taken it upon himself to travel to the court of Rome. Commenting Alexander is "fox-like" and coops "himselfe in Castle Angelo", Ascanio tells the King of the fables he has heard in recent months. Disregarding the advice, Charles states dismissively, "come we will touch him, summon forth a parle". Arriving at the walls of Rome a short time later, the company is unable to enter the city. Instead, Piccolomini greets the party from a distance. Accusing Piccolomini (the Pope's messenger) of preventing their entrance, the immobile camp blames the messenger for delaying their entry into Rome. "Noe most gracious Lord", he exclaims, I am here "to salute you from his Holines" ($D1^{v}$). Unmoved by the explanation, Mompansier queries, "What is he sicke?" To which Piccolomini replies, ay, "not very well dispos'd" ($D2^{r}$). A seemingly inconsequential discussion, this scene suggests Alexander feels unwell due to an exposure of corrupt air in the previous scene, or he is avoiding the meeting for political reasons. If the latter of these is indeed the case, which is more than likely given the context, the notion Alexander is sick suggests Barnes is offering the audience a topical joke that surely would have instilled a chuckle in many Protestant playgoers.

After further discussion and deliberation between the two parties, Alexander finally enters atop the wall. Demanding the King and his men abandon their arms, the Pope offers Charles peace provided they bow down and worship him. Charles accepts Alexander's terms, surrendering his soul unto the Pope as a token of goodwill. "Your soules", Alexander retorts, "they stinck in sight of God & man/ Your soules? Why they be sould to *Lucifer*". Once more, this would have been a comical scene for the early modern audience who realize that Alexander is describing himself. In addition, this exchange reminds audiences Alexander is both diseased and reeks of antichristian sickness. Offending the party with these injurious comments, Alexander faces a disgruntled troupe. "Renowned Charles", yells Ascanio, "pull downe this Antichrist" (D3^{v}). However, the King opts to bend even further, exposing his neck to the Pope in hopes it will result in peace. Proving to be successful, this act of political and religious submission finds favor with the pontiff. Rome's walls open and the King and his company enter Alexander's plague-ridden court. A friar emerges "*with a holy-pot casting water*" while all in attendance "*bow as the Pope marcheth solemnly through*". Making the sign of the cross with his fingers, Alexander assumes his position in the court, establishing his divine seat and temporal supremacy. Caesar Borgia beckons the sovereign to kneel before the pontiff. Proceeding to kiss Alexander's feet and cheeks, King Charles allows the Pope's hellish vestments and blemished corporeality to penetrate his pores. Face to face with the antichrist pope, the monarch ingests Alexander's contagious stench, inhaling miasma from the Pope's leprous garments and contaminated breath (E1^{r}).

Permeated by the antichrist's fumes, it is only a matter of time until Charles will die from sickness. "Heere leave we Charles with pompous ceremonies", recites Guicciardine, "Feasting within the Vaticane at Rome" (E1^{r}). Leaving the stage and never to return again, Charles continues on his journey throughout the papal lands. During his time in Amboise, the sovereign grows increasingly ill until he eventually dies of apoplexy. Understood as an effusion of blood, this disease could enter one's nose. "A Knight being in an assemblie was sodenlie astoned and diseased over all his bodie", writes Paracelsus in *A Hundred and Fourteene Experiments* (1583), "as if hee had the *Apoplexie*" (C3^{r}). Curing the Knight "by anointing the hinder parte of his head with *Balsamum Heleny* and *Essentia Mecurialis*", the writer explains that such a disease requires purging "by the nostrels" because of its olfactory origins (C3^{r}-C3^{v}). As Harris has noted, Paracelsus is a significant figure in the medical world at this time (*Foreign Bodies* 22-30). His writing, which offers groundbreaking notions pertaining to infection and the infiltratory aspects of certain maladies, became the catalyst for the transition from identifying disease originating within the body to recognizing disease entering the body. Infected with pestilent smoke and emitting a rancid stench, Alexander represents an infectious agent that contaminates those around him with a virulent scent.

The source of the court's contagion, Alexander is also the drama's chief plague victim. When demons first enter the stage to claim the soul of Roderigo Borgia and exalt him from cardinal to pope, zymosis is only in its nascent stages, but as the play progresses we see that Alexander has all the signs of someone who is diseased. Accused of adopting "his sonne *Caesar* into the fellowship of Cardinalls, that he with the menstruous poyson of his breath might choake the whole Conclave", the Pope's body overflows with noxious blood (B1^{v}). Expressed again towards the end of the play, an onstage devil charges Alexander: "Thy soule foule beast like a Menstruous cloath, Polluted with unpardonable sinnes" (L4^{v}). Symbolizing man's fallen nature: "our righteousnesse is but like to a menstruous cloath", these

accusations also speak to conceptions of plague and infection (Abbot Bb4^{r}). Writing on harmful exposure to "alteration[s] of the ayre", Simon Kellwaye finds "some putrefied and corrupt quality" in the air "doth cause an ebullition of our blood" (L2^{v}). The cause of this inflammation, he explains, "is the menstruall blood which from the beginning in our Mothers wombes wee receaved, the which miring it self with the rest of our blood, doth cause an ebulition of the whole" (L3^{r}). Diseased menstrual blood, which pervades both sexes at this moment in time, begins to swell within the body when it comes into contact with infected air, causing physiological alterations in the bodies of both women and men.

Finding its way to the body's interior, infected air affects the natural temperature and causes the blood to boil. Heated blood then mixes with "that menstruall matter", and fusing "with the rest of our blood" menstrual fluid "doth cause a continuall vering and disquieting thereof, whereby an unnatural heate is encreased in all the body" (L3^{r}). Causing the blood to boil, menstrual substances inflame the body's internal temperature and trigger vomiting. "This filthy menstruall matter", Kellwaye claims, "is separated from our naturall blood, & the nature being offended and overhwelmed therwith doth thrust it to the outward pores of the skinne". Described as "hoate and slimy", apertures can be the body's pores or one's mouth (L3^{r}).

Alternatively, Alexander's body is perhaps unconsciously bloodletting to avoid further ailment. Discussing remedies for the plague's effects, Thomas Lodge advises the diseased to "evacuate and expell those superfluities [...] which abound" in the body (D1^{r}). "It is therefore noteworthy", he continues, "in suspected and dangerous times that no accustomed evacuations either by fluxe of [...] menstruall blood, itches, or such like should be restrained" (D1^{r}). Endorsing the expulsion of these occult materials, Lodge explains purging the body of blood "maketh the body healthfull, whereas [...] being either repressed by astringent medicines or such like ointments, might greatly hurt the principall members, and produce strange sicknesse" (D1^{r}). Quoting Galen and Hippocrates he writes, "it is a good signe when as any defluxion is expelled, from the inward and principall parts of the body: where contrawise, if the same be transported from the outward to the inward parts, it is a most evil and sinister signe" (D1^{r}). In addition, men and women suffering from plague were advised to "have a vein opended" in an effort to keep disease at bay (Wirsung Tt2^{r}).

Rather than piercing his flesh for medicinal purposes, Pope Alexander allows sickly air to enter both his olfactory glands and the open wound on his arm at the beginning of the drama amidst putrid exhalations. Drawing on both religious and scientific evaluations, the pontiff experiences infection during satanic invocations and ritualistic bloodletting. Allowing corrupt air to enter his lesion, Alexander permits an evil contagion to overwhelm his corporeality. This causes the blood to increase in temperature before swelling and subsequently ascending to the head.

At the beginning of *The Devil's Charter* Alexander's brain suffers from an irremediable poison. "The braines", Wirsung asserts, "are the uppermost and chiefest of all the inward members of mans bodie, a place and abode of the understanding, memorie and judgement" (H3^{r}). For John Jones, "the reasonable or animall spirite proceedeth from the braine, as is perceived by feelings, sense, and understanding" (A3^{r}). The brain, with its innate coldness and moisture, regulated internal temperature and routed the blood. In *A New Treatise of the Pestilence* (1603), Hobbes declares "venemous ayre" putrefies the body "whereby the pestilence is ingendered" (A2^{v}). "Perturbations and affections of the minde", he claims, arise through heated blood in

the head and "rotten humors" in the body (A3^{r}). Furthermore, "they who sucke [...] infected aire are in daunger to be attainted with this contagion and sicknesse of the Pestilence [...] especially, if they be of an evill constitution of body, repleate with evill humours" (Lodge B4^{v}). Recalling Harsnett's approximation of Catholics and their fundamentally diseased innards or humors, the Pope's physiology and his exposure to stinking, pestilential air induces sickness. Warning that if one suspects they are ill due to pestilence, Lodge directs readers to forgo the "use of women". Explaining "there is not anything during this contagious season more forcible to enfeeble nature then [...] unbridled desires which [...] distemper the humors and dispose the body to receive infection", the writer prohibits lascivious acts, arguing sexual contact not only infects other parties but also inflames the disease in those already sick (E4^{r}).

Sodomizing young boys and committing incest with his daughter, Alexander's libido is both beastly and unending in the drama. This, claims Mary Carruthers, was believed (in addition to plague) to cause the brain to overheat, as all acts of "immoderate or superfluous" sexual activities provoked unnatural warmth in the brain (61). Already in the grips of an internal corporeal heat due to infection, Alexander's prurient activities increase the plague's effects, impacting his ability to preserve information. Before too long, the Pope's mind becomes a festering pool of gunk and Alexander's cognitive ability begins to wane.

In early modern culture, forgetfulness implied infectious disease. "Memorie", Wirsung explains, "is a retaining of acts either heard or seene" (H3^{v}). It "is a retaining, establishing, and preserving of matters which have bene conceived in the spirit". Memory is only compromised if an "infection of the braines" occurs, and this happens if disease enters via the nose. Correspondingly, if "memorie be hurt, then followeth forgetfullnesse of matters which be past and done" (H3^{v}). Unable to recall the agreed upon duration of his pontifical reign, Alexander grows confused and forgetful when a devil arrives and demands the pontiff pay his dues. "My time is not expir'd", he squabbles. The demon then sits with Alexander, producing the devil's charter. After the demon explains the conditions of the contract Alexander remains unmoved, defiantly stating, "Seaven years are yet to come, I look for them". Scoffing at the pontiff, the devil spits, "thou foole examine in Arithmetik, numbers without distinction placed thus". "How? How? How? How? Howes that" laments Alexander (L4^{r}). Bumbling around the stage, Alexander resembles an old dotard stumbling to recall markedly important memories.

Recognizing the cause of Alexander's forgetfulness in the drama involves conflating scientific and religious rhetoric in relation to early modern notions of diseased minds. Preaching, "*Satan* must first intoxicate the braynes, and extinguish the eye of reason" (D2^{r}), Adams in *The Divells Banket* (1614) declares, as "*Water* is an enemie to digestion; so is *Sinne*, clogging the *memorie* (the soules stomach) with such crudities of vice, that no sober instruction can bee digested in it" (D3^{r}). Philip Barrough, on the other hand, claims, "the losse of memorie [...] is caused in [...] lethargie and other soporiferous diseases". This loss can occur through two differing temperatures. The first is a "cold distemper" and is "either externall or internall". Regarding the former, an "abundance or fleame, or melancholy is the cause" of a cold brain. Or, "if there be no signes of those humors abounding, then must it needs come of some externall cause, especially if it come not through extreame old age". Peripheral sources come from "anie disease" that is "newly passed, & so turned into oblivion" (C5^{v}). The second distemper is that of warmth. If "heate" is the cause of forgetfulness "*Mania*", or madness, soon follows (Wirsung H3^{v}). This psychosis appears during Alexander's lines toward the end of the drama:

> Holla, holla, holla, come, come, come, what, when, where, when, why, deaf, strike, dead, alive, oh alas, oh alas, alwaies burning, alwayes freezing, alwayes living, tormented, never ending, never, never, never mending, out, out, out, out, why, why, whether, whether, thether. (M2^{v})

Appearing to have lost all cognitive and motor skills, the pestilential combination of sin and bad air has taken hold of Alexander, turning him into a babbling, incoherent dotard.

In the drama's final act, Barnes unequivocally establishes that the Pope suffers from both a physical and metaphysical poison. The former causes his natural death while the latter instigates his spiritual demise. Intending to poison two cardinals with bottles of poison disguised as wine at a papal feast, Alexander sits down to eat with his clergy and last remaining child Caesar Borgia. During the feast, a devil masquerading as a cardinal emerges and switches the Pope's and Caesar's untarnished drinks with the poisoned cups. Drinking deeply from their mugs, Alexander and Caesar soon exhibit nausea. The cardinals, recognising that they are the plot's intended victims, flee from the scene. Groaning, Alexander exclaims, "Heere Caesar taste some of this precious water/ Against all plague, poison, and pestilence/ A present helpe" (L2^{r}). A Jew from Galilee, it would seem, sold this preservative (or "precious water") to Alexander some years beforehand. Drawing on the spiritual remedies of a sin-clogged soul prescribed by Protestant preachers, Barnes implies a celestial physician has prepared the preservative. Swallowing the enigmatic potion, Alexander experiences a miraculous recovery. He is unable to save his soul. Dragged to hell by a swarm of devils, Alexander exits the stage and *The Devil's Charter* ends on a seemingly joyful note.

The final moments of Barnes's drama evokes the play's opening imagery albeit in a markedly subtler manner. Appearing in the seconds following Alexander's spiritual demise and physical death, a group of cardinals' gaze upon the bloated corpse of the pontiff, believing he has died as a result of the poisonous beverage he ingested in the previous scene. "Even as his spirit was inflate with pride", exclaims one clergymen, "Behold his bodie puffed up with poyson/ His corpse shall be convaied to Saint *Peeters*/ Open for all beholders, that they may/ See the reward of sinne, amend and pray" (M2^{v}-M3^{r}). At a glance, this scene suggests a rebirth of epistemological Christianity that emphasizes the consequence of sin and reveals the effects of religious iniquity. Although pride was a particularly abhorrent vice in Protestant theology throughout this period, it is not the central motif in this scene. Rather, the underlying significance of these lines is, once again, olfaction.

Finding putrid smells to be wholly transmittable in nature, physicians caution the public by announcing that religious figures are often the vessels by which sickness spreads from one body to another. "For I have said before", argues Ewich, "and say still, that only the outward and common infectious ayre, but also contagious breaths and infectious breaths, or blowings, which are gathered & afterwards imparted to the whole". Arguing plague spreads from one body to another in a matter of seconds, Ewich advises, "minister of the church" who "going hither and thither, and standing by the infected [...] ought specially to avoided" (C4^{r}). Representing religious figures exposed to noxious smells, the cardinals who gaze upon Alexander ingest his unsavory stench and will continue to spread the plague's contagion once they leave the papal court. Quoting Galen, John Hones writes, "if the minde be troubled, it affecteth the whole body" (A5^{r}). Considering the pope's metaphorical body is that of the Catholic Church and its congregation, it is feasible to assume Barnes sought to encourage conceptions surrounding papal bodies as disease-carrying vessels capable

of distributing spiritual and physiological infection. The head of Catholicism, personified in the pope, would surely disseminate contagion to the remaining members.

Personifying anti-Catholicism in early modern England extended beyond mere entertainment and emphasized the dire consequences of coming into contact with a member of the papacy. Analyzing the embodiment of anti-Catholic discourse in the framework of cultural realities and experiential nuances thus requires modern scholars to engage with the playhouse because in this setting bodies experienced a phenomenon that aggressively interacted with the body's senses: namely the nose. Highlighting the symbiotic relationship between differing cultural spheres, ranging from medical discourse to religious rhetoric, playwrights like Barnes rendered public imaginings whilst reconfiguring ideas to the London stage. In the past, historians of anti-papal discourse have dealt with the continuation of religious practice within a post-Reformation world or focused on the cultural atmosphere of Protestant sermons. None has explored the central role of the body in relation to fashioning Protestant propaganda in the playhouse. During these moments, dramas demand a sensory paradigm to be understood. Sensing the papal body, I have argued, requires the nose, but what of the ears?

Chapter 6

Corporeal Discord and Aural Physiognomy: Hearing Catholicism in *The Whore of Babylon* (1606)

Thomas Dekker's religiously charged and politically potent play, *The Whore of Babylon* (1606), abounds with bodies that are musically discordant, pathogenic, and politically dissonant, and stages the early modern belief that English Protestant monarchs are able to detect treasonous bodies harboring Catholic beliefs through hearing discordant vibrations. Written in the months following the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, Dekker represents these bodies through jarring personifications of Catholicism embodied in the drama's chief villain: the Empress of Babylon. Signifying Saint John's vision of Babylon's mystical whore, the Empress personifies the Roman Church and captures contemporary Protestant anxieties that depicted the pope's religion as politically dissident and musically discordant. The Empress's body, which is both unmusical and diseased, resembles an inharmonious instrument whose penetrative sounds entice English bodies to commit treason. Dekker stages such motifs to convey cultural visions of the corporeally discordant, and in the process reveals that Catholics must be heard if they are to be seen. Focusing on how Catholic bodies doubled as contagious vessels capable of spreading political sedition and ecclesiastical contamination, this chapter will focus on the cultural significance of musical language and dissonant metaphors in the immediate political setting of Dekker's drama. Contemporary definitions of political and musical dissonance, I argue, culminate in the staging of papal bodies diseasing English bodies with infectious tunes that incite religious insurrection.

Corporeal Discord: Papal Bodies and Early Modern Law

Early modern religion, political policy, and secular law of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century are matters often discussed extensively by historians. Tracing the development of Catholic persecution throughout Tudor England, Rafael Tarrago examines the distinction between religious oppression and political rebellion under Elizabeth I (121). This distinction, as Alice Dailey has noted, attempted to separate spiritual conviction from acts relating to administrative rebellion. Considering a piece of legislation in 1585 outlined that the presence of Catholic priests on English soil was an act of treason in and of itself, the differences that divided secular law from religious conscience are ambiguous to say the least (104-108). Priests, argued the Elizabethan administration, emanate from the treasonous bosom of the papal antichrist and thus their presence in England was to undermine providential Christianity and usurp Protestant monarchical rites. It would appear this created a crisis of conscience for many Catholics facing trial on the grounds of social dissension, but not because it meant acknowledging their religious belief in a Protestant court. Rather, this crisis emerged from the realisation that martyrs would be re-branded criminals in the eyes of God, country, and history (Dailey 111-115; McCoog 907).

Although contemporary writers argued that rebellion against the monarch was an issue of law and not religion, this divide was neither obvious nor simple. For example, Peter Lake suggests that Protestant authors sought to distinguish such matters whilst advocating there was an identifiable connection between Catholicism and treason ("The Structures" 236). Implying Catholics are not inherently traitorous

but that traitors to the crown are often Catholic, authors describe treason as a Catholic proclivity akin to a heritable disease or baldness: following Catholicism does not entail treasonous behavior, but treasonous behavior is almost always caused by a belief in Catholicism. To date, Lake and Michael Questier have provided the most comprehensive analysis of this early modern division in its immediate setting (*The Antichrist's Lewd* 64-67). In the past, several authors have been quick to accuse the Elizabethan regime of reconceptualising treason in order to serve religious agendas. As a result, historians appear to maintain a particular bitterness toward the collective memory of "evil" Queen Mary and her "chaste" counterpart Elizabeth. For Lake and Questier, in contrast, treason, as an overarching accusation, was not a mere replacement to religious intolerance that served to cruelly blur Catholic dissidence and political upheaval. Instead, ecclesiastical terms and secular policy were categories that faced perpetual transmutation similar to that of other constitutions read within various paradigms formulated for a particular audience. Analysing lawful and unlawful aspects of Catholicism during this period, Lake and Questier provide a convincing view of the cultural nuances, literary distinctions, and performative depths of social mechanisms utilised to achieve acceptable forms of violence, theatricality, and persecution in the public sphere (590). However, both historians do not suggest that Catholics in early modern England did not themselves view charges of treason as cruel jokes and crude reconfigurations reminiscent of Queen Mary.

The trials that followed charges of treason inevitably led to public displays of religious conviction and social outbursts, and it was during public trials that questions surrounding the religious divide experienced further abstraction. Again, it is Lake and Questier who reveal that the theatricality of public treason trials and their display of bodily destruction "was not the visceral projection of the power of the state in and through the maximized public agony of the victim", but rather it functioned as a "visual message that the felon had died a traitor's death rather than a heretic's" ("Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric" 72). Likewise, Photini Danou argues that public trials relating to political sedition provided a warning to potential traitors rather than suspected Catholics (393).

For many authors, the convergence of militant Protestantism, ecclesiastical politics, and the public display of allegiance to the English crown reached its zenith at the beginning of James's reign with the Oath of Allegiance. Formulated in 1605 and seen as a response to the Gunpowder Plot that occurred in the same year the Oath of Allegiance, which furthered the obfuscation of the religio-political divide, is a theoretical solution to an inherently paradoxical division that undoubtedly would have divided and confused Catholics. The oath's opaqueness derives, in part, from the notion that Catholics are not inherently treasonous and yet treasonous acts occur because of Catholicism. In comparison, Alexander Okines argues the oath is not "deliberately ambiguous", proposing that James did not intend "to split the Catholic community". Instead, "the strategy was to frame an oath the content of which, while always likely to go too far for some Catholics, could be interpreted merely as temporal and so for many might be deemed acceptable" (279). While I do not share Okines's view of the oath's seemingly inherent simplicity and temporal forthrightness, I do agree with Questier's observation that the oath was an "exceedingly complex association of religious and political ideas" that "advertised itself as a profession of merely civil allegiance" ("Loyalty, Religion and State" 311-312).

In this chapter, I investigate the role of sound in shaping politicians, preachers, and *The Whore of Babylon's* use of musical metaphors regarding anti-

Catholic rhetoric and treason discourse. The terms "corporeal discord" and "aural physiognomy", I maintain, speak to early modern conceptions of the treasonous body as a politically dissonant corporeality that produces illicit reverberations and pathogenic resonances. During a period where the distinction between Catholic rebellion and political traitor was a grey area, identifying traitors required an external awareness of what were essentially internal processes: thoughts, feelings, and religious morals. For political writers, preachers, and the monarch alike, English citizens resembled melodious notes harmonized through Protestantism, and this musical metaphor extended to Catholic bodies. In this model, Catholic plotters who preserved treasonous intentions are corporeally discordant to both Protestant unity and political harmony. As I explored in chapter two, more than half a dozen Catholic conspiracies to dismember England's body politic took place between the 1570s and early 1600s. Following the Gunpowder Plot, 1605 to 1610 saw a politically charged climate where ecclesiastical power and secular rule collided, leading to further discussion on what precisely constituted an act of treason: was it political belief or religious conviction? Indeed, the arbitrary divide that separated Catholic bodies from rebellious figures is a topic Thomas Dekker devotes significant attention to exploring throughout this period.

Thomas Dekker: Politics, Plague, and Sound

A poet, writer, and playwright, Dekker offers modern readers a glimpse into the political landscape, social climate, and auditory backcloth of early modern trends at the core of English culture at the beginning of James's reign. Dekker, who was known to attract intense criticism from contemporaries including Ben Jonson, experienced intense scrutiny from his peers throughout his lifetime. Criticisms arose because the author's works almost exclusively chose to explore popular topics and document well-known events and trends. Nonetheless, this accusation implies that the themes in Dekker's material can be seen as motifs that sold in the English marketplace.

Dekker's writings in the early 1600s routinely focus on images relating to anti-popery, disease, and affect. "Bookes are a strange commoditie", he notes in the introduction of *Jests to Make You Merie* (1607), writing, "the estimation of them riseth and falleth faster then the exchange of money". Comparing popular literary topics to Renaissance clothing, as both "alter more often then the English man doth the fashion of his apparell", Dekker strove to include prevalent themes into his writing ($A2^{r}$). Imploring readers to "taste" his work, he writes, if you "finde it pleasing I am glad, if not, I cannot be much sorry, because the Cooke knew not your dyet, so that his error was his ignorance, and ignorance is a veniall sinne to be pardoned" ($A2^{v}$). Dekker's visceral tone is a recurring motif that in turn shapes all of his works.

Desiring to affect his audience's physiology by engaging with readers and playgoers alike through corporeal allusions and direct references to the body's senses, Dekker maintained that the body is a construction in need of constant stimulation. Although he believed appealing to the body would in turn result in commercial success, Dekker was often destitute: his inability to secure consistent patronage resulted in debt, imprisonment, and fist fights on several occasions throughout his life (Twyning).

Commissioned to record King James's coronation pageant in 1603, Dekker and Jonson wrote the state sanctioned pamphlet on the royal entrance—surely much to both writers' great annoyance. Published in the following year, *The Magnificent*

Entertainment Given to King James contains both writers' accounts of James's ceremonial coronation pageant (1604). Dekker's enthusiasm in documenting state affairs continued throughout the year, and in 1603 he published his first non-dramatic piece of literature. A pamphlet in which the author describes the death of Elizabeth, the accession of James I, and the plague of 1603, *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603) is a solemn piece that exhibits the author's interest in visceral motifs. Dekker's pamphlet begins with allusions to England's political and social recuperation—"behold, up rises a comfortable Sun out of the North, whose glorious beames (like a fan) disperse all thick and contagious clowdes"—before focusing on the physiological effects of plague ($C1^{r}$-$C1^{v}$). "It is held dang'rous", he warns, "to be infected with a leaprous line" and so he asks readers to "banish" popish slanderers, political critics, and social climbers "from thine eare" ($C2^{r}$).

Affected and deeply troubled by recent events, Dekker paints an expressive image of pestilence in the reader's mind. Recalling the spiritual turmoil of the year's happenings, he writes,

> A stiffe and freezing horror sucks up the rivers of my blood: my haire stands on end with the panting of my braines: mine eye-balls are readie to start out, being beaten with the billowes of my teares: out of my weeping pen does the inck mournefullie and more bitterly than gall drop on the pale-fac'd paper, even when I do but thinke how the bowels of my sicke country have bin torne […] [I will] rip up and Anatomize the ulcerous body of this Anthropophagized plague. Lend me Art (without any counterfet shadowing) to paint and delineate to the life the whole story of this mortall and pestiferous battaile, & you the ghosts of those more (by many) then 40000 that with the virulent poison of infection have bin driven out of your earthlie dwellings. ($C3^{r}$)

Consumed with vivid memories of London's plague and those afflicted with malady, Dekker records the distress caused by pestilence, correlating his own bodily motions with the physiological outcomes of disease. In Dekker's mind, plague stirs the body's internal mechanisms, cultivating changes in the religious, medical, and literary psyche. These internal changes signal a transformation in differing social arenas, ranging from discussions on religious contagion in Protestant sermons to medical debates surrounding the meaning of contagion to plaintive odes depicting infection.

Investigating plague's physiological effects, Dekker's pamphlets demonstare how a network of ideas are prevalent in authors' discourses at the beginning of the 1600s. As Rebecca Totaro notes, the early seventeenth century is a period of English history where the literary, scientific, and religious blended into one another through descriptions relating to plague (*The Plague Epic* 2-5). As she suggests, poets and authors inspired by the plague's effects and origins offer modern readers insight into historically recurrent dichotomies between man and God, fear and understanding (7). Unlike previous scholarship on early modern plague literature, Totaro argues for a specific literary genre shaped by early modern plague rhetoric and classical sentiment in a period that catered for personal, religious, and medical desires regarding an epidemic's function and power within a community. Participating in this tradition, Dekker describes in *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603), "heapes of dead mens bones: the bare ribbes of a father that begat him, lying there: here the Chaples hollow scull of a mother that bore him: round about him a thousand coarses". These corpses, he mourns, can be found, "standing bolt upright in their knotted winding sheetes" while "others halfe moulded in rotten Coffins, that should suddenly yawne wide open,

filling his nosthrils with noysome stench, and his eyes with the sight of nothing but crawling wormes" (C3^{v}).

Describing a Londoner's experience of plague, Dekker shifts from smells to sounds. "He should hear no noise but of Toads croaking", he laments, "Screech-owles howling, Mandrakes shriking". Asking, "were not this an infernall prison", the writer imagines even "the strongest-harted man (beset with such a ghastly horror)" would "looke wilde [...] runne madde" and "die" after such an experience. Imagining someone walking through a plague-affected road in the late hours of the night, Dekker describes the "musicke" of London's "melancholy streets". Referring to "the loude grones of raving sicke men: the strugling panges of soules departing", he records the sounds of the dying: "servants" cry "out for maisters: wives for husbands, parents for children, children for their mothers" (C3^{v}).

Shifting from contemporary concern surrounding pestilence to religious jibes, Dekker soon began to integrate anti-papal rhetoric into his writing. Published in the year of *The Whore of Babylon's* opening performance, *The Double PP* (1606) addresses the "nobility, clergy, and gentry *Of Great Britain*" (A1^{r}). A superficially cryptic allusion to the pope, the title of the pamphlet speaks to Protestant fears of Catholic dissidence and popish treason. "A Papist Variant, or *The Changeling*", Dekker explains, is "like an instrument of sundry strings Not one in tune, yet any note he sings" (C3^{v}). Whereas the "Papist Umbreant, or *The Moldwarp*", he continues, is "like a Skreech-owle" that "sits all day unseen: but when the sorcerous night Spreds her deepe Spells, hee conjures up his wits, Giving his soule to Treason" (D2^{r}). In contrast, a Protestant Bishop, "tunes his voice unto so sweete a *Chord,* Hee winnes mens very soules: and is therefore sent To be the *Speaker* in *Gods Parliament*" (E2^{r}). Enumerating the many assassination attempts against Elizabeth as acts motivated purely by the papal religion, Dekker unequivocally associates popery with political subversion whilst calling on musical language to further tuneful associations between Catholicism and discordant sound.

Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1606)

In *The Whore of Babylon,* Dekker stages auditory motifs within the cultural framework of plague discourse and anti-Catholic sentiment. As I will demonstrate, it is Catholicism's discordant sound that becomes the pathogenic agent in this drama. If Dekker truly was a pandering hack then *The Whore of Babylon* should provide readers with images that undoubtedly strived to resonate with contemporary audiences. In a period consumed with images recently inspired by plague and the Gunpowder Plot, Dekker published a play that draws on what he believes are the social, political, and religious realities surrounding anti-Catholic feeling.

The play itself, however, has received varying degrees of attention from historians and literary scholars over the years. For the most part, the drama tends to be read merely as a reactionary piece to the Gunpowder Plot, offering modern audiences little to no other insight into historical concerns. Susan Krantz, for example, examines the drama's engagement with Spanish xenophobia during the rise of Prince Henry in the Protestant imagination of militant Christianity, arguing that it is "one of the first generation of texts to recast Elizabethan England nostalgically as a form of covert criticism of the contemporary Jacobean court" (271). In contrast, Julia Gasper argues, "it would be a mistake to see it and its view of events in too narrow a context" (62). Larry S. Campion also avoids the specificities of the drama's historical perspective, abandoning *The Whore of Babylon*'s immediate political context. Instead, he

categorizes the drama as another example of anti-Catholic sentiment born from Protestant vitriol (75). Mary Hunt perhaps maintains the most noticeable disdain for Dekker's play, dismissing the production as a crude piece of writing that is lacking in comparison with other, more sophisticated dramatic pieces (39). Accusing Dekker of falsifying "the account of time" and arguing that the author's "obvious intention was to marshal before the audience all the great public facts of the Queen's life up to about 1594 – 1596", Hunt labels *The Whore of Babylon* as an unsophisticated history play (36). For Regina Buccola, the drama lacks religious distinction. At times, she argues, Dekker blurs the differences that divide Protestant Christians from their papal counterparts (158).

Drawing on the play's overt feminization of its characters, Buccola's analysis of the drama echoes the work of Frances E. Dolan, who considers the Empress of Babylon as the papal antichrist. Arguing that modern critics must read the Empress of the play's title as the pope, Buccola (quoting Dolan) determines that Dekker's lead villain is a misogynistic construction tied to Protestant attacks on the female body (Dolan 54). Stating that Dekker perpetually destabilizes Protestant notions pertinent to anti-Catholic sentiment, Buccola argues *The Whore of Babylon* makes little sense because the playwright is unable to articulate Protestant ideals due to the drama's dense use of allegory (146). Similarly, Sarah Scott maintains that the Empress is "a female inversion" of the Catholic pope, arguing Dekker (for reasons unknown) includes both male and female imagery in his lead villain (75). Focusing on the explicit use of sexual imagery and venereal disease throughout the drama, Scott finds that Dekker "complicates the gendering of the Empress's otherness" by attributing both masculine and feminine qualities to the Catholic sovereign (80). What is lacking in the above commentaries, I argue, is an engagement with anti-Catholic rhetoric in its politically charged setting.

The opening section of *The Whore of Babylon* provides scholars with a socio-political environment that accentuates musical metaphor, religious didacticism, and contemporary interest in the association between Catholicism, treason, and sound. "*The Generall scope of this Drammaticall Poem*", Dekker expresses in the play's Lectori, "*is to set forth* [...] *the inueterate malice, Treasons, Machinations, Underminings, and continual bloody stratagems, of that Purple whore of* Roome" (L1-6). He then defines the subtext of the play: "*I write as a Poet, not as an Historian, and [...] these two do not live under one law*" (L23-24). Regarding his religious and political stance, he writes, "*In sayling upon which two contrary Seas, you may observe, on how direct a line I have steered my course*" (L16-17). In this opening salvo, which functions as an address to the post-performance reader and not the immediate playgoer, Dekker counteracts almost every argument that modern critics have with this work. Perhaps it was the overt failure of the play's first and only performance that has led many scholars to the assumption that it is an opaque piece with vague references to historical topics and cultural happenings.

By all accounts, *The Whore of Babylon* did not engage with audiences, and when one considers Dekker's apparent fondness for topical matters it is difficult to gauge why the play failed in a commercial setting. Unfortunately, this fact tends to influence modern critics' evaluation of the drama, leading several scholars to the conclusion that the drama is void of topical significance. Explaining that he was unable to attend the performance for unspecified reasons, Dekker remains uncertain of the play's failure, as "*mine eare*", he writes, "*stood not within reach of their Larums*" (L27). Comparing actors' voices to shrill sounds, Dekker blames the play's performers for its poor response. "*Of this my knowledge cannot faile*", he writes, "*that*

in such Consorts, many of the Instruments are for the most part out of tune" (L28-29). Comparing an actor's body to a musical instrument, Dekker states that the players that night did "*sing false notes, in dispite of all the rules of Musick*" (L31-32). In Dekker's mind, *The Whore of Babylon* had everything an early modern audience in 1606 should have identified with such as allusions to plague, treason, and Catholic villains. Regardless, the play's use of musical language is most definitely in tune with contemporary concern surrounding Catholic dissonance, religious contamination, and political upheaval. Staging dissonant bodies that produce infectious sounds, Dekker's drama embodies the auditory qualities of anti-Catholicism.

Protestantism's Aural Physiognomy and Catholicism's Dissonant Body

During a time when Protestant writers feared Catholicism's contagion and diseased capabilities, Dekker first associates pestilence with Catholicism before utilising musical metaphors to add a political depth to this imagery. In Act One Scene One, audiences first encounter the whore of the play's title. The Empress of Babylon enters the stage accompanied by four cardinals, two persons in pontifical robes (one holding a sword and the other keys), three kings, and a group of friars. In a display of antichristian corporeality, Dekker speaks to a Protestant definition of a satanic body politic. Discussing how Titania (the Queen of Fairyland modeled on Queen Elizabeth I) has expelled "true religion" from its shores, the Empress grumbles of how the sovereign continually discredits Babylon's synagogues (1.1.1-30). Establishing the play's two opposing forces (Protestantism and Catholicism) in the drama's opening scene, Dekker determines that the papal body is unable to recognize its intrinsic evil.

Moaning about her public image and the battering it has taken in recent times, the Empress complains of the Fairies who see her as a disease-ridden vessel of spiritual contamination and sexual lasciviousness. Relaying the opinions of Fairies, the Empress states, "from our mouth", they say, "flow rivers of blasphemy and lies [...] our Babylonian Sinagogues are counted Stewes, where Fornications and all uncleannesse Sodomiticall [...] are now daily acted" (1.1.31-35). Fuming that such "leprosy touch'd us never", the Empress discredits these rumours and blames Fairyland's monarch for disseminating such unpardonable untruths (1.1.35). Attending the Empress are four kings, and upon hearing their Queen's outburst one asks, "who [...] feeds so ulcerous, and so ranke a Spleene?" (1.1.46). In response, the Empress bellows Titania's name, screaming, she "Calles her selfe *Truth"*, but she "has stolne faire *Truths* attire, her crowne, her sweet songs, [and] counterfets her voyce" (1.1.59-60). Claiming that Titania has achieved this "by prestigious tricks in sorcerie", the Empress accuses her rival with titles repeatedly ascribed to Catholicism during this time (1.1.61). Pacing back and forth across the stage, the papal monarch appears paranoid, but to audiences it is clear that the designations she ascribes to Titania are titles she embodies herself.

Moving away from descriptions of leprosy to images of unpleasant sounds, the sovereign explains the musical descriptions the Fairies have given to her over the years. "All the tones/ Of harmony, that *Babylon* can sound", she spits, "Are charmes to Adders, and no more regarded/ Than are by him that's deafe, the sicke mans groane [...] Yea even her vassaile elves, in publicke scorne defame me, call me Whore of *Babylon"* (1.1.77-83). Accusing Fairies' to be "deafe", the papal sovereign relays how her foreign enemies maintain that she creates "sicke" sounds because of her diseased corporeality (1.1.80). Producing Catholic reverberations, the Empress's dissonant corporeality induces illness in foreign (taken to mean English or Protestant)

bodies. Nonetheless, the precise details surrounding the nature of this disease are yet to be clarified. Physically exhausted from her acerbic speech, the sovereign collapses into her throne. Realising the situation between the two nations demands a response, the kings suggest that the Empress send them to Fairyland's shores. Upon entering the neighbouring country, they will infiltrate Titania's court and infect the queen with popish rhetoric (1.1.85-90). The Empress agrees to these suggestions, leaving the court to devise further stratagems. Those in attendance follow the Empress in hurried trepidation whilst several other papal figures remain onstage. These figures, which are the play's cardinals, jesuits, and other papal clergy, discuss the merits of the proposed scheme, revealing that the chief papal body is not that of the Empress but rather her dissident subjects.

Tantamount to the Empress in regard to pestilent behaviour, political discord, and musical dissonance, the clergy contrive a popish plot that maintains religious secrecy and evokes pathogenic similes. Rarely seen by scholars as the drama's villains, these characters are, in many ways, figured as more cunning than the ruler they serve. The Empress, who represents the Catholic Church, is merely the source of contagion. The cardinals, on the other hand, are the Catholic body's diseased limbs capable of penetrating England's body politic, and are hence the play's chief foreign invaders that repeatedly threaten to compromise England's health.

In 1606, an author by the name Philopatris describes Jesuits and Seminary priests at length throughout the *An Humble Petition*, stating papal clergy are "the chiefe inventours of all those pestilent plots, & ringleaders of the rest to this damnable Rebellion" (F4^{r}). Referring to the several attempts on both Elizabeth's and James's life in recent decades, the author goes on to compare Catholic bodies to "tyrannous Traytors and cruell bloud-sucking" fiends (E2^{v}). As I explored in chapter two, authors such as George Abbot declared, "Jesuits [...] seduce youth" and "inveigle & beguile the wealthy, to play al trickes of Machiavel, to conspire the death of Princes, to plot how to set kingdomes in combustion & cunningly to sow secret discord and sedition" (F2^{r}). Calling jesuits "lewde Trumpets" that covertly infiltrate Protestant Kingdoms, John Rhodes describes at length the intended treasons of Catholic foreigners in the same year (A2^{v}). Some years later in 1611, an anonymous author in *The Fierie Tryall of Gods Saints* (1611) claims that English treasons are "assisted by beasts (for men I cannot call them, but rather devils)" of the Catholic religion. "Both Priests [and] Jesuites", he writes, give protection to "Caterpillars, Degenerate persons, Miscreants, Vipers, Monsters, and not men, and whatsoever name more odious, that also; yea unworthy to bee called by the name of any of Gods creatures" (F3^{r}). Finally, this author states, "your unholy father the Pope" has "fret out your heart-strings" before concluding that jesuits "harpe so much upon two strings, to wit, breach of promise and bloud shedding" (F4^{v}).

The cardinals and jesuits embody precisely such descriptions in *The Whore of Babylon,* quarrelling amongst themselves and arguing over the merits of the Empress's plan. Referring to the sovereign's strategies as an ineffective remedy to their temporal problems and spiritual ills, the cardinals are unhappy with their monarch's proposed approach. "This physicke cures not me", mutters one of the clergy (1.1.115). A second agrees, while the remaining members consort, "nor us" (1.1.116). "It is not strong of poyson, to fetch up thats bak't within: my gall is overflowne/ My blood growne ranke and fowle: an inflammation/ Of rage, and madnes so burnes up my liver", rumbles the first cardinal (1.1.118-120). "Even my heart-strings cracke", he says before the others sound in agreement (1.1.121). Unlike

the kings who bow at the Empress's request, the clergymen refuse to "creepe upon" their "bellies in humilitie" (1.1.136-137).

Refusing to feign meekness in order to infiltrate the Fairy court, the cardinals conceive of a subversive plan that relies more so on infection than counterfeit display. Contemplating the finer details of what such a scheme entails, a cardinal declares the plan should involve "ponyards" (1.1.142). The other cardinals in attendance, however, shake their heads in response to the suggestion. Meanwhile, a clergyman suggests "poyson" or "treason", but the remaining members once again disapprove (1.1.143). After a lengthy silence, a cardinal that is yet to speak emerges from the shadows. Pacing back and forth across the stage, this lone figure begins an impassioned dialogue. "They hunted us like wolves", he yells, "Out of their Fairie forrests, whipt us away [...] mockt us, and said our fall/ Could not be dangerous, because we bore/ Our gods upon our backes" (1.1.173-177). "Now", he states, "must we whip them/ But wiselier" (1.1.177-178). The attentive clergy hark these words, asking how they will achieve such a feat. Assuaging his religious fellows with a diabolical plan, the persuasive cardinal proposes a surreptitious approach to defeating their English enemy. "Those that fill our roomes", he declares, will proceed to Fairyland to infect its nation's people with dissonant sounds (1.1.179). Fairies, he describes, "are counted wells of knowledge, poyson these wells/ They are the kingdoms musicke, they the Organs/ Unto whose sound her Anthems now are sung/ Set them but out of tune, alls out of square/ Pull downe the Church, and none can it repaire" (1.1.183-187). Pronouncing that jesuits are "the best consort of the soule", the cardinal points to the remaining clergy: "you shall to Fairie land" go (1.1.190-194). The jesuits assume their primary role in the drama: Catholicism's infectious agents who will contaminate English bodies with pathogenic sounds.

Staging contemporary English opinions on political dissension, religious contagion, and Catholic discord in *The Whore of Babylon's* opening scene, Dekker focuses on how sound aids in the conceptualisation of treason. The jesuit priests signify dissonant notes whose sounds penetrate English bodies that upon infiltration destabilise a Protestant kingdom comprised of harmonious figures.

Musical metaphor, it appears, extended to the English nation itself. Thomas Gainsford, an English soldier and political writer, argues that James "must string and tune his *Britaine*, Before he can his pleasing musicke make, Hee'le mend each craze, the strings & stops hee'le trie, Before he will performance undertake" ($G3^{r}$). Writing, "the *Clergie* he alreadie well hath tuned, and with great care the false strings hath remooved; Which would have made the comfort seeme untuned, And to the skillfull eare would harsh have proove", Gainsford utilises musical descriptions in order to support a Protestant vision of unified Great Britain free of Catholicism's jarring strings ($G3^{v}$). The son of a London goldsmith, Gainsford's military service saw him fight in the Netherlands from 1594 to 1596 before serving in Ireland under Richard de Burgh in 1597. A well-travelled soldier who eventually replaced a sword for a pen, he turned to writing political literature at the beginning of the seventeenth century (Baron). For Gainsford, "*Brittaines* discord" is "to remaine a thought", provided England remains a Protestant nation. The "publike stage", he writes, is best for presenting "the brainsick vapours" ($H2^{v}$).

In the preceding century, Edward Aggas employed musical metaphors and infectious imagery to explain political policy. An English publisher and translator of several French texts, Aggas proposes "a question of this time" ($A2^{r}$). This question, which asks why monarchs do not convert to Catholicism to appease Roman Christians, meets Aggas's fervent disapproval. Catholics "cloke [...] their rebellion"

he explains, and regardless of outward authenticity cannot be trusted. "This remedy", he submits, "is not sufficient to cure our disease" ($A2^{v}$-$A3^{r}$). Once again, treason operates within an occult paradigm where sickly imagery becomes the focus of Protestant polemicists. Demonstrating inappropriate (and by extension appropriate) sounds, musical representation furthers images of political visions of loyal Christian subjects. "When an Instrument of Musicke is out of tune", Aggas decrees, men must not "breake the rest of the strings, but by wrestling and slacking of them, to reduce them to a consent and harmony as well as they may". For Aggas, a monarch who converts to Catholicism in order to appease his Catholic people is to preserve a discordant apparatus. In comparison, to return to true Christianity (taken to mean Protestantism) involves "peace [to] be knit againe, and the harmony of this estate be restored in the place where it was broken" ($B4^{r}$). Embodying these opinions at the beginning of *The Whore of Babylon*, Dekker introduces the audience to notions surrounding papal disease through allusions to musical dissonance.

Following the Empress's plan to send her popish kings to infiltrate England's court, the three sovereigns arrive on Fairyland's shores eager to carry out their nefarious plots. Act One Scene Two opens with Titania in her court, speaking with her Fairy attendants Fidely, Florimell, Elifron, and Pentioners. Discussing how she has heard of the Empresses' "Invenomed Spleene", Titania reminds audiences of a similar description called on by the Empress to descibe the Fairy Queen's diseased corporeality at the beginning of the drama (1.1.10). As I mentioned earlier, scholars often view such parallels as a shortcoming of Dekker's writing ability, arguing the author confuses the two sovereigns by staging analogous rhetoric. However, it is conceivable that Dekker includes inverted parallels in order to suggest that the diseased party is a cultural construction of contemporary times, proposing the mimetic represents true-to-life scenarios where Catholics accuse Protestants of the diseased allegations labelled against them. Discussing the nation's recent turn of events, Titania describes how "plagues" have ravished Fairyland, which in turn have "destroyed/ Great numbers" and created infectious fumes throughout the land (1.1.14-15). On cue, the Empress's three kings appear onstage. Disguised as Fairy suitors, their entrance occurs amidst discussions of disease. Their presence in turn elicits Thomas Lodge's scientific opinion that particular bodies carry particular sicknesses. Arguing, "there are certain regions and places which by a peculiar propertie in themselves engender certaine kindes of infirmities", he states that some diseases,

> are particular only to the inhabitants of that region, either by occasion of the aire, or the waters in that country. As in the new found land (discovered by the Portugalls and Spaniards) in that land which is called Hispanola, and other places of India, there raigne certaine pustules or broad scavs (not much unlike the French poxes) wherewith almost all the inhabitants of the country are infected. ($B2^{r}$)

Lodge's opinion that particular nations breed specific diseases and infect their inhabitants through contagion is perhaps the subtext of Dekker's staging of the three kings. Embodying the idea that Catholicism denotes plague, the playwright suggests the three kings are infectious agents who desire to infect Fairyland's court with religious contagion. Gil Harris notes how the kings in this scene embody "pathogenic Catholic infiltrators", arguing that papal nations radiate several diseases including plague and syphilis (*Foreign Bodies* 68). Suggesting red spots adorn the kings' faces in order to represent the many venereal diseases they symbolize, Scott argues that the kings' disguises not only conceal their political allegiance, but they also obscure their diseased bodies (85).

It then follows that the three kings in the drama embody Catholicism's primary sickness: pestilence. Considering Lodge's belief that an "evil qualitie of the aire" in "some region, or countrey" produces "inflammation of the tunicle of the eies, Carbuncles, or collicks" and "fluxes of blood", the kings don cosmetics in order hide their leprosy (B1^{v}-B2^{r}). In this view, the cardinal's earlier exclamations of his "heart-strings" disintegrating "as in a furnace" speaks to the bodily effects of plague (1.1.121). Describing at length the effects of pestilence, Lodge observes, "plague proceedeth from the venemous corruption of the humors and spirits of the body, infected by the attraction of corrupted aire, or infection of evil vapours, which have the propertie to alter mans bodie" (B2^{v}). Evil air, he continues, is a "mortall enemy to the spirits, which have their residence in the heart". Contagion, he argues,

> is an evill qualitie in a bodie, communicated unto another by touch, engendering one and the same disposition in him to whom it is communicated. So as he that is first of all attainted or ravished with such a qualitie, is called contagious and infected. For very properly is he reputed infectious, that hath in himselfe an evil, malignant, venemous, or vitious disposition, which may be imparted and bestowed on an other by touch, producing the same and as daungerous effect in him to whom it is communicated, as in him that first communicateth and spreddeth the infection. This sicknesse of the Plague is commonly engendred of an infection of the Aire, altered with a venemous vapour, dispearsed and sowed in the same, by the attraction and participation whereof, this dangerous and deadly infirmitie is produced and planted in us, which Almightie God as the rodde of his rigor and justice, and for the amendment of our sinnes sendeth downe uppon us (B2^{v}-B3^{r})

Applying Lodge's observation to Dekker's characters allows readers the opportunity to recognize the play's three kings for what they signify: the Empress's pathogenic agents afflicted with qualities of plague (Catholicism) and musical dissonance (political treason). Attempting to infect Titania with their sounds (i.e. voices) and smells (i.e. diseased bodies), the kings exhibit sickly states and thus conceal their identities with elaborate make-ups and perfumes. Rushing around the stage, the kings begin to sweat and before too long the cosmetics used to conceal their identities melt, resulting in the Queen's attendants discovering the mens' intentions (1.1.20-40). Purging Titania of Catholicism's presence, the sovereign's attendants promptly remove the papal agents from the court before infection takes hold of the Protestant body politic. Unsuccessful in their plot to contaminate the Queen, all but one of the kings return to Italy. Choosing to remain in Fairyland, the third king, which represents Spain in the drama, disguises himself as an old man. It is at this point in the play that musical representation and pestilent imagery merge.

Disguised as an old man on Fairyland's shores, the third king awaits the opportunity to infect an unsuspecting body with papal disease and political sedition through jarring sounds. Before too long a young scholar named Campeius wanders onstage, and the masked king swarms to his prey. Modelled on Edmund Campion, an English scholar, deacon, and Catholic martyr, Campeius is a naive student easily persuaded by those around him. The king speaks to the scholar's uncertain future, explaining that he too was at one stage in his life an aspiring student. Fairyland, however, prevented him from pursuing his dreams, as the nation does not support intellectual pursuits. Upon hearing this news, Campeius exhibits sadness at the idea he will not be able to pursue his own visions of academic grandeur. Crouching beside the upset Campeius, the king whispers a solution that will solve the scholar's woes:

treason. Suspicious of the old man's suggestion, Campeius is unable to determine the validity in the king's sounds. Sensing this, the king asks, "Doe you take me for a hangman?" "I would be loath", replies the young scholar, "For any harsh tune that my tongue may warble/ To have the instrument unstrung" (2.2.83-85).

Acknowledging that treason throws one's body out of tune, Campeius hesitates for a moment before entering into further conversation of rebellion. Explaining that the Empress of Babylon supports individuals like Campeius, the king infects the Englishman with the villainous sounds of Catholic subversion. Proceeding to board a ship that the king has organised to set sail for Italy, it is only a matter of time before Campeius will step forth on the poisonous soil of a stench-ridden Catholic country, and at this point plague will finally consume him (2.2.1-10). While Campeius enters the ship, the king lurks behind, waiting for news from a satanic conjuror he employed earlier to construct an enchanted sacrament. Moments later, the conjuror appears with a picture of Titania in his hands. "This virgin waxe", he cackles, "Burie I will in slimie putred ground/ Where it may peece-meale rot: as this consumes/ So shall shee pine, and (after languor) die/ These pinnes shall sticke like daggers to her heart" (2.2.169-172). The king relishes in the magician's news, asking where he intends to bury the portrait. Pointing toward an ill-perfumed mound that evokes the smells of the antichrist pope and his antichristian brood, the conjuror gestures, "On this dungill" (2.2.179). The king congratulates the magician before disappearing onto the ship. Burying the image in the dunghill, the conjuror pauses to admire his handiwork. Titania's guards, however, arrive onstage before the papal figure completes his task. Arresting the sorcerer, the guards ensure Titania remains unharmed, destroying the virgin wax. This news makes its way back to the Empress's papal court, and the sovereign's ability to produce jarring sound becomes the centrepiece of the proceeding scene.

Returning to the Babylonian court, audiences witness a Catholic sovereign consumed with jarring noise. "Who sets those tunes to mocke us? Stay them" (3.1.1). Searching for these dissonant and unmusical sounds, all in attendance reply "peace" (3.1.2). A cardinal then whispers, "your musicke must be dombe" (3.1.3). Explaining that hearing discordant melodies are the signs of inward disorder, the cardinal explains, "When those Cælestiall bodies that doe move/ Within the sacred Spheres of Princes bosomes/ Goe out of order, tis as if yon Regiment/ Weare all in up-roare" (3.1.4-7).

To the best of my knowledge, Gil Harris is the only scholar who has commented on this scene, remarking, "the Empress of Babylon is discordant, tellingly, the Empress demands the cessation of music in her court, because she herself is out of tune" (*Foreign Bodies* 65-66). Grounding this observation on his reading of the aforementioned scene, Gil Harris acknowledges that the Empress feels sick because of sound, but he believes the source of the queen's condition is the court's music. At first glance, it is understandable why he posits that the Empress demands for the court music to cease. However, both the stage directions and reply from the kings and cardinals imply that there is, in reality, no music in the court—"your musicke must be dombe" (3.1.3). Based on this, we are able to infer that the queen cannot help but be in a constant state of *sounding,* and although she typifies the Roman Catholic Church and thus would find Protestant, or harmonious music, nauseating, her diseased corporeality produces inharmonious sounds akin to infectious reverberations. As a result of her unhealthy physiology, the Queen's sounds generate inward malady. In reality, there are no musical sounds present in the court. Rather, the sovereign's body functions as an unstrung instrument that generates

jarring sounds, infecting those around her with dissonant tunes. As earlier scenes suggest, her body creates discordant reverberations that trigger English rebellion and provoke Catholic infection. In this paradigm, corporeal discord implies bodily disorder through musical description. Dekker, alongside political writers of the time, maintains that treasonous bodies not only maintain distinct visual elements but also signify auditory qualities.

The remaining scenes in *The Whore of Babylon* illustrate corporeal discord in their immediate political, religious, and cultural setting. Stomping around the stage because she is unable to produce melodious sounds, the Empress collapses on the floor of her court (3.1.1-20). Onstage characters fall silent while they await their monarch to rise from the ground, but before the Empress is able to do this attendants rush onstage and explain that the kings have failed to infect Titania with Catholicism (3.1.15-34). Filling the court with dissonant echoes, the Empress whoops and howls like a petulant child. Emerging onstage amidst discordant sounds, the third king rushes to the sovereign's side, attempting to quiet her jarring notes. Explaining that he has brought two Fairies back for papal infection, the king soothes the Empress with this information. Returning from Fairyland with Campeius and Ropus the king, he explains to the sovereign, has made "them drunke" with blasphemy, murder, and treason (3.1.83). Ropus, modelled on Queen Elizabeth's Portugese physician Roderigo Lopez, is Titania's personal doctor who prescribes the Protestant monarch with spiritual remedies and physical medicines. Recognizing the opportunity to infect Titania with Catholic disease is at last within her grasp, the Empress is hardly able to contain her excitement, whispering, "*Wee* [will] use them/ Like instruments of musicke, play on them/ A while for pleasure, and then hang them by/ Who Princes can vnbrayd, tis good they die" (3.1.90-93). Elated, the Empress continues, "send/ These busie-working Spiders to the wals/ Of their owne country [and] when their venomous bags/ (Which they shall stuffe with scandals, libels, treasons)/ Are full and upon bursting" reward them with gold (3.1.119-123). Beckoning that Campeius and Ropus enter the court, the Empress croons, "He that first sings a Dirge tun'd to the death/ Of that my onely foe the Fairie Queene/ Shalbe my love" (3.1.168-170). Playgoers are then transported back to Fairyland where musical metaphors soon become contagious sounds.

Drawing on the contemporary writers who approach Catholic bodies as inharmonious instruments that infect English Protestants with discordant sounds, I will now analyse scenes that reveal such illicit reverberations before exploring the play's primary example of aural physiognomy. Ragazzoni is a particularly wily character in Dekker's drama. Alongside Campeggio, he is an agent for the Empress whose main function in the play is to discredit Titania's name and in the process spread rebellion. Treason and contagious discord come to a peak in the drama when Ragazzoni comes across an anonymous character, known simply as "a gentleman" (2.3.2). Bearing in mind that the year before *The Whore of Babylon's* inaugural performance, his "majestie's publisher" printed *His Majesties Speach in this Last Session of Parliament, as Neere His Very Words Could Be Gathered at the Instant* (1605), where the editor chronicles "the names of those that were first in the treason, and laboured in the Myne": Thomas Percy, Thomas Winter, John Wright, Christopher Wright, and Guido Fawkes. Holding no official titles, these men are simply known as five "gentleman" (K4^{v}). We can then assume with "Ragazzoni *at one dore*" and "*a Gentleman at another*" playgoers are readying their ears for talk of an English insurrection (2.3.2). This does not happen, however, and Ragazzoni opts to exit the stage, leaving behind the anonymous gentleman in the company of another character:

Doctor Paridel. The inspiration for Paridel, an exceptionally treacherous figure, is that of the infamous William Parry, an Englishman solicited by William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley, to travel to Rome and appear as a disillusioned Protestant in search of religious truth between the 1570s and 1580s. Hoping that Parry would gather information concerning any potential Catholic plots against the English sovereign, the English spy ended up a double agent and eventually become the focus of a nationwide imbroglio after he attempted to kill the queen in 1584 (Lock).

Although sentenced to death in 1585, Parry came to epitomise Catholicism's innate contagion that, although foreign, was able to transform domestic bodies into treasonous monsters. Exemplifying Richard Johnsons' s warning in *A Lanterne-Light for loyall Subjects, or a terrour for Traytours* (1603), Parry typifies the writer's opinion: "my loving brethren the subjects of England, open not [your] eares to the subtill perswasions of Papists, left rebellion enter into [your] hearts, & sovengeance light upon [your] whole bodies ($C2^{v}$). Paridel also represents Thomas Bedle's policy on converted Catholics. Addressing English Catholics as "metamorphosed Romanes", Bedle imagines physiological transformation caused by religious conviction and political allegiance ($A4^{v}$). An onstage example of an English body that has undergone a Catholic conversion, Paridel is the *The Whore of Babylon's* "bird that had skill in song/ To learne harsh notes" (4.2.92-93). Unable to cease sounding dissonant notes, as his "instrument has been unstrung", Paridel beckons the anonymous gentleman with the following spiel that Dekker bases on supposed conversations between English Catholics. "Deere countryman the parly we late held/ About the land that bred us", he begins, "as how order was rob'd of ceremonie (the rich robe of order)/ How Truth was freckled, spotted, nay made leaprous:/ How justice—" (3.2.68-71). Before Paridel can finish this thought the gentleman interrupts him by muttering, "come, no more", explaining they will talk of such things "at houres more opportune" (3.2.71).

Possibly construing his face to look offended, Paridel's expression demands an explanation from the gentleman. Correspondingly, the gentleman implores Paridel to cease this dialogue: "I heard of late the musicke of my soule/ And you the instrument are made that sounds it" (3.2.76-77). Explaining the present time is inconvenient for such a discussion, the gentleman nevertheless converses via a few coded allegories the plots devised by the Empress and her minions against Titania. Asking if Paridel has found "skilfull coasters, that know all the sounds", the gentleman begs to know if those who were hired to do the whore's bidding "make [...] musick?" To which Paridel responds, "Faith", before pausing, "a little jarring: sometimes a string or so" (3.2.92–97). Implying there may be a few loose ends, or what they're doing may in fact damn them, Paridel ends by assuring the gentleman "it is lawfull" (3.2.102). Having successfully infected the gentleman with his sounds, the anonymous fellow cries "Deere Countriman, my sword, my state, and honor/ Are for your use" before exiting (3.2.106–107). Nonetheless, this is not the last we see of the gentleman, encountering him once again a short while later.

In Act Four Scene Two the now converted gentleman returns to the stage, presumably to act out his previous talk of political dissidence. In the presence of Titania and three of her councillors, Elifron, Florimell, and Fideli, and a third figure (the treacherous Ropus), the gentleman watches on, "*standing aloofe*" (2.4.2). As these directions foretell, the gentleman is quite unassuming throughout this scene and appears (quite literally) to stand by, saying and doing nothing, but it is for this reason the scene is revelatory in exemplifying aural physiognomy, as the gentleman, like the Empress, is unable to cease vibrating discordantly. It then follows that an emphasis on sense is paramount in reading and understanding this scene. While Titania and her

two attendants discuss matters pertaining to the kingdom, the gentleman quickly exits upon hearing Titania mention, "Nay we are not falling yet" (4.2.52). Having said nothing the entire time, Florimel comments that Titania's "presence dawnted/ The silly gentleman" whereas Fideli remarks, "He knew not how to stand, nor what to speak" (4.2.53-55). Although the queen's two assistants notice nothing too peculiar about the gentleman, Titania presciently states, "That wretch hath sworne to kill me with that sword" (4.2.58). Baffled and completely unaware, all exclaim "how?" (4.2.59) All too much for the oblivious Florimell, the attendant entreats the queen to enlighten them all, asking "How got you to this knowledge—blessed heaven!" (4.2.68) Titania, maintaining a sage pose, offers no insight and simply says, "it came unto me strangely" (4.2.69). Playgoers can then assume that Titania is able to hear the faintest of dissonant sounds, sensing Catholic bodies that produce discordant noises based on treasonous intentions. The anonymous gentleman, infected with Paridel's popish sounds, is unable to cease sounding jarring tunes that collide with Titania's body.

Following the Parry Plot (1585) and the Babington Conspiracy (1586), two machinations to remove Elizabeth as the head of England, a steady flow of literature surfaced containing descriptions of infectious clergymen, noisy Catholics, and pathogenic bodies. William Parry, seen as having "subjected himselfe to the Pope" by an anonymous but presumably Protestant author in *A True and Plaine Declaration of the Horrible Treasons* (1584) ($A2^{r}$), became embroiled in Protestant imaginings of apocalyptic whoredom, with Thomas Rogers's in *An Historical Dialogue Touching Antichrist and Poperie* (1589) stating:

> That Whore of Babylon in the holie boke of Revelations [...] is [...] prooved to bee the church of Rome. Notwithstanding as common strompets often-times put upon them both the faces and the persons of most honest women: so this whore, filthie though she be and uncleane, yet would she appeare in the eies of man to be pure and chast, as the spouse of Christ ($A2^{r}$-$A2^{v}$)

In this passage, the pope is responsible for projecting his whorish church as pure and chaste. The Catholic Church, which appears as a melodious construction to the eyes, is in fact a contagious synagogue that contaminates English corporeality with religious dissonance that in turn transforms unwitting bodies into treasonous Catholics. The aforesaid author of *A True and Plaine Declaration* goes on to convey to readers the "letter written by Parry to her Majestie", a letter that begs Elizabeth to see "the dangerous fruites of a discontented minde" ($C3^{r}$). The letter documents how "wicked Papistes and Popish books" led Parry astray, convincing the Englishman "it was lawfull to kill her Majestie" through their sounds, or voices. ($E2^{r}$). Not alone in dispensing advice masked as confession, the 1584 copy of the *Order of Praier and Thankes-Giving for the preservation of the Queenes Majesties life and salfetie: to be used of the Preachers and Ministers of the Dioces of Winchester* details how "Doctor Parry" was "animated thereunto by the Pope and his Cardinals" ($A1^{r}$). During this turbulent time of religious plots, William Barlow, an Anglican priest charged by King James with translating the New Testament epistles for the 1611 edition of the Bible, in 1601 explains that Protestants must become "skillful physiognomers" in order to detect Catholic traitors ($B3^{r}$). As I have demonstrated with *The Whore of Babylon*, Barlow's advice extends beyond the visual to include the auditory. In this way, aural physiognomy illustrates how an English, Protestant sovereign is able to recognize discord both visually and aurally, acting like a tuning fork for the kingdom's instruments: aware when bodies, vibrating discordantly, emitted treasonous sounds caused by Catholicism.

Investigating the multifactorial development of discordant constitutions in early modern culture reveals moments that are deeply politically and culturally significant. Up until the early 1600s, the term discord described an act *or* a sound. Staging anti-Catholic rhetoric, Dekker is the first writer to coalesce the differing definitions of the word in order to embody topical motifs that depict the body not only producing pathogenic religiosity but also emitting infectious music. By doing so, he reveals a potent early modern comparison between English citizens and melodious notes, illuminating readers on the literary depth of musical language and metaphor. In the *Whore of Babylon*, embodying Catholic physiology goes beyond sights and smells: diseasing one's innards by affecting the ears through sound. As I have explored in this and the previous chapters, smell and sound are vital to reading early modern plays long deemed unintelligible by modern scholars because it allows for a more nuanced reading of texts that contain culturally significant meanings. In the proceeding chapter, I argue that both smell and sound must be taken into account when reading a drama yet to be considered a piece of anti-Catholic discourse: *Lust's Dominion* (c.1600).

Chapter 7

"Mad them with villainous sounds": Catholicising the Foreign Body in *Lust's Dominion*

In 1610 John Harrison, an English diplomat commissioned by King James I to travel to Muley Zaydan, Morocco, began what would eventually become a twenty-year foreign political campaign. Publishing an account of his journey to and dealings with the foreign land in 1633, Harrison describes to readers the legendary Abu Marwana Abd al-Malik II, the reigning Sultan of Morocco from 1627 to 1631. Labelling Abu as "the mad king" driven by "mad humour" to perform "mad-pranks" upon his people, Harrison details how the king forcibly removed "the women […] washing at the sea side upon the sands, set them upon their heads, & cause water to be powred [...] into their unseemly parts, to see if it would come out at the mouth againe" ($A1^{r}$-$B3^{v}$). A testament to his predilection for abrasiveness, Abdala also hated, it would seem, melodious music: "He cut of a Moores head [...] for crying on the church rovver [...] another also for [...] singing more than usuall" ($B1^{r}$). Maintaining a proclivity for discordant sound, Abdala shares his propensity for ugly noise with another, albeit fictional, mad Moorish king: Eleazar, the reckoned arch-villain of the relatively unknown drama *Lust's Dominion, or The Lascivious Queen* (c. 1600). Evidence of Eleazar's desire to saturate one's ears with acrimonious sound, the Moor screams in Act Five Scene Two, "Mad them with villainous sounds" (5.2.86). Directed at both the audience and characters onstage, Eleazar's demand epitomizes the Protestant belief that foreign bodies are susceptible to Catholic conversion upon coming into contact with a member of the papacy.

In this chapter, I argue that the Catholic body is responsible for infecting Eleazar and inducing madness. Manifesting both physiologically and religiously, Eleazar's madness results in the catholicisation of his corporeality with respect to contemporary designations of both medical and spiritual definitions of the term. Set in Catholic Spain, the drama depicts Eleazar's physical and religious transformation in response to growing concern over popish diseases and the infectious sounds of political dissonance caused by papal reverberations. Eleazar's conversion, I demonstrate, reflects contemporary anti-Catholic attitudes common throughout English communities in this militantly Protestant period. In the performance, the Moor is a foreign body vulnerable to popish infection. Absorbing disease like a defenseless sponge, he represents both a vulnerable body and a mimetic mirror, reflecting the popish qualities of the Catholic characters that pollute him with their pestilent breath and virulent sounds.

Lust's Dominion (c. 1600)

Scholarly opinion on *Lust's Dominion*, however, has never broached the play's anti-Catholic resonances. Instead, discussion tends to revolve around either issues of race or the play's authorship. Analyzing the former of these, Claire Jowitt has written on the drama's negative portrayal of Islamic men, relating this view to contemporary fears and anxieties surrounding Muslims at the beginning of the seventeenth century (411). Similarly, Frank W. Wadsworth argues that the drama "centers around the attempts of a dark-skinned Mohammedan villain" (194), forming a correlation between the play and its ostensible influence on John Mason's *The Turke* (1610). Concerning the play's authorship, there is a semblance of consensus regarding the

origins and development of *Lust's Dominion*. As Gustav K. Cross has commented, critics originally believed Christopher Marlowe wrote the drama. Published in 1657 by Francis Kirkman, *Lust's Dominion* is the reimagined title for a drama originally named *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy* (38-40). Perhaps renaming the drama to better engage with audiences in the 1650s, Kirkman also credited Christopher Marlowe for the work because the original quarto bears the playwright's handwritten inscription. Accordingly, writers throughout the Restoration period often remarked that *Lust's Dominion* was "a much better play than *Dr. Faustus*" (39).

Likewise, the drama received several accolades within literary circles throughout the nineteenth century. One critic, for example, went so far as to mention that it is "the most dramatic" of Marlowe's plays while another praised the drama for its erudite splendor, commenting, "there are a number of single lines that seem struck out in the heat of a glowing fancy, and leave a track of golden fire behind them" (Cross 39-40). For almost two hundred years, critics remarked how *Lust's Dominion* was Marlowe's greatest dramatic offering. Recent evidence suggests, however, Marlowe perhaps drafted an initial version of the text sometime in the early 1590s. Philip Henslowe then outsourced the draft in the fall of 1599 to John Marston, which then saw further revision by Thomas Dekker, William Haughton, and John Day sometime in 1600 (Hoy 62-5; Cathcart 360; Kinder 236; Mackay 542). The play's topical references also suggest that it endured additional amendments up until 1610, with P.J. Ayres affirming that the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and the 1609 expulsion of Spanish Christians, otherwise known as Moriscos, are both referenced throughout the drama (212-13). In any case, the authors' of this play dramatized contemporary events and, as we will see, repeatedly employ anti-Catholic motifs.

Revenge, pride, betrayal, and unbridled sexual passion all come to mind when relaying the plot of *Lust's Dominion*. John Le Gay Brereton defines the performance as a tragedy of blood, describing how "a stormful atmosphere of treachery and violence" permeates the drama (22). No doubt influenced by George Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (1594), *Lust's Dominion* depicts Eleazar as the foreign and exotic trophy retained by King Philip of Spain after his victory against Barbary some years beforehand. A prisoner of the Spanish court, Eleazar is the son of slain African King Abu Marwan Abd al-Malik I Saadi: the historical figure who ruled as the Sultan of Morocco during the 1570s (5.1.90-93). Dying in 1578, Abu perished in combat amidst of the battle of Alcácer Quibir. Far from the only royal blood spilt on Portuguese soil during this conflict, the Spanish monarch and King of Portugal, Sebastian I, also lost his life during the gruesome mêlée.

The papacy's reaction to news of the Spanish sovereign's death saw a vitriolic response from Rome, but it was Elizabeth rather than a solider that received the blame for the Catholic king's death. Exchanging English cannonballs for Moroccan saltpetre prior to the battle, Elizabeth, the papacy asserted in the Spanish papal nuncio following the battle, "succoured Molucco [Abd-al-Malik] with arms, and [...] with artillery" (Jones 35). These cannonballs, according to a majority of Catholics, "were the very cannon balls with which the forces of the Catholic king [...] had been routed at the Battle of Alcazar" (35). It makes sense then that Prince Philip II in *Lust's Dominion* represents King Philip II of Spain (1527-1598): Protestant England's former co-monarch who intended on performing Catholic revenge upon Queen Elizabeth I in 1588 with the Spanish Armada. The foreign fleet, construed as having been spearheaded by Philip, had, by the late sixteenth century, become so embedded in the collective consciousness of Protestant England that it came, in part, to epitomize Catholicism's intrinsic proclivities for treason against the supposed

providential nation. Mary Hunt has described *Lust's Dominion* as "a story of successful lust", implying that the play's ending, which stages a Spanish body (Prince Philip II) assuming the foreign throne in favour of a moorish one, illustrates triumph. In contrast, it is my contention that a vengeful, bloodthirsty Spanish king, modeled on King Philip II, would have instilled more abjection in a London audience than a throned, mad moor (63). However, it is the experiential nuances of anti-Catholic rhetoric that accompany Eleazar's illegitimate accession, which arise at the beginning of the drama, that are particularly worth investigating as it is these experiences that trigger illness, mental disorder, and spiritual madness within the spurious king.

The Foreign Body in *Lust's Dominion*

Replacing a textual approach with an embodied understanding of the drama's opening scene reveals several experiential motifs recurrent in anti-Catholic diatribes. In Act One Scene One, audiences witness a lone figure: Eleazar, sitting on a chair, apparently at peace with his surroundings. Eleazar's secluded environment, however, does not remain quiet for too much longer. Rushing onstage, the Queen Mother of Spain and two moors "*taking tobacco*" enter Eleazar's private chamber (II.I.I). Court music signals the Queen's entrance and Eleazar suddenly stirs: "On me, do's musick spend this sound on me/ That hate all unity" (1.1.1-2). Aware that it is the Queen Mother who has entered, the Moor looks at her and growls, "There, off: Is't you that deafs me with this noise" (1.1.7). The aging monarch, seemingly oblivious to Eleazar's accusation, asks, "Why is my love's asspect so grim and horrid?/ Look smoothly on me/ Chyme out your softest strains of harmony/ And on delicious musicks silken wings/ Send ravishing delight to my loves ears", before bursting with sexual elation: "Come let's kisse" (1.1.8-14). Eleazar, visibly shaken by the request, orders the Queen to leave him, stating, "I am now sick, heavie, and dull as lead" (1.1.20). Again the Spanish sovereign doesn't understand, this time ignoring Eleazar's sickly state by way of further encroachment: "I'le make thee lighter by taking something from thee" (1.1.21). Refusing to lock lips with her majesty, Eleazar responds with a somewhat unexpected retort, stating,

> Do: take from mee
> This Ague: and these fits that hanging on me
> Shake me in pieces, and set all my blood
> A boiling with the fire of rage: away, away;
> Thou believ'st I jeast:
> And laugh'st, to see my wrath wear antick shapes:
> Be gone. (1.1.22-28)

By this stage, the Queen Mother truly has no idea what Eleazar is telling her, believing the cause of his sickness to be from the court music that signaled her onstage entrance, and thus exclaims, "What means my love?/ Burst all those wyres! Burn all those Instruments!/ For they displease my Moor" (1.1.29-31).

The first sensory motif reminiscent of anti-Catholic discourse in this scene is smell. The two moors that accompany the Queen are puffing tobacco pipes, possibly billowing smoke so profusely that it clouded the stage. In 1602, a booklet containing the bodily effects of smoking tobacco entered the London marketplace. Written by an author who calls himself Philaretes, *Work for Chimny-Sweepers: Or a Warning for Tobacconists* (1602) condemns the use of tobacco for remedial purposes and proposes that its smell engenders sickness. Indeed, the author likens tobacco smoke to hell's smoldering depths before providing readers with eight detailed reasons and expansive

arguments that rail against the use of tobacco. Arriving at the aforesaid conclusions through rigorous investigation, the author proposes he has discovered the influence of tobacco smoke on the body's health. What he finds is that smoke "withereth and drieth up" the "naturall moisture in our bodies, thereby causing sterrilitie and barrenesse". Commenting, "that the first author and finder hereof was the Divell, and the first practisers of the same were the Divells Priests, and therefore not to be used of us Christians", the author associates tobacco smoking with antichristian practices. The final of these reasons relates to disease. Tobacco smoke, the author declares, "is a great augmentor of all sorts of melancholie in our bodies, a humor fit to prepare our bodies to receave the prestigations and hellish illusions and impressions of the Divell himselfe". Writing, "many Phisitions" find melancholy "to be the verie seate of the Divell in bodies possessed", the author aligns tobacco with bodily infirmities and devilish minds (B1^{v}).

Arguing that tobacco smoke heats the blood and causes the body's natural melancholy, which in itself is cold, to shift between states of extreme temperature, the author claims that tobacco smoke alters the body's internal heat. "This hellish smoake", he argues, not only reeks but also "greatly alter[s]" the blood by causing it to boil (D2^{v}). Referring to the smoking of tobacco as a pastime that is both "diabolicall and hellish", the author warns readers that this smoke causes bodily infirmities immediately (E2^{r}). These include the "defect of feeling, sense & understanding, losse of sight, giddinesse of the head and braine" and "to some hastie and untimely death". "All of which", the author claims, "do manifest a poysoned qualitie or venemous nature in the thing received" (E2^{v}).

In the following year, King James argues tobacco smoke causes infection and provokes noticeable effects. Writing on "smoke" and "the fume of an idle braine" in *A Counterblaste to Tobacco* (1604), James establishes a smelly landscape that also warns smokers of the root's corporeal effects (A4^{v}). "Smells", he writes, "of hot and drie qualitie" induce "great forwardnesse" and "mad[ness]" in the body (B3^{v}). "Tobacco", he continues, "hath a certaine certaine venemous facultie joyned with the heate thereof, which makes it have an Antipathie against nature, as by the hatefull smell thereof doeth well appeare" (B3^{v}-B4^{r}). Finding "the Nose" to be "the proper Organ and convoy of the sense of smelling to the braines", James divides odours into two categories: those that are either "healthfull or hurtfull to the braine". Tobacco, which falls into the latter of these classifications, is a "filthie smoake" that with its innate heat ascends to the brains and overheats the mind (B4^{r}). Smoking tobacco, he warns, is a "custom lothsome to the eye, hatefull to the Nose, harmefull to the braine, daungerous to the Lungs, and in the blacke stinking fume thereof, neerest resembling the horrible Stigian smoke of the pit that is bottomelesse" (D2^{r}). Echoing Philaretes's opinion that tobacco belongs to the devil, James argues the weed's "stinking smoake" is "sucked up by the Nose" before pervading the brain's ventricles (B4^{v}).

Tobacco's smell also features in Protestant tales of popish lore. Describing papal anecdotes to his congregation in 1609, Henoch Clapham "repeat[s] a pretty story" recently "acted in the Clink-prison in Southwarke at London, before the stayall of the last great Plague". "A certaine Romish-priest being there to Prison newly committed", he writes, "and not accustomed to bonds, became exceeding pensive, he was advised to take a pipe of *Tobacco*". Putting the pipe to his lips and allowing the smoke to mingle about his nose, the priest, it would appear, began to grow ill. Reasoning, "whether for that the *Tobacco* smoake encreased Melancholy, or guilt of conscience in respect of some treason, or whatsoever the cause might be", Clapham describes how the priest suddenly collapses on the prison floor (L3^{r}). Calling on

tobacco to further images of disease and conscience, Clapham utilizes tobacco's imagery in relation to Catholic traitors. At no point are Protestants described as smoking tobacco, nor are they pictured as entertaining tobacco's smell. Focusing on historical smells and papal odours, the opening scene in *Lust's Dominion* draws the playgoer's attention to smell before staging the effects of hearing corporeally discordant echoes.

Sound and its corporeal significance are vital to reading the drama's opening scene. The source of Eleazar's evident nausea, the Queen Mother is an inharmonious sovereign whose body resembles a dissonant instrument that provokes bodily disease and domestic treason within the moor. Indeed the Queen, wife to a decaying King Philip and mother to a young Prince Philip II, is an adulteress who relentlessly schemes against her country through conspiring to kill her offspring in favour of helping Eleazar illicitly ascend the Spanish throne. Thus, Hoy describes the Catholic monarch as "an extravagantly abandoned woman" because of her forsaken role as queen, wife, and mother (66). Repeatedly labeled by onstage characters as a "strumpet", "harlot", "concubine", "mother of all evill", and the "reeking" leader of a "many headed beast", the Queen Mother evokes titles reminiscent of the pope's ill fragrances and the Whore of Babylon's tainted corporeality (1.1.66-70; 1.1.97; 5.2.29; 1.2.121; 1.1.93). Like the Empress in *The Whore of Babylon*, the Queen Mother is unaware that her body emits discordant melodies that disparage unity, infecting those around her with treasonous behavior. Believing the sounds that occurred during her royal entrance are the source of Eleazar's palpable displeasure, the Queen mother attempts to calm her would-be lover, but Eleazar stresses to her by clarifying, it is "you that deafs me with this noise", but the queen is ignorant to the allegation Eleazar has laid before her (1.1.7). Similar to the Empress in *The Whore of Babylon*, the queen mother creates bodily sounds she is unable to hear herself.

Against this background emerges a pathogenic encounter between a Catholic figure and a foreign body. Smell, sound, the body, and Catholicism are staged in unison at the beginning of *Lust's Dominion*. The Queen Mother represents the Whore of Babylon's infectious sounds, corrupting Eleazar's physiology akin to a disease entering the body. Attempting to kiss the moor on several occasions in the opening scene, the Queen demands that Eleazar ravish her body. Refusing to bed the Queen, Eleazar attempts to exit the stage, declaiming her "ugly as hell" (1.1.66). Although the Queen Mother accuses Eleazar of lying with her in the past, the moor repeatedly denies this throughout the drama (1.1.70-72; 1.2.143). In response, the Queen Mother shrieks Eleazar's name and the moor yells, "Harlot! I'le not hear thee speak" (1.1.97). Showing signs of illness, Eleazar attempts to escape the Queen Mother's voice but the empress remains by the moor's side. "Hear'st me speak", she cries before repeating again, "hear me speak!" (1.1.98-102) It is not until the Queen Mother cries treason, and soldiers enter to arrest and perhaps kill Eleazar that the moor finally offers to kiss the Catholic monarch. The Queen Mother's pathogenic agents proceed to infect Eleazar's physiology at close quarters, and the moor, as I will demonstrate, is now in the grips of a corporeal alteration that will eventually transform him not only into a madman but also a Catholic.

Following the Queen and Eleazar's exchange, a messenger enters to inform the sovereign that the king is on his deathbed and that the Cardinal Mendoza has requested her presence. Leaving Eleazar to attend to her husband, the queen hurries offstage, allowing the moor to enjoy a quiet chamber once again. In comparison to earlier scenes, Eleazar is unable to return to his previous state of noiseless satisfaction. Instead, his body begins to respond to Catholicism's pathogenic agents,

and his physiology initiates a sickly transfiguration unlike any disease he has experienced in the past. "Agues […] shake me in pieces" and "set all my blood a boiling with the fire of rage", Eleazar screams (1.1.22-23). Growing "sick, heavie, and dull as lead", Eleazar slumps in his chair before standing energetically, rising like a papal phoenix from diseased ashes (1.1.20). Facing an imaginary audience, the moor begins to rave of treason. I "Shall blow up the old King, consume his Sons/ And make all *Spain* a bonefire" he spits (1.1.195-196).

If we treat *Lust's Dominion* as exploring anti-Catholic themes at a time when the arts were all too often called to the campaign against Catholicism, then it is clear when we first encounter Eleazar his being is in the process of enduring a Catholic conversion. The queen, or Whore of Babylon, infects him with her dissonant sounds and the moor's body undergoes a physiological reconfiguration before demonstrating popish behavior: "I am now sick, heavie, and dull as lead [...] my blood a boiling with the fire of rage" (1.1.20-23). Evoking a similar sentiment to that of Robert Parker, an English Puritan scholar and clergyman, who in 1607 described "The papist" as a fellow that "must be healed like the Melancholie man" (Hh4^{r}), Eleazar has been unable to block the passages of his senses, consequently triggering "great motions and mutations to the naturall heate" of his body, which in turn produces madness (Lowe F4^{r}).

Further evidence to suggest a bodily transformation is occurring onstage, Francis Bacon discusses the corporeal effects of dissonant sound. Bacon, a well-known scientist and proto-empiricist, in *Sylva Sylvarum* (1626) explains how "Discords [...] are [...] the most odious, in Harmony, to the Sense", and that certain music, specific sounds, and "the Sense of Hearing [...] have most Operation upon Manners" (F2^{r}-F2^{v}). Declaring that hearing "striketh the Spirits more immediately than the other Senses", and "more incorporeally than the *Smelling*, for the Sight, Taste, and Feeling, have their Organs, not of so present and immediate Accesse to the Spirits, as the Hearing hath", Bacon argues that sound produces "manifest Motion" within the body and continues to stir the passions even when the "Object" that is producing sound discontinues creating noise. "It has been anciently held, and observed", he argues,

> *Smelling* (which indeed worketh also immediatly upon the *Spirits*, and is forcible while the Object remaineth) it is with a Communication of the Breath, or Vapour of the *Object Odorate*: But *Harmony* entering easily, and Mingling not at all, and Comming with a manifest Motion; doth by Custome of often Affecting the *Spirits*, and Putting them into one kinde of Posture […] Tunes and Aires, even in their own Nature, have in themselves some Affinity with the Affections; As there be [...] Dolefull Tunes, Solemne Tunes; Tunes inclining Mens minds to Pitty [...] it is no Marvell, if they alter the Spirits; considering that Tunes have a Predisposition to the Motion of the Spirits in themselves [...] Tunes, doth dispose the Spirits to variety of Passions, conforme unto them [...] Musick feedeth that disposition of the Spirits which it findeth [...] severall ires, and Tunes, doe please severall Nations, and Persions, according to the Sympathy they have with their Spirits. (F2^{v})

Concluding that the "*Sense of Hearing*" and particular "*Kinds of Musick*, have most operation upon *Manners*", Bacon finds that drum sounds provoke warlike feelings while string instruments abate such responses. Rousing the spirits, sound is capable of causing austerity or instigating ire. In both cases, "*Tunes*, doth dispose the *Spirits* to variety of Passions [and] conforme unto them [...] generally, *Musick* feedeth that

disposition of the Spirits which it findeth" (F2^{v}). Perhaps, then, the staging of a foreign body in lieu of a white or Catholic figure contains thematic potencies that modern readers, unlike an early modern audience, may miss at first glance.

Eleazar's physiology in *Lust's Dominion's* determines his ability to undergo a corporeal transformation that in turn will convert his body into that of a Catholic. "Ethiopes", explains Johannes Boemus in *The Fardle of Facions* (1555), derives from "the Greek words *aythoo* and *ops*, whereof the former signifieth to broil, or to burn up with heat" (C2^{r}). Arguing that the air of a "mans native soyle" is the most conducive to health, Boemus states "everymans naturall place preserveth him, which is placed in it" (B1^{v}). Hearing villainous sounds on foreign soil thus triggers Eleazar's dormant essence, maddening the moor whose nature confines him to experience emotions he has no control over: "how should a man choose but be cholerick and angry, that hath his body so clogged with abundance of grosse humors?" (Burton O8^{r}). The queen's voice, which embodies Bacon's belief that certain sounds signify diverse "diseases" and "infections" that enter via the ears, working "chiefly in the Spirits", causes a bodily alteration most likely to stir Eleazar's supposed inherencies (L1^{v}). In reaction to hearing pathogenic sounds, Eleazar's body generates an overabundance of boiling blood, inducing a corporeal psychosis and opening the floodgates to bedeviled emotion.

Madness in Early Modern Culture

Madness was a popular topic in English communities throughout the seventeenth century. As historians such as Simon Cross and Roy Porter have shown, London's Bethlem Hospital was a legendary institution in early modern England. Similarly, Natsu Hattori and Rafael V. Núñez have examined literary sounds that accompany descriptions of the renowned institution. While Hattori has observed how the word Bedlam in the English vernacular was interchangeable with unruly sounds and babbling or mad utterances, Núñez has written on how "melancholic sounds" appear "somehow related to music in the Elizabethan and Jacobean drama" (Núñez 219). However, as Angus Gowland notes, madness is yet to be discussed in relation to the period's religious climate (78-80). While early modern medicine is a field that has long been explored by cultural theorists, literary scholars, and medical historians, there is little discussion on the nexus between conceptions of spiritual madness and corporeal madness. More specifically, the notion that one's religious belief could induce psychosis has not been directly related to contemporary perceptions of infectious infiltrators represented through miasmic air and discordant sound. Hence, before examining how Protestant polemicists throughout this period stress that madness and religion operate in a symbiotic framework, I will first unpack two sickly statements that Eleazar bellows during the drama. The first occurs when he encounters the Queen Mother—"agues [...] set my blood a boiling"—while the second occurs in the drama's final act—"see my veins/ Stuck't out, being over heated with my blood/ Boyling" (1.1.22-23; 5.2.112-114).

Eleazar's admissions of heated blood and agues are descriptions commonly found in medical tracts on frenzy, madness, and melancholy. Between 1600 and 1621 several treatises detailing the causes and effects of the aforesaid diseases appeared in England. Explaining the causes of frenzy in chapter fifteen of *The Method of Phisick* (1601), Philip Barrough believed "*Phrenetis*" is "a disease wherein the mind is hurt". Drawing on Galen, the author describes, "frenesie" as "an inflammation of the braine or of the filmes" that causes "raging and vexation of the mind" because of an

"abundance of bloud, or of choler, occupying the braine or the filmes" (C3^{r}). If "the choler whereof the disease engendreth be burnt", he continues, frenzy ensues (C3^{r}-C3^{v}). Considering "frenzy" is "cause[ed] of bloud", the writer describes the disease as a "most sharpe & most perillous" malady that "is indeed uncurable & deadly for the most part" (C3^{v}). In chapter twenty-seven, the author goes on to describe madness. Otherwise known as "*mania*", Barrough identifies the bodily effects of "*Insania* and *furor*". Explaining the warning signs of madness as "a debility of the head", the physician explains, "if time proceed" then the victim will discover "a readines to bodily lust". These individuals, he claims, "are the worst to cure" (D6^{v}).

In the years following Barrough's observation, Philemon Holland translated Plutarch's *The Morals* (1603) that describes at large the corporeal signs of one who is suffering from the aforementioned diseases. "Phrensie", Plutarch writes, are "burning agues" and "augment their heat so much, that they bring a man to the losse of his right wits, and so trouble the senses". Suggesting madness is an internal irritation that resides in occult areas of the body the author writes, psychosis "*stirre*[s] *the strings at secret root of hart, Which touched should not be, but lie apart*" (Dd1^{r}). Conveying to the reader that madness is a cognitive disorder, Holland ends his discussion by simply stating, "phrensie [...] is an inflammation or impostume bred in the braines" (Dd1^{v}).

Outlining the bodily changes heralded by corporeal madness, Christopher Wirsung and Robert Burton document the phsyiological effects of frenzy. "Franticknesse, madnesse, or doting, and such like infirmities", Wirsung claims, "springeth out of hot humours, and chiefly of *Cholera*, which inflameth the braine too much" (H6^{v}). Writing on the two kinds of "*Phrenitis*", Wirsung finds madness to be "caused of bloud" or "of *cholera*: out of both which, the third kind which is *Melancholia*, as a mixture doth sprout and spring" (H7^{r}-H7^{v}). Regardless, these diseases result in "a distemperature of the understanding, which altereth the right and reasonable thoughts" (I1^{v}). For these victims, the author writes, "the hearing of musicke and all mirth" eases the humors and cools the mind (I2^{r}). Moving on to descriptions of "agues in generall", Wirsung calls these "*Pyretos,* that is, firie" and "seething or boyling, and in our vulgar tongue we name this sicknesse the Ague, that is, a superfluous, hurtfull, and unhaile heate, that sometimes often, and sometimes more vehement than before commeth againe, and returneth" (Qq7^{v}). Recalling Eleazar's innate propensity to warmth because of his moorish blood, Wirsung describes "pestilent agues" as "according to the humour into which the bloud is altered, qualified, and do also give a certaine signe of their nature". The result of infection, Wirsung describes "venimous ayre" and "conversation with sicke men, or those that be diseased" as pathogens that enter through the nose and ears, "whereby the pores are opened, that thereby all noysome vapors might exhalate". "For when as they are shut up", he continues, "then must all such infectious humors remaine in the bodie, whence divers perillous agues are caused" (Rr1^{r}).

Describing the voluminous kinds of fevers, Wirsung defines the conditions of madness for readers. While most agues do not remain for longer than twenty-four hours, Wirsung does describe "*continua*" diseases that do not leave the body once they have entered. These agues, he writes, derive from "putrifaction" and "venimous ayre; as in the time of pestilence". "The common signes of this mightie ague", he continues, "are paine of the head and great heate (easily to be felt)" (Rr2^{v}). Identifying "*synochus*" as a second incurable ague, the author writes, this disease evokes "putrified and noysome bloud in the veines" (Rr8^{v}). Eleazar's observation—"see my veins stuck't out, being over heated with my blood"—recalls Wirsung's evaluation of a sick body.

Likewise, Robert Burton in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) cautions English citizens by announcing, "diverse diseases of the body and mind proceed from their influences" (Q2^{v}). Offering little hope to Londoners suffering from a troubled mind, Burton offers warnings akin to Barrough's statement that madness "is indeed uncurable" (C3^{v}), asserting that madmen "are the worst to cure" (D6^{v}). Vehement emotion, captured in "anger" writes Burton, "causes grievous diseases in the Body, so bodily diseases affect the Soule by consent" (O8^{r}). Comparing madmen to musical instruments the author writes, "the chiefest causes" of this disease "proceed from the [...] spirits: as they are purer, or impurer, so is the Mind, and equally suffers, as *a lute out of tune*, if one string, or one organ be distempered, all the rest *miscary*" (O8^{r}). Likening mad bodies with musical apparatuses, Burton affirms that once a madman's "head is heated" the body's temperature "scorcheth the blood, and from thence proceed melancholy fumes which trouble the mind" (R1^{r}). It is this continual mediation of heat, he argues, that "fetch up the spirits into thy braine & with the heat brought with them, they incend the brain beyond measure, and the cells of the inner senses, dissolving their temperature [...] they cannot perform their offices as they ought" (R1^{r}-R5^{r}). Explaining how "spirits and humors doe most harme in troubling the Soule", the author writes, "thence comes then this malady, madnesse" (O8^{r}). "If the *Braine* be hote", he argues, "the animall spirits will be hote, and thence comes *madnesse*" (P2^{r}). For Burton, the causes of agues are "bad aire" (P4^{r}). As I explored in chapters four and five, bad air can be both a smell and sound—it can be the stench of plague or the sound of treasonous intentions. Correspondingly, sounds and smells of this disposition are the most common experiential motifs in anti-Catholic discourse. Experiencing Catholic bodies' pathogenic agents, Eleazar's corporeality is transformed into that of papal madman.

In late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England, Protestant preachers classify Catholics in the ranks of madmen, associating insanity with the papacy. In the 1570s, Thomas Naogeorg describes Catholics with "shaven crownes", "mourning gownes", and "bedlem jesture mad", while John Fielde in the following decade combines the medical effects of madness with religious discussion on Catholics (Naogeorg I4^{r}). Scoffing at Catholics who label him "a brainsick fellow" and "mad", Fielde maintains that papal bodies personify a "popish heate" and "Antichristian corruption" (A8^{v}). Similarly, Hugh Broughton in *The First Part of the Resolution of Religion* (1603) labels irreligious figures as "mad, or franticke with passions, and beastly pleasures" (A2^{r}). In the same year, Samuel Harsnett preaches, "these are the times, wherein we are sicke, and mad" (Y3^{v}). Thomas Adams in *Mysticall Bedlam* (1615), on the other hand, refers to "a double *madnesse*". Dividing this malady into an ailment that is either "*corporall*" or "*spirituall*", Adams argues, "the object of the former is *Reason*: of the latter, *Religion*". Both, however, "obsesseth the *braine*" and "the *Heart*" and one requires "the helpe of [a] naturall Phyisitian" while the other demands "the *Mysticall"*. Quoting contemporary physicians who separate "betwixt *Phrenzy* and *Madnesse*", the preacher figures corporeal and spiritual madness as proceeding from "an infection and perturbation of the formost *Cell* of the *head*; whereby *Imagination* is hurt" (F1^{v}). Adding, "if the *Romanists* were not *mad-men*, or worse", Adams argues Catholics "would never set up ignorance as a Lampe to light men to heaven: assuring it for the damme to produce, and nurse with her cherishing milke to batten *devotion*". This spiritual milk, he believes, "is indeede an originall cause of *madnesse*". Labeling Catholics the worst of these spiritual madmen, the preacher scoffs, "let the *Roman Canonists* turne their *Pope* into a new nature; which is neyther God nor man: they are *madde*" (I2^{v}). "The *Papists*", he writes, "are certainely *mad-men*, dangerous *mad-*

men; *madde* in themselves, dangerous to us: and would happily be confined to some locall *Bedlam*, lest their *spirituall lunacy* doe us some hurt" ($K3^{r}$). "Mad-men", or "Papists" he concludes, "are ready instruments of commotions, perversion, treason. These are a sicknes […] our land cannot be at ease, so long as these lye on her stomacke". Catholics, he declares, "rore their Musicke and poyson [...] their Phisicke" ($K3^{v}$). Noting how papal bodies enjoy musical objects rendered discordant, Adams implies that these sounds resemble unpleasant dins. Indeed, Catholic characters throughout *Lust's Dominion* personify dissonant noises.

Catholicising the Foreign Body in *Lust's Dominion*

Presenting audiences with noisy Catholic characters, the playwrights of *Lust's Dominion* stage inharmonious bodies whose sounds speak to cultural imagining of spiritual, corporeal, and musical dissonance. At the beginning of the drama, the Queen Mother's voice warbles with jarring reverberations and overwhelms Eleazar's physiology, inducing a corporeal madness that will eventually transform him into a Catholic. Act One Scene One ends with Eleazar postulating treasonous plots and describing his boiling blood. Based on this, conversion is in its nascent stages, and thus one would expect Eleazar to embody Protestant images prevalent in anti-Catholic discourse by the end of the drama. Before exploring this further, I will discuss the theatrical conventions by which the playwrights emphasize Catholic sounds. In doing so, the authors of *Lust's Dominion* unequivocally establish the drama as an anti-papal text.

Following her onstage encounter with Eleazar in Act One Scene One, the Queen Mother noisily re-enters the stage, entering the royal chambers where her dying husband awaits. In a display of insincere grief, the monarch wails during her entrance, "Whose was that Screech-Owls voice, that like the sound/ Of a hell-tortur'd soul rung through mine ears/ Nothing but horrid shreiks, nothing but death" (1.2.1-3). In a show of faux emotion, the sovereign prognosticates her husband's imminent death. "All cry'd", she howls, "the Majestie of *Spain* is dead/ That last word (dead) struck through the echoing air/ Rebounded on my heart, and smote me down" (1.2.8-10). Echoing Thomas Dekker's description of the streets of London following Elizabeth's death: "No Scritch-Owle frighted the silly Countryman at midnight, nor any Drums the Citizen at noone-day, but all was more calme than a still water, all husht", the Queen Mother's voice, in contrast, pierces the air ($B1^{v}$). Early modern writers, as Brett Hirsch has noted, incorporated descriptions of screech owls because of their tuneful associations. As Hirsch argues, an owl's screech envelopes three of Shakespeare's plays, and in each instance the sound stems from lust (141).

Owls' sounds pervade preachers' sermons and political writers' civil tracts, representing Catholicism's auditory signifiers. Referring to an "uncleane cage of papists", John Fielde describes Catholics, "or obscure owles", who have "skriched oute in her Majesties eares, such notable untrueths and wicked assertions". These untruths, it would appear, were the "greevous persecutions" of "Catholiques" ($A4^{r}$). Recounting how a particularly noisy Catholic "singeth or rather whoopeth in the ears of our gratious Nightingale", Fielde condemns the sounds of Catholics whilst affirming a Protestant sovereign's harmonious notes ($B8^{r}$). "This howling owle", the author jeers, "scritcheth in her majesties eares, of the hard handling of Catholikes" ($C3^{r}$). Declaring that treasonous plots leveled at Queen Elizabeth represent discordant sounds, the author describes how papal machinations have "sprong from the unquiet and hammering heads of faythlesse and trayterous Papists" ($B8^{v}$). Emphasizing papal

sounds, Fielde offers vivid descriptions that resonate with readers: "O how they yelpe, screech, yell, crow, and whoope" (F5^{r}). Echoing these descriptions in 1603 and again in 1606, Thomas Dekker in *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603) discusses how "Toads croaking, Screech-Owles howling, and Mandrakes shriking" are signs that death is imminent (C3^{v}). In *The Double PP* (1606), the writer describes the "Papist Umbreant, or the *Moldwarp*" who "like a Skreech-owle, sits all day unseen: but when the sorcerous night Spreds her deepe Spells, hee conjures up his wits, Giving his soule to Treason" (D2^{r}). In addition to owls' association with treason and Catholicism, George Abbot argues, "popery was established by fragments" before relaying to his congregation a popish tale (Z6^{r}). "Rome in a Councell", he explains, "a little before gathered by John the 24 an Owle appeared looking directly upon the Pope, to the amasement of some, to the great scorne of others" (Z5^{r}). Likewise, John Rhodes aligns Catholic treason with owlish sounds, arguing, "the Romish Church doe hatch such Birds" who "walke by Owle-light" (D3^{r}). To "walk by owl light" implies to live by religious ignorance, subjecting oneself to spiritual lunacy and "madnesse in the braine" (A4^{v}). In 1610, Francis Herring reflects on how Catholics are "warbling Birds" (C2^{r}). Representing treasonous allusions, dissonant sounds, and spiritual madness, the Queen Mother is the only character in *Lust's Dominion* to speak of screech owls, embodying their sound whilst projecting anti-Catholic tones.

Refusing to cease her incessant wailing and theatrical lamentations, the Queen Mother continues to sob at the foot of her husband's bed, producing jarring sounds in a succession of cacophonous movements (1.2.78-80). "Let none with a distracted voice/ Shriek out, and trouble me in my departure", utters the dying sovereign on his deathbed (1.2.73-74). Raising his hands in weakened trepidation he utters, "Heavens hands I see are beckoning for my soul/ I come, I come; thus do the proudest die/ Death hath no mercy, life no certainty" (1.2.75-77). Recognizing that the decaying monarch has asked for silence during his rapid decline a cardinal warns those surrounding the bed, "As yet his soul's not from his temple gone/ Therefore forbear loud lamentation" (1.2.78-80). Abandoning such requests the Queen screeches, "Oh he is dead, hee's dead! Lament and die/ In her King's end begins *Spains* misery" (1.2.80-81). The stage directions then indicate that the king dies following the Queen's shrieks (1.2.82). Readers can presume then that the sovereign not only exits this world amidst tumultuous action but also experiences the queen's incessant squawks, suffering jarring noise in his final moments on earth. Finding herself unable to remain silent, the Queen Mother pervades an expiring body's last mortal moments with dissonant sounds and owlish screams (1.2.78-80). Revealingly, the king does not demand cessation of those with a loud voice. Instead, he requires "none with a distracted voice shriek out".

Distraction, a relatively new adjective in the early modern vernacular, exclusively denotes madness. In the moments following his father's death, Prince Philip II enters the stage and stares at his mother. "Why stand you thus distracted, he queries (1.1.97). "Sweet sonne", she replies, but the prince cuts her off (1.1.105). "Sweet mother: oh", he bellows, "How I now do shame/ To lay on one so foul so fair a name/ Had you been a true mother, a true wife/ This King had not so soon been robb'd of life" (1.2.105-108). Appearing dazed, the Queen Mother exclaims, "What means this rage, my sonne" (1.2.109). "Call me not your sonne", he retorts, "My father whilst he liv'd tyr'd his strong armes/ In bearing christian armour [...] spent his brains in warlike stratagems/ To bring Confusion on damn'd Infidels/ Whil'st you at home suffered his bed-chamber/ To be a Brothelry" (1.2.110-118). The prince then turns to Eleazar, charging the troubled moor: "Thou hel-begotten fiend at thee I stare"

(1.2.124). In reality, Eleazar is not to blame for any of Spain's troubles: he has served the nation faithfully, obeying his captors with willing servitude. Nevertheless, Philip accuses the moor of Spain's decline, associating Eleazar's skin colour with sin.

On a superficial level, Eleazar is the drama's principal villain. His appearance distinguishes him from the Spanish court, rendering him foreign in both a racial and religious sense, and so he is the play's outwardly villainous other. As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, scholars tend to agree with this view, arguing that the drama focuses on the exploits of a dark-skinned felon. After charging the moor with the aforementioned blast, Prince Philip looks to a cardinal for agreement. Recently appointed lord protector of the realm until Prince Philip's older brother assumes the throne, the Cardinal Mendoza proceeds to strip Eleazar of the financial royalties he maintained under the King Philip. Defending her erotic trophy, the Queen Mother asks, "For what cause" do you perform this order? "His treasons need no tryal", the Cardinal Mendoza responds whilst staring at Eleazar's skin, "they're too plain" (1.2.155-156). Virginia Vaughan argues, "lasciviousness spreads from Eleazar to permeate the court of Spain (in the person of the Queen Mother) [...] as well as the Church" (53-54). In contrast, I believe the drama shows the opposite, and although Eleazar thinks he has been successful in his plight to block out the queen's infectious sounds: "how often have I stopt/ Thy unchaste songs from passing through mine ears?/ How oft, when thy luxurious arms have twin'd/ About my jetty neck, have I cry'd out/ Away, those scalding veins burn me, 'tis true" (5.1.179-182), he is tragically unaware that he already is diseased.

Heralded by the queen's sounds and foreshadowed by infectious smells, Eleazar's physiological change produces a rage within the moor that transforms his corporeality into that of a Catholic. While Jacques Lezra claims, "England imagines its dissident communities", including Catholics, "in Spanish dress", I contend that Protestant polemicists during this period figure Catholicism as the source of everything from bad smells and infection to political treason and disease (121). Accordingly, *Lust's Dominion* stresses its Spanish characters' Catholicism, and I agree with A. Gordon Kinder's argument that Spain during this time was "one of the main pillars of papal edifice" in continental Europe (227). In this setting, Eleazar's catholicisation binds him to act erratically until his eventual demise.

Further evidence to suggest this is occurring can be found through the dramatic conventions by which the playwrights utilize putrid smells and discordant sounds. Employing two friars to spread libels throughout Spain, Eleazar comments on how the clergyman, "Hath scattered this infection, on the hearts/ Of credulous Spaniards" (2.3.76-77). Talking to a group of "*Stinkards*", the friars mingle in the Spanish marketplace, scattering infectious rumors regarding Philip II in order for Eleazar to assume the Spanish throne (2.3.3). The men and women in the marketplace listen closely, muttering how the friars are "all fire, and […] be kindled once—hot Catholick[s]" (3.3.38). Standing on a platform, the friars begin to yell their libels in Latin. In response, the Spanish crowd states they feel "quezy" (3.3.47). After listening to the friars for a few moments, a listener whispers to a friend, "look how he glows" (3.3.62).

Epitomizing an intersection between Catholic physiology and medical madness, Act Three Scene Three recalls the opinions of early modern physicians and preachers. Brimming with heated blood, the friars infect listeners with their contagious sounds and putrid smells. Commenting on how Spaniards are a "heap of fools, who crowding in huge swarms/ Stood at our Court gates like a heap of dung/ Reeking and shouting out contagious breath", Eleazar believes he is purging the

kingdom of its spiritual toxins: "I have perfum'd the rankness" of Spain's "breath" (3.4.25-27). Additionally, when audiences first encounter Eleazar he loathes dissonance. Testament to his hate of inharmonious music, he wails that the queen is engendering discordant sounds. In contrast, by the end of the play we find Eleazar performing lines akin to Dekker's story, found in *The Wonderfull Yeare* (1603), of "a drunk", or "the tinker", who plays with a dead, plague-ridden body on the streets of London, "tossing the dead body too and fro [...] thinking him a fine instrument to be plaid upon" ($F2^{v}$). Such menacing imagery becomes a feature of the language at the end of the drama: "to thee I'le sing/ Upon an harp made of dead Spanish bones/ The proudest instrument the world affords [...] limbs black as mine, in springs of blood/ Still gushing from the Conduit-head of *Spain*" (5.3.49-54). Bellowed by none other than Eleazar, "the mad moor", he then spits the following orders to his servants, Zarack and Baltazar:

> A consort, that amain, play that amain.
> Amain, amain. No; so soon fallen asleep,
> Nay I'le not loose this musick, sirrah! Sirrah!
> Take thou a drum, a Trumpet thou, and Hark;
> Mad them with villanous sounds (5.2.82-86)

These directions, which are intended for prisoners of Eleazar's court, are met with what one may suppose as being quizzical expressions from the soldiers, with Zarack muttering to Baltazar "rare sport, let's go" (5.2.87). Left alone for a moment, Eleazar drones ominously, "Musick will doe well in woe" (5.2.88). Gone for only a few seconds Zarack re-enters the stage, but Eleazar, seeming to have forgotten his previous instructions, cries, "Where's *Baltazar*?" (5.2.108) Reminding readers once again of Parker's warning that the "popishly minded", with their "popish humor" and "popish passions", usurp their soul, and in doing so forget themselves, Eleazar demonstration of forgetfulness is the result of a religious contagion ($R4^{r}$-$R4^{v}$).

Reverberating the opinion of Protestant polemicists these lines relate to early modern conceptions of medicine and the body. In Barrough's chapter on "Frensie", the author enlightens readers to the signs of a distracted globe explaining that brainsick men "erre in sense and cogitation [...] and therwith also loose their memorie" and "forget all things that they do or say" ($Ciij^{r}$-$Ciij^{v}$). Zarack, appearing to be unaware of these contemporary medical opinions, replies curiously to his master's seemingly obvious question by muttering, Baltazar is "A drumming" (5.2.109). Reminding the now mad figure of his previous demand, Eleazar begins yet another ecstatic rant:

> I have made them rave, and curse, and so: guard her:
> Your Court shall be this prison, guard her, slaves,
> With open eyes; defie me? See my veins,
> Stuck't out, being over heated with my blood,
> Boyling in wrath. (5.2.110-114)

The idea of war-like drumming, dissonance, and vile noise sets Eleazar off. The now Catholic moor is no longer able to conceal his impassioned love for discord enveloped in psychosis. Embodying the papal qualities of his Spanish counterparts, Eleazar has become the play's metaphorical mirror, reflecting the popish virtues of the play's characters.

Indeed, Prince Philip II is the only other character in the drama that matches Eleazar's maddened thirst for blood and jarring sounds. Plotting to usurp the recently crowned Eleazar in Act Four Scene Two, Prince Phillip II rallies the exiled Spanish army. Foaming at the mouth and stomping around the stage in a display of frenzy,

Phillip screams and bellows of how he is the legitimate king of Spain, demanding the soldiers murder Eleazar regardless of the cost (4.2.1-3). Accusing the prince of exhibiting insanity, a cardinal pleads with Philip to abandon his strategies in the hope that it will result in soldiers not losing their lives unnecessarily on the battlefield. Refusing to comply with the cardinal's request Philip demands blood is spilt upon the earth even if it comes at his army's expense. "You lose your witts", the clergyman screams, "You're mad" (4.2.4). Warning his captains, "I'le beat the dog to death, that sounds retreat […] I'le tear his heart out, that dares name but *Sound",* Philip hears one solder signal a retreat (4.2.40-42). "Who's that", Philip bellows, "you tempt my sword Sir/ Continue this alarum, fight pell mell!/ Fight, kill, be damn'd […] Sounds a retreat! Zounds, you mad me" (4.2.44-48). In addition to calling for drums, the clanging of steel against steel and other discordant sounds, Philip is the only other character besides Eleazar charged with madness. The Spanish character eventually defeats Eleazar, murdering the moor in jubilant exhilaration. In an act of irony, it is Philip who commits treason: killing the crowned Eleazar in the name of political accession and religious supremacy. Even though Eleazar is a spurious king he is nevertheless a legitimate monarch according to early modern law. "In all your sights", King Philipp II states, "I thus do plant myself Lord Cardinal" (5.3.172). Assuming Spain's throne, King Phillip II begins his rule by proclaiming his religious superiority and declaring his Catholic sovereignty.

Eleazar's role in *Lust's Dominion* is to be villainous, but he is not inherently iniquitous. Rather, he reflects the innate qualities that define Catholic characters throughout the drama. These characters exhibit treason, disease, lust, and madness. At the beginning of the drama, the audience witness Eleazar's unwilling conversion to Catholicism. Opening against a sensory landscape of infectious smells and discordant sounds, the drama stages a foreign body pervaded by pathogenic agents and religious contagion. Throughout the drama, Eleazar endures a biological conversion: corporeal madness and spiritual psychosis. By his own admission, he then suffers from inward pollutants that corrupt him emotionally, physically, and religiously. Hearing popish sounds and smelling papal bodies, Eleazar's physical and spiritual body undergoes a Catholic conversion: he resembles the mad King Philip II; the immoral Cardinal Mendoza obsessed with political power, and the corporeally discordant Queen Mother. These are qualities that define the papacy for Protestant writers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Acting as a mirror for his onstage rivals, Eleazar reflects the diseased qualities and evil actions of his Catholic counterparts.

As I noted at the beginning of this chapter, scholars are yet to consider *Lust's Dominion* an anti-papal text. The drama embodies contemporary themes called on by Protestant writers who envision the body as the locale by which Catholicism enters, attacks, and converts. "Black faces may have hearts as white as snow", Eleazar reflects, but "the whitest faces have the blackest souls" (5.3.9-11). This line establishes the moor's foreignness whilst commenting on how opposing figures personify evil qualities that cannot be seen. A prisoner of the Spanish court and a victim of Catholic conversion, Eleazar is the fetishized prize of King Philip I, a plague victim of the Queen Mother, and the black fiend whom Philipp II slays. Representing a sickly mirror that reflects the papal traits of his onstage rivals—chiefly a love of discordant music and desire to infect vulnerable bodies—Eleazar's conversion functions to reveal the polemic depths of Protestant writers that view Catholicism in conjunction with notions of pathogenic sound and papal disease.

Chapter 8

"Mark Me": Anti-Catholic Reverberations and Auditory Consciousness in *Hamlet* (c. 1600)

"By experience", records Thomas Wright in 1601, "the passions of the minde are effected". For Wright, "the facultie of seeing, the power of hearing" and "the sense of smelling" stir the mind and affect the heart in extraordinary ways (D1^{r}). The eyes, ears, and nose are the body's empirical gateways to the world's objects. These objects range from the sound of Protestant preachers warning congregations of Catholic foes to the smell of dead bodies in plague time. In the playhouse, however, sight, smell, and sound coalesce to present playgoers with embodied sites of cultural significance wrought by historical events. For early modern Londoners, these moments shaped how they understood their environment and, as a result, would act in response to them. As I explored in previous chapters, understanding the early modern body's connection to anti-Catholic literature requires taking into consideration the experiential dimensions of discourse. From discussions on sound, smell, and sight to staging characters that personify all the hallmarks of anti-Catholicism, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (c. 1600) exemplifies contemporary beliefs surrounding how sensory experience is connected to being, representing how the body's participation in the verity of the world's objects either destroys or resolves the interplay between the body and its visual, olfactory, and auditory settings.

The most potent of these pragmatic exchanges can be seen in the encounter with the ghost of Hamlet's father in the play's opening scenes—an interaction between faith, violence, and corporeality. Moreover, Hamlet's encounter with the ghost embodies Protestant attacks against Catholicism, the bloodshed that results from belief, and the role of sound in fashioning the experience of both phenomena. Staging the effects of an affective rhetoric, Shakespeare's play seemingly participates about contemporary medical and religious concerns on diseased Catholics, pathogenic sounds, and infectious smells whilst reducing said concerns to a rational experience beyond anti-Catholicism's bellicose rhetoric. Analyzing Shakespeare's use of sound in relation to the body, I will argue for two things in this chapter. The first involves historicizing the function of sound. The second claims that phenomenologically rendering *Hamlet's* ghost allows for a more nuanced understanding of a notion I call auditory consciousness, maintaining the idea that *esse* is *audire*. Approaching the celestial being from this perspective, I argue, abandons one's experience with *Hamlet* for Hamlet's experience itself, allowing for a better understanding surrounding the dramatic perception of cultural happenings. In this setting, Shakespeare modifies anti-papal rhetoric by incorporating burgeoning scientific conceptions that reveal the consequences of hearing *anti*-Catholicism's sounds in lieu of hearing Catholicism's sounds.

Hamlet's ghost, to say the least, has afforded its fair share of head scratching from scholars over the years, and it would seem this spectral character first became a topic of intense investigation at the turn of the twentieth century. In 1917, Walter Wilson Greg said with feasible exasperation, "I should like an authoritative statement of what Shakespeare thought about ghosts" (26). Five years later, Maurice Baudin argued, "the ghost has a greater role than is generally conceded" (185). By 1929, critics had discussed at length the ghost's variegated meanings, and so John Rea's article—"Hamlet and the Ghost Again"—captures his feelings about contemporary

scholarship. "Too much has already been written", he contends, "upon all the problems connected with *Hamlet*" (207). In spite of Rea's objections, scholarship on *Hamlet* proceeded to increase between the 1940s and 1960s. Approaching the ghost from various pneumatological angles, critics argued that the celestial presence was a blatant allusion to Christian polemic surrounding the validity of specters. This lead to claims that the phantasm was, "a Catholic ghost, a paganesque ghost" or "a devil" (West 1110).

Other critics argued that Shakespeare mixed cultural themes owing to the Catholic past and Protestant present, but often concluded that the ghost was irrevocably Catholic in nature (Hankins 695; Battenhouse 161; Joseph 494). Between the 1960s and 1990s, however, scholars began to view the ghost as a phenomenon that challenged early modern and modern audiences alike (Mason 129; Kikuchi 103), arguing that it confronted "being and acting" (Knowles 1063).

In short, most scholarship on *Hamlet's* ghost tends to approach the celestial form through Shakespeare instead of the period, and Shakespearean critics have long recognized the theological, psychological, and metaphysical impact of the character on both audiences and onstage characters. David Hillman notes how the ethereal being "has long posed a difficulty for commentators" while Thornton Graves refers to it as "a perplexing and unusual phantom" whose origin remains dubious to all throughout the performance (95; 140). For Derrida, the ghost is a markedly Shakespearean creation that loiters between differing spheres of measurable expression and idealization, manifestation and evaporation (Prendergast 45). Joseph Natoli likewise argues that Shakespearean scholars often label the apparition, "para-normal, a-causal, non-empirical, and non-rational" (93).

While most opinion surrounding the enigmatic apparition tends to polarize critics to assume a religious stance regarding Shakespeare's supposedly Protestant or Catholic motivation behind his ambiguous construction, it has also yielded phenomenological investigations that detail the stimuli behind early modern cognition. Arguing that the ghost is a puzzle for Horatio and yet a distinct being for Hamlet, Natoli reflects on the effect the ghost's words have on the prince of Denmark (94). Similarly, Bruce Johnson believes that the ghost's voice represents an "aural intersection of stagecraft and epistemology" in the drama while Laury Magnus stresses that it is Hamlet alone who converses with the ghost (260; 84). Bruce R. Smith, on the other hand, asks readers to "hear green" in *Hamlet*, arguing scholars "reconstruct bodily experience in the past on historically informed terms" (*Hearing Green* 6). Although the aforesaid scholars remark that such encounters mean something, there is yet to be a scholarly examination that analyzes the phenomenological nature of Hamlet's physiological encounter with the celestial being in its early modern setting.

Ranging from arguments that *Hamlet* stages universal truths to discussion that explore the drama's historical motifs, critiques of Shakespeare's perhaps most mystifying and yet perceptively resonant tragedies are far-reaching to say the least. Michael Payne, for example, asks readers, "what's the matter with Hamlet?" (100). Rather than supposing there are definitive answers to such an obscure question, the discussion at hand investigates a simple, and yet often ignored, fact: Hamlet (alongside playgoers) alone experiences the ghost's experiential totality. Although several characters see the ghost throughout the drama, I argue that understanding the function of sound in its immediate phenomenological setting (particularly using Francis Bacon's studies on sound) results in the aforesaid assertion. Understanding the play's erring spirit, then, means to render the apparition as a purely

phenomenological, or experiential, presence through privileging sound and hearing. In order to achieve this, I will first approach experience from an early modern perspective before offering modern inferences concerning the nature of aural evidence in relation to wider theories of perception and the conscious mind.

Experience and Consciousness in Early Modern Culture

In early modern culture, experience involves an understanding of religion, medicine, and nature, and relies on the body's engagement with constitutional knowledge and the meaning attributed to that knowledge. In this context, consciousness refers to one's conviction or belief in a thing or one's awareness of a thing. Experience is the catalyst to a sense of being, and it is this sense of consciousness that first arose in Edwin Sandys's book *A Relation of the State of Religion* (1605). An intensely political work that investigates the nature of Catholicism this publication was the result of Sandys's travels with Archbishop Thomas Cranmer throughout papal countries between 1596 and 1599. Dedicated to Archbishop John Whitgift, the pamphlet describes the varying faiths the two men had experienced in their travels abroad. Far from presenting readers with a monstrous vision of Catholics, the work offers a relatively tolerant view of papal bodies. This is not to suggest, however, that the work promotes the Catholic religion. Regarding consciousness, Sandys calls on the word with reference to "the true and serious worshipping of God", and it is the corporeal experience of the Holy Spirit that induces "a certain consciousness of [man's] own worthlessness" ($L1^{v}$-$L2^{r}$). Immediately following this line, the author discusses "those meanes which are used by the Papacie, for excluding of all accesse and sound of Religion" ($L2^{r}$). Associating consciousness with conviction and religious experience before examining the shortcomings of the papal religion, Sandys situates consciousness within the framework of Protestant polemics against the Catholic Church and reignites discussion on one's conscience.

The term conscience, on the other hand, solely conveys a sense of morality or English faith. Explaining that the best "preparatives" and "spirituall weapons" for Christian men is "a good conscience", Johann von Ewich associates Protestant conviction with morality ($B2^{v}$). Meanwhile, the physician Roger Fenton describes how "conscience doe accuse us, and our sinnes doe witnesse, that we are of offendors who have kindled this wrath of God against us" ($B10^{v}$). Shifting from cultural conceptions as to the cause of London's pestilence to spiritual diseases and eschatology, Arthur Dent argues, "sanctified hearts and consciences" are "odours" that "smell sweete in the nosthrils of God" ($H4^{r}$). In this paradigm, Catholic bodies emit foul smells due to their conscience, incensing God's nose.

Enfleshing these medical and religious notions on the London stage, dramatists offered audiences myriad illustrations of conscience, consciousness, and experience. The result saw theatrical constructions of brainsick figures and Catholic bodies that were unable to escape from a distracted globe. Abounding with images of musical dissonance and affective sound, English plays became embodied sites for hellish enfleshment. As I have discussed, in 1607 Thomas Dekker, a playwright noticeably open to religious propaganda, staged unstrung English bodies in *The Whore of Babylon* who wailed Catholic discord in hopes of infecting the Protestant body politic. In *The Devil's Charter* Barnabe Barnes figured the pope as the causal agent in infecting the body. In addition, the authors of *Lust's Dominion* embody contemporary intrigue surrounding Catholic bodies' innate capabilities to infect non-Catholic figures.

Shakespeare too includes similar images throughout his plays. There are descriptions of a "heat-oppressed brain" in *Macbeth* where occult sounds emanate from witches' mouthes (2.1.39), and in *Cymbeline* Jupiter demands "No more" of "petty spirits of region low" because they "offend [...] hearing" (5.5.187-88). Staging perceptually aware and physiologically responsive characters, these plays evoke a sentiment similar to that expressed by Peter Lowe, a notable English surgeon, who in 1597 described bodies that, unable to block "all passages of senses", could trigger "great motions and mutations to naturall [bodily] heate" ($F4^r$). In *Hamlet*, several characters believe the young prince has been infected with a pathogen because his awareness of the world's objects is distorted. Most figures in the drama believe Hamlet is mad, or brainsick: "O gentle son/ Upon the heat and flame of thy distemper/ Sprinkle cool patience", howls the Queen before crying that it "is the very coinage" of Hamlet's brain that motivates the prince's erratic action (3.4.113-115; 3.4.128). Rosencratz (like modern scholars) demands to know the reason of Hamlet's distemper in hopes it will result in a greater understanding of Hamlet's behavior. Instead of whetting these questionable appetites the Danish prince opts for opaque explanations, stating that his "wit's diseased": leaving the matter open to conjecture (3.2.308-309).

The disease most commonly ascribed to Hamlet is madness. As I demonstrated in the previous chapter, however, madness in this period signifies a contagious vessel tied to a diseased condition that is unable to reflect on the condition through introspection. Instead of understanding the condition, mad bodies are confined to simple statements regarding sickness, heaviness, or burning blood. Hamlet's behaviour, on the other hand, suggests he is somewhat of an exception to the auditory pathogen pattern found in the medical and anti-Catholic literature of early modern culture. In this way, Hamlet contrasts the mad character model that was indebted to medical and religious conceptions of sound and disease.

Hamlet's display of madness and professed sickness speaks to the cultural milieu of anti-Catholic literature that consumed early modern England throughout the 1590s and beyond. Ophelia's account of Hamlet's voice is an example of this: "his music [...] Like sweet bells jangled out of tune and harsh" (3.1.159-161). Arguing Hamlet is corporeally discordant and projects inharmonious tunes, which as I explored in previous chapters are descriptions reserved for Catholics or those in the throes of a Catholic conversion, Ophelia's allegation that the Danish prince produces discordant sound aligns with Protestant opinion surrounding religious contagion, spiritual disease, and papal experience. Evidence that suggests a rudimentary transformation is not occurring onstage can be found through the play's internal evidence. Hamlet, when accused of exhibiting madness, argues that his "pulse [...] doth temperately keep time/ And makes a healthful music", clarifying

> It is not madness that I have uttered. Bring me to the test,
> And I matter will reword, which madness
> Lay not a flattering unction to your soul
> That not your trespass but my madness speaks.
> It will but skin and film the ulcerous place
> Whilst rank corruption, mining all within,
> Infects unseen. (3.4.131-140)

In contrast, mad characters in early moderns dramas resemble inharmonious instruments: constructions inherently dissonant through repeated admissions of boiling blood, distraction, and acrimonious music, the result of which is both a religious and medical vision of the corporeally discordant. Madness induced by sound also conjures particular associations between an emanating object from which a

pathogen originates—producing miasmic air—followed by belief or superstition. The object most called on in early modern drama during the early 1600s to achieve this is a religiously potent and often Catholic character: a Spanish Empress or Queen coded as the biblical Whore of Babylon; an antichristian pope; or, an English dissident that conspires to remove a Protestant sovereign. *Hamlet*, on the other hand, calls on a character that encapsulates the above characteristics without ever becoming explicit: a ghost.

The Body of Air in *Hamlet*

The ghost in its immediate historical topography offers several ideological imperatives. To respond to the spirit's demand—"know me"—requires an investigation of differing contemporary experiences shaped by early modern conceptions of competing ideas. As Carlo Mazzio has recently observed, the ghost is primarily a body of air, lending itself to the religious, the physiological, the diseased, and the experiential (153-157). Indeed, Mazzio's reading of *Hamlet's* erring spirit has informed much of my own interpretation of the drama, and it is her work that provides the bedrock for the current argument. In early modern England, the aforementioned bodies of air—religious, corporeal, medical, and sensory—converge to embody, I argue in later sections of the chapter, anti-Catholic literature. Revealing ongoing concern over the papal body's dangerous innards and grisly exterior, the ghost's sounds in *Hamlet* reveal its multifactorial capacity and stresses that the early modern body participate in understanding its declaration to know its meaning. Unlike other dramatic texts during this period, however, Shakespeare's embodiment of anti-Catholic phenomena in *Hamlet* does not, I suggest, encourage religious prejudice. Instead, the playwright is concerned with the ways in which the human body partakes in anti-Catholic experiences. Demanding that playgoers use their eyes, ears, and nose to absorb the ghost's significance, Shakespeare stages an interaction between a body of early modern beliefs and a human body.

Hamlet's ghost is air. A simple enough statement, this declaration is not as straightforward as it first appears and upon closer inspection the fact that Shakespeare stages a ghost is one that is culturally rich, historically refined, and corporeally emphatic. During this period, air signified putrid smells, noxious fumes, and dangerous sounds capable of infecting vulnerable bodies through experiential pathogens. Air is capable of consuming the early modern body with pestilence, madness, and Catholicism, and Shakespeare embodies these themes, which are general literary features in anti-papal discourse, throughout *Hamlet*. Aware of bad air and its contemporary associations, Horatio begs that the prince avoid hearing the ghost, asking, "What if it [...] deprive your sovereignty of reason/ And draw you into madness? Think of it" (1.4.50-55). Echoing Loyer's opinion that specters are capable of inducing "feare, superstition, and credulitie", Horatio is aware of contemporary opinions surround apparitions, mindful that those who experience an incorporeal presence oftentimes "suffer themselves to be drawne into a beliefe and perswasion of that, which is quite contrary to truth" (G1^{v}). Likewise, after Hamlet and the ghost leave, Marcellus (perhaps sniffing the air) comments, "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark" (1.4.67). In addition, King Claudius refers to "buzzers" who "infect" the "ear/ With pestilent speeches" (4.5.88-89). These statements, alongside the dozen references to madness throughout the drama, speak to cultural conceptions regarding religious contagion and corporeal disease (2.2.93-151; 3.1.18-35; 5.1.145-155; 5.1.268-282). Although the sights and smells of the early modern landscape

recurrently appear throughout religious, political, and literary works in this era, the phenomenon of sound for several early modern writers was the only affective agent interchangeable with consciousness. Examining the ghost within early modern parameters of consciousness should then lead scholars to the realisation that the ghost is a pure experience that appears to be a contradiction: it is an untainted sight, smell, and sound evocative of a tainted sight, smell, and sound.

In a medical framework air affects the body's physiology. "Humors", Thomas Wright declares, "depend upon" the "ayre" (F1^{r}). Alongside sleep, food, exercise, and the remaining non-naturals, the air is capable of altering the body's insides. More specifically, air stirs the passions and humors that "over-rule the body", altering an individual's physiology upon contact (F1^{r}). Wright, a Catholic priest, published the aforesaid account in *The Passions of the Mind in Generall* (1601). An established source-text for Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), Wright's medical diatribe contains a detailed overview of the body's internal mechanisms. The passions and humors in general are described as topics worthy of lengthy volumes, and thus Wright limits his study to corporeal specificities. "*Passions in gesture*", he argues, are confined to "motions of the eyes, pronuntiation, managing of the hands and bodies, and manner of going". Sudden movements of these body parts such as "a rowling eye" suggest, "a light wit" caused by "a hote cholericke complexion". Anger is the passion that stimulates the mind and provokes impatient behavior. Before the choler prompts this behavior, however, the body must first exhibit an "abundance of hote spirits" (K2^{r}). Calling on Plato's tripartite theory of the soul, Wright's concepts align with prevailing scientific notions prevalent throughout the Renaissance.

In Platonic medicine, the passions reside in the heart and the humors rely on the heart for instruction whereas the spirits are the animating force by which the body is energized. The body's spirits are delicate substances, and so the body's sensitivity to the world's objects (particularly the air) cause the spirits, which operate within a corporeal physiology, to fluctuate between repose and distress more so than other areas residing in the body, such as the humors or passions (Wright B1^{r}-E2^{v}). In general, the passions denote feelings and emotions, and are closely related to the body's humors of phlegm, choler, black bile, and blood. Unlike the humors and the passions, the spirits are a part of the body's internal equilibrium that controls awareness. For example, during sleep the eyes are destitute of spirits because they gather and coagulate within "the inner partes of the body" during moments of unconsciousness (D2^{r}). The spirits reassume their function when the body awakes and the imagination is active. It would be remiss to suggest that "spirits" is merely a term interchangeable with *the* spirit, or soul. Rather, the spirits attend to particular cognitive functions. "When we imagine any thing", Wright maintains, "the purer spirites flocke from the brayne, by certayne secret channels to the heart, where they pitch at the doore, signifying that an object was presented, convenient or disconvenient for it". The heart synchronizes the spirits through controlling the humors. When someone experiences pleasure it is because of "pure spirites" (D7^{r}). During times of pain or sadness melancholy humors overwhelmed the body whereas, in outbursts of anger, a rush of choler and blood incensed the physiology. While air influences the spirits before stirring the humors or passions, it is capable of affecting the body's entire physiology. Once air pervades corporeality it can trigger belligerent conduct (caused by choler), fear and madness (caused by melancholy), or vivid dreams (caused by the spirits). In this paradigm, air assumes a pathogenic role.

The 1590s and early 1600s signaled fluctuating concepts of rotten air causing disease. In *A Perfume Against the Noysome Pestilence* (1603), Roger Fenton

discusses the origins of plague epidemics throughout history: "Some take it to be a discommoditie brought over in our Merchants commodities from forreine countries" while others "take it to be an unhappie conjunction of certaine Planets, inflaming the ayre unnaturally" (A6^{v}-A7^{r}). Some writers, he argues, "conceave that a huge concourse of people in some extremitie of heat and drought, hath inflamed and corrupted the bloud, and so it begun" (A7^{r}). The miasmic breath of the non-believer, he argues, infects English air and poisons the nation's healthy Protestant. Likewise, an anonymous writer in *True and Wonderfull* (1614) argues, air that has been putrefied through lasciviousness "be very dangerous" (B4^{v}). Nonetheless, infectious air cannot affect the body's exterior. Noxious fumes do not scald the skin nor does it harm the limbs. Instead, vapor enters the "breathing Organs (the Mouth or Nose)" before entering the bloodstream and modifying the body's physiology (B4^{v}).

The ears are among the primary entrances by which air enters the body. "Of the eares", writes Christof Wirsung, "which nature hath ordained as instruments for receivers and judges of the voice and their noise, whereof as well men as beasts have alwayes twaine, on each side of the head one, that alwayes stands open". These "crooked entrances", he argues, "receive much aire, and noise might retaine and discerne the same the longer" (G4^{r}). Another author describes hearing as a sense that affects the passions of the mind more directly than the other senses. "For there is no object of the eye", the author explains, "nothing what we taste or touch that causeth such extasies, so violent troubles or sudden frights, as those which enter and pearce into the soule, by the means of some noises, sounds and voices, incident to our hearing" (Plutarch E2^{v}). Discussing the imagined sounds of an infected individual, Philip Barrough defines a "noyse and tinckling in the eare" as arising from some "windie vapor, or of grosse and clammie humours" within the body (E8^{r}). Imagined sounds, he argues, are the result of sickness, and this condition usually develops due to internal fluxes caused by contagious experiences. Before analyzing the significance of sound further, it is necessary to examine the ghost in a paranormal context.

Unlike physicians' understanding of air, supernatural investigators claim ghosts permeate the totality of the body's senses. Deriving from the Latin "*spectrum a spectando*", specter equates to "seeing" (Loyer B1^{r}). The disease of melancholy can cause such a vision, corrupting the imagination with gross vapors and burnt fumes; or, an occult body clothes itself with the air and appears unto men, women and children. As Loyer argues,

> When the mind [...] which is alwayes attending on the Imagination doth receive in imagining any formes of divels or dead men, either in sound or in qualitie, in odour, or in touching. And that this Imagination is transferred unto the Sense, correspondent to his proper action: (as the odours doe referre themselves to the particular Instrument of smelling: and that which is heard in the Eares, and the Specters, to the Eyes:) then shall any man thinke that he seeth, heareth, or smelleth something, without that any object doth truly present it self to the sight, to the hearing or smelling. And as touching the sense of seeing, although it be so, that the vision be no other thing then a perceiving of some shape which is made within the lively chrystall of the eyes. (K2^{r}-K2^{v})

For Loyer, specters are capable of altering the body's faculties: "the eyes from seeing perfectly, the eares from hearing, the nose from smelling, the mind and the phantasie from reasoning and discoursing, and from discerning things by the use of reason" (Hh1^{r}). Specters, he reveals, deprive corporeal sensations through experience. "All *Images*", Loyer continues, "which doe externally present themselves unto our senses,

either they are *visible*, or *invisible*: If they be *Invisible*, either they are *created in the Ayre*, or *in our owne minds*" (H2^{v}). Regarding bodies created in the air, Loyer uses such phenomena as the steam from a river and the sparks of forest fire as examples. Sound, on the other hand, is a phenomenon that specters often utilize to invade earthly bodies. Again, a specter's sound is either the result of periodic displacements in the air or periodic displacements in the mind. Imagined sounds are the result of sickness and commonly occur during dreams or hallucinations. In comparison, sound caused by movements of the air "are berated and beaten back, from the *Christall* and transparent". The air, Loyer claims, "it may of it selfe cast some kinde of *Image*, having power to appeare, they prove it in this sort; All *Aire* that is *Chrystallive*, or transparent, hath a kind of refraction" (H3^{r}). Hence, specters are incorporeal mirrors that deflect the air. *Hamlet*, which has long been compared to an emblematic mirror held up to culture, is said to reflect the social values of any given historical context: whether it is love, religious ideals, or revenge. Nonetheless, this analogy is always in reference to the visual. In contrast, the ghost's sound is yet to be taken into account.

In early modern culture, sound shapes being. Arguing a specter's voice carries an auditory potency unlike those of corporeal bodies, Loyer claims, "for one voyce there are many engendered" (H2^{v}). Consequently, incorporeal bodies are not only a mass of air but are also a mass of sound, amplifying several noises in unison. In this way, a specter is a full-bodied sound in and of itself. Providing readers with numerous examples of specter's sounds, Loyer associates noisy bodies and celestial air with environmental phenomena. For example, lightning and thunder represent the visual and aural intersections of nature, creating what we now recognize as a type of cognitive dissonance. "The experience" of a thunderstorm, he explains, "may be seene in the lightning: the brightnesse, and shining whereof is seene sooner than we can heare the thunder" (Q4^{r}). Likewise, sounds are the result of movements within the air, and so "our hearing", he asserts, "will be deceived also when we thinke that wee heare thunder, and notwithstanding it is but some Coach or Chariot that passeth by the streetes" (Q4^{v}).

Manipulating sound through stirring the air, specters are capable of rousing the body's internal mechanisms by affecting the body's ears. Apparitions enter the ears and stir "the phantasie through sound", triggering memories of noise such as thunder, coaches or gunshots, infecting the brain "with certaine vapors". Correspondingly, "contagion passeth from thence into the phantasie, and maketh it to imagine all things false and absurde, as long as those vaporous fumes doe continue turning within the braine" (Aa2^{r}). As such, scholars for several decades have considered Hamlet's experience of the ghost as nothing more than a delusion triggered by melancholy. The principal source text for such assertions is Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). "Weeping, Sighing, Laughing, Itching, Trembling, Sweating, Blushing, hearing and seeing strange noyses, visions, winde, cruditie, are motions" of a body suffering from disease (R5^{v}). "That they see and heare", Burton continues, "so many phantasies (Chimeraes, noyses, visions)" are experiencing a "corrupt phantasie" that in turn creates sights and sounds "that which is indeed neither heard nor seene" (R6^{v}). Nonetheless, the mere fact that several characters throughout *Hamlet* also witness the specter problematizes the notion that the ghost is merely a hallucination of one individual. Shakespeare undoubtedly includes such images to draw attention to early modern conceptions of disease. The ghost, I claim, should be seen as an entity capable of permeating corporeal apertures and triggering illness within the body. Instead of simply calling on sight to understand *Hamlet's* ghost, the ears, I argue, provide new readings of the play because the

cultural properties ascribed to hearing designate the ghost's contemporary significance: it is the closest thing to an onstage representation of sound, revealing the embodiment of transmission solely through presence. The fact the ghost speaks exclusively to Hamlet allows the audience to confront the specter's experiential significance, forcing playgoers to hear privileged moments of sound in their experiential totality. In order to understand the depths of this exchange, emerging scientific conceptions of the body and sound must be taken into account when reading Hamlet's contact with the specter.

In his groundbreaking study of phenomena, Francis Bacon is the first English scientist to discuss in detail the physiology of hearing. Basing his observations on the results he has gathered from several specific experiments, Bacon argues, "all *Eruptions* of *Aire*, though small and slight, give an *Entity of Sound*" ($F4^{r}$). "It is certaine", he argues, "that *Sound* is not produced at the first, but with some *Locall Motion* of the *Aire*" ($F4^{v}$). Describing, "an over-potent *Object* doth destroy the *Sense;* And *spirituall Species* (both Visible and Audible) will worke upon the *Sensories*, though they move not any other *Body*", the author is essentially describing Hamlet's interaction with the ghost as the young prince is the only character to absorb the ghost's sounds ($G1^{r}$). Although I am aware that the apparition makes a sound beneath the stage in Act One Scene Five, I have based the aforementioned statement on Bacon's assertion that sound requires air "against other *Aire*" and "with some *Resistance* of *Aire"* ($F4^{v}$-$G1^{r}$). For example, "the *Body Percussed"* during conversation creates motions of sound. *Hamlet's* ghost, then, is a mass of pure noise constructed to be experienced, and thus requires another body in the same physical space to be heard because bodies occupying the same space (whether that body is air or corporeal) act as the acoustic vessels that in turn lead to hearing ($F4^{v}$).

Hamlet's ghost demands to be heard. We know that numerous characters in the drama are aware of the phantom, but it is Hamlet alone who experiences its sound. At one stage in the drama Hamlet even believes hearing the ghost verifies its reality—an aspect of perceptually understanding an object in relation to consciousness—and so demands his mother hear the specter after she is unable to exploit her vision to absorb the spirit: "Do you see nothing there [...] nor do you nothing hear?" (3.4.122-124). However, it is the ghost's ability to remain hidden that makes it a pervasively intriguing force. We can then assume that Hamlet's perception of the ghost is remarkably different to other characters that also encounter the apparition. "What can be made of this?" asks Greenblatt. "The point", he argues, "is not to settle issues that Shakespeare has clearly gone out of his way to unsettle" (*Hamlet* 244). Demanding "we need only to recognize how alert [Shakespeare] was to the materials that were being made available to him", the author claims we should accept the ghost in all of its magnificent vagueness (254).

By analyzing the prince's experience of the ghost, playgoers are able to infer two objective outcomes of Hamlet's interaction with the ghost. The first is that he experiences a bodily transformation corresponding to early modern conceptions surrounding pathogenic sound, infectious smells, and madness: all of which arise through Catholicism. If this is the case, *Hamlet* joins a repertoire of early modern anti-Catholic plays. This, as I have argued so far, seems unlikely, as the emanating object is spiritual rather than physical. The second option is to render the ghost, phenomenologically speaking, as homomorphic to corresponding perceptible properties of corporeal objects without arguing that it is corporeal in itself. We need only recognize that the ghost—as David Hillman has argued—lingers between a

physical reality and an ambiguous construct that operates as an otherworldly authority in a physical domain (83).

Consider, for a moment, the ghost's one demand in the drama. Requesting that Hamlet "lend thy serious hearing/ To what I shall unfold" (1.5.5-6), the spirit stresses that Hamlet experience it as an auditory phenomenon, thereby emphasizing utterings harbored by a presence that then casts previous knowledge into doubt (Smith xii-iii). A fundamentally motivational state of mind, sound is an experience that affects the ears before the brain and heart in an early modern scientific framework. The ghost's news, while appearing to be consonant with Hamlet's mind's eye, does not, as Aaron Landau has discussed, lead the prince to peace, euphoria, reason, or understanding (226-28). Hamlet, then, suffers from an affective dissonance that it is both aural and cognitive. Comparably, Horatio's experience of the ghost leads him to the conclusion that the spirit is an innately dissonant object. In addition, at the beginning of the drama Barnardo entreats Horatio to "Mark" the ghost (1.1.41). After observing the ghost for a short while, Horatio explains, "It harrows me with fear and wonder" (1.1.43). Desiring to experience the presence, Horatio demands, "If thou hast any sound or use of voice/ Speak to me [...] Speak to me [...] O speak! [...] Speak of it, stay and speak" (1.1.109-120).

Sometime later the apparition signals that Hamlet walk with it and Horatio is the only character that comments on this spectacle. "It beckons you to go away with it", he observes, "as if it some impartment did desire/ To you alone" (1.4.39-41). After Hamlet relays to Horatio the ghost's news, Horatio digests the account and simply acknowledges, "These are but wild and whirling words, my lord" (1.5.137). Perhaps expecting a different and more enthusiastic response, Hamlet retorts, "I'm sorry they offend you, heartily/ Yes, faith, heartily" to which Horatio replies, "There's no offence, my lord" (1.5.138-140). Refusing to act on pure conviction, Horatio is one of the few characters that survive the tragedy of Hamlet: perhaps because he chose to disbelieve the auditory evidence at his disposal. Driving the remainder of action until the play's final scene, the spirit's words move through Hamlet at its request.

Indeed, *Hamlet* emphasizes one's ability not only to hear but also to be conscious of hearing. Hearing, ears, and sound (all of which combined occur over seventy times throughout the drama) relate to knowledge, religion, belief, emotion, reason, and action. It is Hamlet's belief that compels behavior, and this is Hamlet's decision alone as it is Horatio's, albeit different, experience of the ghost that leads him to skepticism. Testament to the aural power and infectious quality of the ghost, the prince imagines it "preaching to stones/ Would make them capable" of action (3.4.117-118). Comparatively, Horatio is unconvinced of the ghost's words because he has not experienced its sound.

Again, I have arrived at this conclusion based on two differing and yet equally convincing facts. Firstly, it is necessary that onstage characters hear *and* see the disembodied figure if the ghost's acoustic quality is to be taken into account. Although the phenomenology of seeing in early modern culture maintains a number of concerns relevant to experience and consciousness, hearing the ghost first requires seeing the ghost. Based on prevalent scientific notions of sound and the body, the ghost must be seen in order to hear it, as sound is the result of two bodies of air colliding into one another, resulting in the sensations associated with hearing. Because the ghost bellows beneath the stage, onstage characters do not hear the apparition since early modern phenomenological conceptions of sound requires relational bodies operating in the same space.

In short, no one onstage hears the ghost because the ghost, which in a phenomenological framework is nothing more than air, requires bodies in the same space it occupies in order for it to be heard. As I mentioned earlier, bodies create the acoustics that in turn lead to hearing. It then follows that seeing the ghost means the sensory parameters are in place for the body to hear its sound once the disruption of air stemming from the sources collides with the receiver. Accordingly, onstage characters do not react to the ghost's sounds during the swearing scene because they cannot hear these sounds. Secondly, the ghost is able to suppress both its sight and sound on command. The mere fact the ghost can be both heard and seen does not mean that characters can hear and see the ghost when it appears or speaks. For example, Gertrude and Hamlet both encounter the specter, but it is Hamlet alone who is able to witness the body of air, whereas Gertrude sees and hears nothing. Although scholars have long identified *Hamlet* as a mirror held up against culture, arguing the drama reflects the political, social, and intrinsic mechanisms of human interaction, the play consistently returns to deeply embedded notions of sound and, particularly, the phenomenology of sound. As Folkerth notes, "Shakespeare created worlds with sound, worlds that in turn contain whole soundscapes within them" (7). While Folkerth, Lindley, and Smith have done much to further the phenomenology of hearing in the early modern period, analyzing sound's impact on the body and listening to moments wrought by historical experience, there is yet to be an analysis of *Hamlet's* phenomenological dimensions in relation to a phenomenon that saturated England's religious, political, and literary landscape: anti-Catholic sentiment.

Anti-Catholicism and *Hamlet*

In order to experience the ghost in *Hamlet*, the matrix of anti-Catholic sentiment that enveloped English culture throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must be, at least in part, taken into consideration. As I explored in the first, second, and third chapters of this thesis, the early 1600s is a period pregnant with descriptions of Catholicism's religious, political, medical, and social meanings. My arguments within each of these chapters reveal that hundreds of anti-Catholic pamphlets, sermons, and plays saturated the English marketplace at the beginning of the seventeenth century. On the cusp of a new era, Shakespeare integrates anti-papal rhetoric in *Hamlet* by employing cultural mechanisms that direct the body's attention to cultural realities, offering early modern playgoers visions of aural perception and religious experiences akin to the vernacular repeatedly called on by anti-Catholic polemicists.

In particular, the ghost embodies the carnal and the spiritual dimensions of anti-papal diatribes that persuaded readers (via bodily participation) to abandon rituals of the flesh in favor of stripped practice and inward solicitations. "Your one body hath but one spirit", explains John Ainsworth, an English politician in Elizabeth's reign, and it is the spirit "which gives life to the whole and to every member of the body" (I2^{v}). Animating the hands, feet, head, and heart, the soul is the body's fuel refined by either God or Satan. In this configuration, the corporeal body and the metaphoric body are parallel locations that intersect and upon meeting reveal the dimensions of early modern religious embodiment. The spiritual body represents that of a Protestant or a Catholic follower steeped in physical devotion whilst symbolizing the foundation upon which a Christian Church is erected. In both cases, the soul, or spirit, nourishes the body and either calms moments of disorder or exacerbates malady. Church of England clergymen argue the Protestant body is powered through Christ's celestial utterances whereas the Catholic body, "have the spirit of Satan" (I2^{v}). Signifying a

demonic presence, the Catholic spirit epitomizes the papal body's diseased physiology.

Evoking early modern observations surrounding corporeality, Catholicism's diseased spirit is intrinsically connected to auditory phenomena. "When the conjured Spirit appears" explains King James in 1597, "which will not be while after manie circumstances, long praiers, and much muttering and murmuring of the conjurers; like a *Papist* priest, dispatching a hunting *Masse*: how soone I say, he appeares" ($D1^{v}$). Associating Catholic lore with satanic conjuration and disembodied forms, James specifically connects the summoning of apparitions with papal speech. In effect, James associates Catholicism with dangerous sounds. Recounting Protestant histories of noisy Catholics, Johann von Ewich recalls an unnamed English Protestant's experience of a sonically discordant clergyman. A Christian man during Elizabeth's reign, he explains, came across a monk engrossed in papal ritual. Noticing that the Catholic fellow was chanting, the Protestant paused to observe the popish figure for a moment. After watching the monk perform liturgical practice the Protestant, Ewich claims, "sawe the evill spirits to creepe into some of their throats, and to provoke them to coughing, and to slyde into the nose of others, and make them to sneese" and "enter into others eares" ($D2^{r}$).

In the course of exploring connections between anti-Catholic rhetoric and the body in the early modern period, Shakespeare reveals the complexity of a social locale informed by diverse authors of distinct cultural domains. Ranging from reformed preachers to poets to physicians and the monarch, anti-Catholic polemicists frequently use imagery associated with the body to articulate anti-papal sentiment. Analyzing the ghost in its historical context requires acknowledging that anti-papal discourse is the primary sensory backdrop to *Hamlet's* ghost because it combines the spiritual, medical, and social structures of the sixteenth century.

Shakespeare examines anti-Catholic motifs in *Hamlet* in terms of the body and its role in fashioning religious change through experience. More specifically, hearing relates to being within the drama, thereby calling into question the body's participation in the construction of religious intolerance and vilification. Choosing to analyze *Hamlet's* body of air in an early modern framework rather than offering a postmodern critique of specters and corporeality, Todd Pettigrew suggests Shakespeare's ghostly tragedy should be viewed through a Renaissance lens because this allows modern scholars to call on a wealth of contemporary evidence that supports seemingly contrary claims (28). In this way, the specter is a body of polygonal segments: it signifies medicinal knowledge and stresses the nadirs of an affective construction. Critics including Gail Kern Paster, Jonathan Gil Harris, and Mary Floyd-Wilson have championed the idea that early modern corporeality is a social construction operating in a somatic reality. Hence, criticism from this point of view incorporates political systems, gender, religion, and sexuality into discussions regarding the culturally determined significance of the body's role in a historical period.

Further evidence within the play that suggests the ghost embodies contemporary anti-Catholic feeling is demonstrated by Shakespeare's engagement with playgoers following Hamlet's interaction with the otherworldly object. Tracking Hamlet's behavior following his isolated exchange with the ghost, playgoers observe how the Danish prince exhibits a corporeal state most often reserved for Catholics during this period: madness. Characters in the drama—Ophelia, King Claudius, Polonius, and Gertrude—repeatedly designate the prince with charges of madness, but none are able to deduce the cause of his apparent psychosis. "As I was sewing in my

chamber", Ophelia states, "Lord Hamlet, with his doublet all unbraced/ No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled/ Ungartered, and down-gyvèd to his ankle/ Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other [...] with a look so piteous in purport/ As if he had been loosèd out of hell/ To speak of horrors, he comes before me" (2.1.78-85). Her father, Polonius, responds by asking if Hamlet is "mad for thy love?" (2.1.86) Playgoers, however, are aware that Ophelia is neither the source of Hamlet's apparent madness nor is she an object the prince yearns to experience in any significant capacity.

Several other instances throughout the drama imply that Hamlet's madness (alongside the cause of his madness) serves as the focal point for playgoers. Hamlet "is mad" states Polonius, "and now remains/ That we find out the cause of this effect/ Or rather say 'the cause of this *defect*/ For this effect defective comes by cause" (2.2.93-104). "Have you heard", asks King Claudius in the previous scene, "Of Hamlet's transformation—so I call it/ Since not th'exterior nor the inward man/ Resembles that it was" (2.1.4-7). Eventually, Hamlet's corporeal display of madness evolves into descriptions of musical objects producing discordant sounds (another phenomenon reserved solely for Catholics in this period) because—as early modern writers argued—diseased bodies emit dissonant resonances through their inability to cease producing pathogenic noises. Hamlet's "sweet bells", Ophelia laments, are "jangled out of tune and harsh" (3.1.161). Ophelia's statement, then, suggests that the prince's body has undergone a physiological transformation. This conversion, which is associated with descriptions of musical instruments, is wrought by discordant reverberations and conveys a profound sense of corporeal alteration. Of course, playgoers (unlike Ophelia, Claudius, Gertrude, and Polonius) are aware that the source of Hamlet's madness—whether this madness is genuine or feigned bears no consequence—is the ghost.

The ghost, an anti-Catholic construct that seemingly perpetuates religious prejudice and early modern cultural truths, embodies anti-papal sentiment most obviously because it stresses how a religious agent is capable of triggering bodily alterations through contagion. In Act One Scene Three, Laertes notes, "Contagious blastments are most imminent" (1.3.42). Setting the stage for the playgoers, Laertes's prediction prepares audience members to use their senses for the purposes of experiencing an unseen and perhaps diseased agency. In the following scene, Hamlet enters the stage and playgoers observe the contaminated atmosphere of Laertes's earlier prophecy. "The air bites shrewdly", Hamlet shudders, "it is very cold". In response, Horatio comments, "It is a nipping and eager air" (1.4.1-2). Moments later the stage directions record the sounds of nearby trumpets that herald the accession of Denmark's new king. On cue, the ghost enters amid comments on one's experience of air alongside outbursts of memorialized sounds.

Hearing *Hamlet's* Ghost

In Act One Scene Five of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the ghost emits its first sounds in the drama amidst a sequestered moment onstage where the significance of its poetic reverberations is of the utmost importance. While several characters in the drama have seen the apparition, none have been successful in their desire to hear it. "Speak, speak, speak, I charge thee speak", demands Horatio whereas Marcellus notes, the ghost "will not answer" (1.1.49-50). Refusing to produce noises for its curious audience, the ghost opts to permeate Hamlet's physiology alone. Taking the shape of

words, these sounds penetrate both playgoers and the prince with a veiled simplicity: "Mark me" (1.5.2). This demand, which means to observe, reflect, consider, or believe, is solely directed at the young prince of Denmark. Having coaxed the sovereign away from his weary friends, the specter requests that Hamlet comprehend its ontological, cultural, personal, and metaphysical totality by entreating the prince with a seemingly straightforward statement: experience me. Although the ghost's words are generally associated with sight, I argue that sound is instead the centerpiece of this exchange. Effectively inviting the prince to unite knowledge with a sense of being, the specter's sounds reverberate throughout the production until the play comes to a bloody close.

The ghost's mandate, a seemingly straightforward declaration, is nevertheless a Pandora's box made from the cultural trappings of early modern life. After all, the specter's deceptively ingenuous decree implies several worldviews depending on the vantage point from which it is approached. Hence, from the 1600s onwards writers, onstage characters, critics, scholars, actors, and audiences alike have discussed the significance of the ghost, questioning its meaning and the dilemma its inaugural sounds promote. Is the ghost the expired King of Denmark bent on exacting revenge, merely acting through Hamlet at the prince's request? Is the ghost a sentimental construction built to showcase a father's eternal love for his son? Is the ghost a fiend sent from hell, or a repentant Catholic spared from the pains of purgatory for a few hours each night? Perhaps, as Greg and Andreasen have argued, the ghost is a figment of Hamlet's imagination caused by the melancholy fumes of a diseased brain? Beyond such questions, there are queries pertaining to historical expression. Maurice Baudin, Joseph Natoli, and Laury Magnus have argued that the motifs Shakespeare's ethereal construction embodies creates a world of metatheatricality that draws spectators into self-conscious emulation in order to emphasize awareness. If this is the case, what kind of awareness does the ghost champion exactly? Perhaps, as Stephen Greenblatt, Aaron Landau, and Peter Milward have argued, the ghost raises an awareness of papal lore, or maybe it is a Protestant invention that questions the role of Catholic faith in a post-Reformation landscape. All of these postulations (no matter how divergent from one another) do share one common thread: they emphasize the importance of an interaction between the human body and culturally embodied.

Recognising the cultural embodiment of anti-Catholic discourse throughout *Hamlet* involves listening to the ghost. At the time of the drama's initial performances, objects pregnant with sound (musical apparatuses and the body) produced anxiety in early modern culture because noise is air that is capable of generating specific reactions by stirring the body's physiology through entering the ears. For example, the human voice and the sound of a trumpet are interchangeable objects because both generate intermittent displacements of the air. Arguing sound is "the shaking or artificiall crispling of the aire", Thomas Wright describes affective sounds emanating from emotive bodies: corporeal and incorporeal. Asking how sounds are capable of controlling the emotions, Wright is puzzled by music in particular. How does it rouse the choler, afflict melancholy, jubilate the heart, and elevate the soul? "It is not so great a marvaile", he states, "that meat, drinke, exercise, and aire set passions aloft, for these are divers waies qualified, and consequently apt to stirre up humors; but what qualitie carie simple single sounds and voices, to enable them to worke such wonders?" (M4^{v}) Jarring, or unpleasant, sounds cut the air with tumultuous reverberations, unstringing the body's heartstrings like a blade held to a violin bow. Melodious sounds caused the opposite effect within the body, affecting

the spirits in a different manner. "Let a good and a Godly man heare musicke", Wright explains,

> and hee will lift up his heart to heaven: let a bad man heare the same, and hee will convert it to lust: Let a souldier heare a trumpet or a drum, and his bloud will boil and bend to battell; let a clowne heare the same, and he will fall a dauncing; let the common people hear the like, and they will fall a gazing, or laughing, and many never regard them, especially if they bee accustomed to heare them. So that in this, mens affections and dispositions, by meanes of musicke, may stir up divers passions, as in seeing we daily proove the like. True it is, that one kind of musicke may be more apt to one passion than another, as also one object of sight is more proportionate to stirre up love, hatred, or pleasure, or sadnesse, than another. Wherefore the naturall disposition of a man, his custome or exercise, his vertue or vice, for most part at these sounds diversificate passions: for I cannot imagine, that if a man never heard a trumpet or a drum in his life, that he would at the first hearing be mooved to warres. ($M6^{r}$)

Unlike smell and sight, the capacity of sound to stir the body's physiology is clearly defined in Wright's impassioned dialogue on the powers of hearing. It also clarifies the capability of sound (taken to mean vibrations in the air) to position the body in a number of contexts: preparing the emotions for war or raising the passions that in turn encourage dancing. Accordingly, the ghost can be approached from a number of vantage points: cultural, medical, and experiential. In early modern culture, these fields often slip into one another, and this process of consolidating the religious, social, scientific, and sensory is by far the most evident in the anti-Catholic landscape of post-Reformation discourse.

Embodying a multifaceted understanding surrounding expanding conceptions of poignant cultural terms relevant to scientific, religious, and literary domains, Shakespeare's staging of a ghost personifies Protestant harangues of the Catholic body through drawing audiences' attention to the corporeal experience of sound, magic, and disease caused by experiential devices. Evidenced through the ghost's overt desire to affect physical and metaphoric ears: "List, Hamlet, list, O list! [...] Now, Hamlet, hear [...] the whole ear of Denmark/ Is by forged process of my death/ Rankly abused" (1.5.22-38); an apparent fixation with witchcraft (1.5.43), and disease caused by penetrating auditory apertures: "With juice of cursed hebenon in a vial/ And in the porches of mine ears did pour/ The leprous distilment" (1.5.62-64), Shakespeare stages moments that personify Protestant fears of Catholic bodies that infect English bodies with papal agents: popish sounds (discussions concerning English treason or Catholic conversion), papal witchcraft (Catholic ceremonies such as transubstantiation), and religious contagion through experience (Catholics' smells and sounds that target the nose and ears either respectively or in unison). All of these agents are the literary traits of polemical tracts that discuss how and why the Catholic body is a dangerous corporeality within English communities.

The significance of sound and auditory consciousness relies on the audience. During the ghost and the prince of Denmark's initial conversation where a body of sound first collides with corporeality, two audiences are present: Hamlet and the playgoers. Both audiences have direct contact with the ghost more so than other characters throughout the drama. Regarding Shakespeare's offstage audiences composition, scholars imagine a number of possibilities. Clark conceives of the audience in terms of religious belief, arguing only Protestants attended the bard's plays (176-180). Andrew Gurr, Ann Jennalie Cook, Alfred Harbage, and Tanya

Pollard discuss audiences in terms of class, stating lawyers, magistrates, and the destitute attended the theater regularly (Pollard "Audience Reception" 459).

Considering Gurr's estimation that public theatres saw millions of patrons throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one can assume theatrical performances engrossed audiences because of their appeal to the senses. Similarly, the wealth of secondary scholarship that exists on the numerous antitheatrical disputes spawned during this era not only draw our attentions to the fleshly appeals of theatrical productions, but also suggest a period in which hungry patrons were obsessed with saturating their body through experiential motifs. Indeed, as Pollard argues, antitheatricalists loathed theatre because it appealed to the senses and stimulated emotional responses within the audience. "By assaulting the senses and appealing to the desire for pleasure", she asserts, antitheatricalists reasoned, "plays not only attracted the lowest sort of audiences, but encouraged those audiences to surrender to their lowest instincts" (462). Stephen Gosson, a prominent antitheatricalist and Shakespeare's contemporary, specifically mentions in *The School of Abuses* (1579) the sounds of theatrical entertainment diseasing the mind through penetrating audiences' ears ($A7^{v}$-$A8^{r}$). As Pollard notes, "Gosson's attention to the ear as a privileged point of entry to the heart and mind highlights contemporary ideas about the physically penetrating power of sound and the bodily vulnerability of listening" (462-463).

Alongside antitheatrical writers, numerous preachers criticized theatrical entertainment because it purportedly reduced audiences to imitators: infecting playgoers and forcing them to emulate onstage behavior. This is precisely what is at stake in *Hamlet* with respect to auditory consciousness albeit in a markedly different manner. Personifying the aforementioned early modern beliefs whilst reducing said beliefs to conscious decisions through the experience of hearing, Shakespeare stages a body infected with bad sound. *Hamlet*, then, calls into question the role of a dominant belief once it impassions a collective psyche with spiritual fervor through an accentuated engagement of two audiences' ears: the prince of the play's title and playgoers.

Although the ghost is a sound in itself: or, a body of air that disrupts ontology, Shakespeare does not merely suggest the significance of sound through staging a ghost, he stresses the role of sound by drawing the audience's attention to sequestered moments of the spirit's presence. Unlike Hamlet, playgoers experience three distinct types of conviction that arise from an auditory consciousness. The first is the prince's belief in the ghost's words while the second is Horatio's disbelief in Hamlet's account of the ghost's words. As Marcellus describes, Horatio "will not let belief take hold of him" (1.1.22). Horatio's disbelief, however, is not the result of an inability to experience the ghost's seemingly contagious sounds. Rather, his skeptical view is the product of reality: the ability to hear does not entail truth. The third type of conviction is that of the offstage audience. Playgoers are aware that when the ghost leads Hamlet to a private space in order to speak with him they are witnessing an emphatic exchange. In this scene, the ghost speaks for the first time in the drama, and both Hamlet and the audience must confront the verity of sound. At this stage in the drama, the audience is unaware of why hearing the ghost is significant, and yet they are aware it is a significant moment because it is a self-contained encounter between two distinct bodies.

Fundamentally, an audience heralds the action or occasion of hearing. Although Shakespeare utilizes such definition of audience, he also uses it to refer to a group of consumers ingesting an auditory phenomenon. Accordingly, playgoers

represent those who are physically present in the same place for the same purpose. During the years in which *Hamlet* was first performed, the term "audience" represented a collective instance of hearing prevalent in two divergent settings: Protestant sermons and theatrical productions. As I have shown, sermons in late Elizabethan culture reached a zenith regarding anti-Catholic discourse, offering audiences comprehensive descriptions of popish bodies and their relationship to the bodies of Protestant congregations. Preachers describe the sight, smell, and sound of Catholics, arguing against experiencing such monstrous forms because they are capable of stimulating disease and provoking dissension through physical contact. Unlike church services and Protestant sermons where attendance was compulsory, the playhouse encouraged a more perceptive form of hearing because those in attendance were there by choice. Indeed, preachers often railed against theatrical mediums because they offered more compelling experiences for the public, shaping audience members' being through sound. "Faith", Laurence Deios preached in 1590, "in deed commeth by hearing, and hearing by the word of God", and the body "cannot heare without a preacher" (J8^{v}). Protestant preachers, like *Hamlet's* ghost, are nothing more than a sound that enters the body, affecting the soul in hopes of provoking action.

Preachers and playwrights desired to be heard by their audiences, and it is this desire to be heard that becomes the centerpiece of *Hamlet*. In the wake of new sermons exploring the validity of anti-popery and its connection to the body, Shakespeare provides the audience with a mediated experience capable of redirecting the potentially cataclysmic events created by religious violence. An early modern audience undoubtedly would have recognized that the ghost embodies the smell, sound, and sight of the contemporary religious, medical, and social landscape. In short, the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean eras championed anti-Catholic sentiment and anti-papal productions sold in the competitive marketplace. From embodying contagious smells and jarring sounds to signifying contagion and discussing treason, *Hamlet's* ghost personifies the core motifs present in anti-Catholic discourse popular throughout the period.

This is not to suggest that the ghost is simply a Catholic or Protestant construction—such views reduce the elegance of Shakespeare's drama. The play's internal evidence and emphasis on sound suggests that the ghost is merely a phenomenon characteristic of Protestant and anti-Catholic phenomena. It is an easy feat to recognize the religious rhetoric Shakespeare employs throughout *Hamlet*. However, belief in information—particularly information of a religious disposition—is the leading concern between Hamlet, the ghost, and playgoers. At the beginning of the drama, Marcellus describes how Horatio "will not let belief take hold of him" (1.1.22). By the end of the play, Horatio relays to the English ambassadors his experience. "So you shall hear", he begins,

> Of carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts,
> Of accidental judgments, casual slaughters,
> Of deaths put on by cunning and forced cause;
> And, in this upshot, purposes mistook
> Fall'n on th'inventors heads. All this can I
> Truly deliver. (5.2.334-338)

"Let us haste to hear it", responds Fortinbras, "and call the noblest to the audience" (5.2.339-340). In other words, Horatio explores the consequence of hearing, revealing how the ghost's sounds did not mold Hamlet's consciousness for the better, providing the Danish prince with everything but understanding, tolerance, or change. Again, the premise that bad air infects Hamlet, and subsequently causes him to act erratically,

corresponds to contemporary medical and religious conceptions of the time. Nancy Andreasen argues, "there is little doubt that Hamlet suffers from melancholia", and so his actions should be seen as the result of disease (1870). However, the idea that the prince reflects on the spirit's words and decides to believe is, most would argue, a more disturbing and realistic undertone characteristic to a religious conviction that compels one to kill in the name of God, faith, or superstition. In the early modern playhouse, audiences would have left theatres soon after Fortinbras's declaration. Perhaps on the travel home, individuals thought of recent Catholic plots and Protestant preachers while young couples discussed the upcoming sermon that promised bloody displays of anti-Catholic vitriol. To hear, or not to hear, that is the question.

"Mark me"—meaning to fashion, conceive, notice, observe, reflect, consider, or believe—are the first words spoken by the ghost to Hamlet (1.5.2). "I shall unfold", utters the spirit (1.5.6), and, similar to how "sound unfolds over time" before colliding with an object, the disruption of air connects with the prince (Peretz, Isabelle, and Zatorre 95). Hamlet sees and then hears the ghost and thus becomes aware of it. Connecting the spirit to the act of hearing—"Speak, I am bound to hear"—Hamlet cannot be conscious that the object sounds unless he first acknowledges its otherness that in turn accentuates its origin (1.5.7). "I will", speaks the man and not the ghost, and any lingering resemblance between a corporeal being and a celestial one dissolves (1.5.3). Relating hearing to being it is Hamlet's consciousness that generates belief. One could argue that Hamlet has no control over his perception of the apparition, and in this way has no control of his consciousness. He is, however, made to reflect on hearing—"To ears of flesh and blood. List, Hamlet, list, O list"—in turn becoming phenomenologically aware of the ghost because of an auditory consciousness (1.5.22).

Hamlet's ignorance of the immaterial object (much like our own) does not impair perceptual awareness of the spirit, and although hearing in itself represents an awareness of sound it is the relational property inherent to experience that has the power to engage Hamlet's consciousness. "Behavior", argues David Rosenthal, "reflects and manifests our beliefs", and it is Hamlet's experience and then belief of the ghost that results in terrible disarray (150). As I described earlier, this could be seen as participating in the early modern religious and medical tradition of pathogenic sound. Nevertheless, sound is already an infectious object capable of diseasing consciousness without having to be a disease in itself. Rather than perpetuating superstitious belief and anti-Catholic imagery, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* embodies this contagious aspect of sound that is neither religious nor medical. Hearing the ghost, then, confronts the etiology of early modern belief through fashioning experience.

Chapter 9

Conclusions

Sensory mediums in the early 1600s are crucial to understanding the connection between anti-Catholicism and the body in *Hamlet*. However, instead of enquiring into Shakespeare's religious belief, it is far more productive to examine the ways the playwright incorporates the structures of anti-Catholic belief into his work, or as Brian Cummings has recently stated, "rather than looking for religion in terms of historical events and then applying them to Shakespeare, it may be just as instructive to look for religion in Shakespeare and apply the vicissitudes of dramatic and poetic interpretation back to the historical events" (665-666). In the past decade, questions surrounding the presence of religious sentiment in theatre have provided substantial research that readdress the once linear pattern of a seemingly Protestant way of thinking within post-Reformation England. In the case of Shakespeare, religious sentiment ran deep. In fact, religion ran so deep that scholars are often unable to agree on the cultural significance of its presence, and oftentimes examine the figure responsible for the play rather than the play itself.

On one hand, scholars including Eamon Duffy argue Shakespeare's dramas exemplify the writer's nostalgic longing for a once vibrant Catholic community before the horrors wrought by the Protestant swerve. On the other, Ernst Honigmann considers the playwright's supposed Catholicism in terms of biography: Shakespeare was fond of Lancashire (a destination known for its excessive recusancy), raised Catholic, and wrote what appears to have been plays that lapse into Catholic perspectives. Such lapses, of course, refer to *Hamlet's* purgatorial ghost. Over the past few years, such accusations have, as Anthony Dawson argues, resulted in what were once nebulous claims becoming unequivocal "facts" (239-240).

Meanwhile scholars such as Glenn Clark abandon questions of personal belief in favor of analyzing Shakespeare's dramatic investment in Christian doctrine. Examining the influence of Protestant pastoral dialogue in Shakespearean drama, Clark argues for the presence of Christian conscience in the playwright's work. Discussing how a representation of pastoral scenes participates in contemporary discussions of how ministers assess the spirituality of the individual's soul, Clark evaluates social connections between the personal and communal. Discussions like Clark's, however, emphasize the expectations of a wholly reformed audience. Rather than arguing that Protestantism is the glue that binds Shakespeare's audience together, it is my contention that sensory phenomena provides spectators with a mediated understanding capable of transforming religious presence through shared experience.

As I have argued throughout this thesis, throughout the early modern English period anti-Catholic sentiment shaped religious, political, and literary rhetoric, emphasizing the papal body in terms of sensory phenomena. The early 1600s not only saw anti-Catholic discourse become the prevalent trend of the decade but also bore witness to a phenomenon that evolved alongside conceptions of consciousness: one's belief in anti-papal propaganda relied on one's awareness of anti-papal propaganda. Preachers realized this and determined consciousness was the catalyst to being. Forcing congregations, audiences, and readers to absorb anti-papal fantasies by employing bodily metaphors and social veracities, preachers, playwrights, and writers exploited corporeal affect to induce religious fear, commercial popularity, and political galvanization. By emphasizing anti-Catholicism's sensory nadirs, writers did not have to integrate explicit meaning in their publication. Instead, the embodiment of

anti-papal discourse appeared to consciousness in rudimentary ways: targeting the senses and generating fear through physical awareness based on cultural realities such as plague or political dissension.

Shakespeare achieves the consciousness of religious phenomena through staging a pure experience: the ghost, and yet the ghost is not simply an object that describes the subjective experience of a religious phenomenon. Rather, the ghost determines the structures and conditions of its historical moment. At the height of anti-Catholic discourse, Shakespeare stages a radical construction that relies on growing concern surrounding the experience of anti-papal bodies, distorting such experiences through listening. In hearing, an object pregnant with sound is always representative of a particular noise and an individual's understanding of what that noise does or does not constitute. Listening to an ambiguous object nevertheless guides perceptual awareness of that object, shaping consciousness. In any case, hearing, the ability to listen, and the impact of both of these things in regard to developing a sense of being are thematic undertones throughout the drama, and it is the ghost that consistently highlights this experience: "To ears of flesh and blood. List, Hamlet, list, O list" (1.5.22). Although the ghost is a body of air and is therefore a memorialized sound, smell, and sight in and of itself, Shakespeare categorizes the ghost as sound through stressing the importance of hearing: "List […] list, O list". Speaking to wider conceptions of sound and the body's ability to reason through hearing, auditory consciousness is the result of a shared experience between an object that sounds and the body that hears.

Coda

When I started researching this dissertation, I anticipated a thesis that merged religious literature and scientific texts with theatre history and political tracts. My original aim, which was to investigate the cultural origins of specific anti-Catholic creations—specifically how visions of the Catholic body traversed from sermons to the English stage—envisioned a study into how drama attempted to embody a particular range of popular beliefs, emerging thoughts, and religious biases. At the time, I believed the best way to approach such a study would be to examine English playtexts that staged the Catholic body. Beyond asking myself the ways vehemently anti-Catholic dramas like Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* and Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* staged papal characters, I questioned the cultural significance of the body in a specific historical moment: the post-Reformation landscape of English culture.

The approach I employed to carry out such a study relied on a largely historical method: examine discourses that contained discussions of both corporeality and Catholicism against dramatic texts that contained papal bodies. My approach, however, quickly began to unravel as I realized the greater interplay at work in my line of questioning, namely the depth of understanding the Catholic body in the historical imagination of English writers at the time. Having now completed my thesis, I can review the wider implications my dissertation proposes. Firstly, I argued that examining the embodiment of anti-Catholic sentiment required taking into account broader ideas beyond the limits of anti-Catholic and militantly Protestant thinkers. I believe this argument, which led to an examination of ideas that have been previously explored (olfactory disease for example) alongside notions that are yet to be investigated (pathogenic sound), demonstrates a connection between anti-Catholic sentiment and sensory phenomena.

Concerned with representations of the Catholic body following King Henry VIII's break from Rome in the 1530s, my thesis examined a range of anti-papal texts occupied by the body. What I found is that under Elizabeth and James in particular detailed discussions surrounding Catholic bodies (the antichrist pope, the Whore of Babylon, papal clergyman, and "papists" in general), coincided with bouts of political unrest, outbreaks of disease, and theatrical entertainment. Engaging with texts written by preachers, doctors, and playwrights, I soon discovered that representations of the Catholic body flooded English culture at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This period, I recognized, contained more recorded dialogues concerning the papal body than any other timeframe in history. The playhouse, on the other hand, staged an unprecedented volume of vehemently anti-Catholic dramas in the early 1600s. Acknowledging that the Protestant Reformation informed the specific years in which I found a substantial quantity of anti-papal literature, I specifically examined a set of dramatic texts that contained bodies sculpted by contemporary culture that not only represented the spectrum of early modern life but also engaged with body.

Interested in how the characters of these dramas embodied contemporary ideas, I imagined watching, hearing, and smelling these bodies in their early modern setting. The most experientially demanding Catholic characters, I discovered, belonged to a set of dramas between 1600 and 1610: *The Devil's Charter, The Whore of Babylon, Lust's Dominion,* and *Hamlet*. In each drama I noticed that themes of disease, politics, and experience were embedded into papal bodies, and again I appreciate now how larger ideas belonging to a wider cultural context are symbolized in a specific historical moment.

Catholic characters, I observed, looked, smelt, and sounded different to their onstage counterparts and embodied motifs prevalent in scientific, religious, and political purviews. Operating as a site of early modern cultural embodiment, Catholic characters enacted myriad notions that were not only interconnected with one another but were also burgeoning concepts within their unique domain. Among these notions is the idea that Catholicism operates as a religious contagion, contaminating both Catholic and non-Catholic bodies through diseased smells and infectious sounds. Likewise, the relationship between discordant sound, the body politic, and pathogenic agents is an idea that has previously gone unrecognized in early modern studies, and yet Thomas Dekker stages such motifs habitually in *The Whore of Babylon*.

Pathogenic sound, a theme that remains unnoticed in Dekker's drama, is one historical artifact my thesis exhumed by exploring the relationship between sound and the body in early modern English culture. Although limiting my thesis to the confines of a specific historical moment was needed to fully explore a period composed of culturally nuanced moments, I would have liked to investigate the social implications of such motifs further. The 1970s, for example, saw the rebirth of moral panic and occult lore in suburban America. Often labeled the "satanic panic" between the 1970s and 1990s, Christian preachers identified pervasive sound, embodied in contemporary "black metal" music, as the instrument behind subliminal messages that supposedly provoked sexual abuse and infected youths to practice hellish rhetoric. Likewise, the 1580s through to the 1620s heralded a flux in English anti-Catholic literature that depicted Roman Christians as contagious vessels capable of diseasing impressionable minds because of their dissonant sounds. Such connections, I believe, deserve teasing out.

Furthermore, modern neuropsychological scientific case studies prove that dissonance, or "bad sound", is capable of affecting the body's physiology. Michael LoPresto has recently conducted experiments that reveal how dissonant music,

sounds, and noises are all capable of conveying "different moods and eliciting various emotional reactions" in a listener (147). It should then follow that pathogenic sound offers modern readers insight into issues that transcend a purely early modern topography. Tapping into a collective unconsciousness of sorts, this relatively unknown notions embodies physiological motifs that are at the core of culture throughout history; ranging from Platonic ideas regarding *musica humana* to Christian lore and the fear of sensual sound, and finally to Kotodama (a fundamental practice in Japanese mythology, Kokugau, and Shinto), which perpetuates that ritualistic sound affects one's spiritual essence. While early modern dramas such as *The Devil's Charter*, *The Whore of Babylon, Lust's Dominion,* and *Hamlet* contain bodies that are implicitly jarring in order to exhibit the early modern notion that sound, or more simply bad air, maintains an infectious quality, it also demonstrates that the corporeal effects of aural dissonance are far from being mere oddities that exclusively belong to the past.

The second argument central to my thesis is that the years between 1600 and 1610 are instrumental in the construction of anti-Catholic embodiment. Although religious, political, and scientific domains provided English men and women with a foundation to understand the human body in culture, the playhouse transposed ideas into experiences. In the case of anti-Catholic drama, the theatre offered new readings on England's emerging ideas. Within the span of sixty years (1558 to 1614), anti-papal drama shifted from attaching hellish sights onto Catholic characters to crafting plays exploring the body's role in creating anti-Catholic feelings. Dramas with papal characters offered iterations of Protestant bodies coming into contact with a dangerous corporeality, and the consistent grafting of bodily participation in constructing anti-Catholic attitudes offered a wealth of culturally informed experiences. Between 1600 and 1610, however, a set of dramatic texts emerged that engaged with playgoers' senses by embodying emerging cultural practices.

In the case of Shakespeare, *Hamlet* anticipates the rise of the anti-Catholic experiences through an appeal to playgoerss' ears by stressing the idea that religious sound is not innately contagious. Rather, it is up to the offstage audience to witness the consequences of ingesting religious sounds (regardless of their denomination) before using consciousness to determine the outcomes such claims yield. Hamlet opts to forgo this ability to reflect, and as a consequence the drama ends in violence. Of course, by the time playgoers encountered the ghost Catholic lore had been the topic of impassioned dialogue in Protestant sermons for several decades, and so their ability to recognize Shakespeare's questioning of accepted practices needed little attention on their behalf. Understanding the ghost, however, required a mental complicity that drew on preachers' sermons in relation to Catholic artifice, discussions surrounding plague and madness, and treatises concerning treason and dissonant bodies. Shakespeare's ability to embody several themes in unison with one another (diseased smell, pathogenic sound, political discord, and anti-Catholicism) reveals a proficiency to absorb contemporary happenings for the purposes of contemplation: does encountering a religious body (regardless of what religion that body represents) endanger your own corporeality? The answer is a resounding yes—provided the religious body asks you to commit violence against aother body. This violence, Shakespeare argues, is motivated by a belief that stems solely from an unverified conviction.

Shakespeare's commentary on anti-Catholic sentiment, however, appears to have done little to dampen the public's taste for displays of papal monsters. Following Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the authors of *Lust's Dominion, The Devil's Charter,* and *The*

Whore of Babylon worked through the tendrils of Shakespeare's complex religious construction by exploring Catholicism's connection with sound and smell, using disease and dissonance to enflesh such connections. The authors of *Lust's Dominion* forced playgoers to confront the sickly smells and contagious sounds of papal characters by staging the effects these experiential agents have within the non-Catholic body. The result is a religious conversion to Catholicism and a corporeal transfiguration to madness. In contrast, Barnabe Barnes opts to examine Catholic smells in isolation from their sights and sounds, personifying the source of Catholicism's disease by focusing on the antichrist pope's olfactory significance. Thomas Dekker, on the other hand, stages the corporeal effects of hearing papal sounds, communicating notions that pathogens render the human body discordant and thus Catholic.

In this setting, embodiment requires taking the visceral aspects of anti-papal sentiment into consideration, and this relies on examining dramatic texts that stress the experiential nadirs of corporeal interactions between characters and playgoers. As I demonstrated, anti-Catholic drama persisted for more than sixty years after its inception in England following King Edward's accession to the throne, and so its catalogue is far-reaching. Only a small handful of texts, however, stress the experiential aspect of anti-papal sentiment. These texts, as it happens, were performed in the space of a decade. Unlike anti-papal dramas written and performed in the previous decades (*The Massacre at Paris* and *Faustus* for example), and those presented in the following years (*The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi*), the dramas that I explored in chapters four, five, six, and seven, merge cotemporary notions surrounding experience with anti-papal sentiment.

While the implications my thesis suggests are worth considering further in the future, I believe that examining bodies rarely attended to by scholars is worth briefly discussing. Alexander Borgia of *The Devil's Charter*, the Empress in *The Whore of Babylon*, and Eleazar of *Lust's Dominion* are bodies that deserve more attention from modern scholars. Rather than analyze a canon dominated by Shakespeare, my thesis exposes that dramas by lesser-known playwrights including Barnabe Barnes and Thomas Dekker deserve attention because these texts contain figures designed to embody meaningful cultural truths. Symbolizing intricate ideas, these bodies signify contemporary beliefs and represent links between reality and performance. Examining these dramas as embodiments of early modern notions better positions the modern critic to understand the cultural depths of a world not confined to ideas that simply reside within the canon and, in turn, the past.

Works Cited

Abbot, George. The Reasons Which Doctour Hill Hath Brought for the Upholding of Papistry. Oxford, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:618>.

Ackerman, Alan L. "Visualizing Hamlet's Ghost: The Spirit of Modern Subjectivity." Theatre Journal 53. (2001): 119-144.

Adams, Thomas. The Divells Banket. London, 1614. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:23676>.

---. The Black Devill or The Apostate. London, 1615. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:491>.

---. The White Devil or The Hypocrite Uncased. London, 1613. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:528>.

---. Englands Sickness. London, 1615. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:511>.

---. Mystical Bedlam or the World of Mad-Men. London, 1615. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:518>.

---. The Sinners Passing-Bell. London, 1614. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:23676>.

---. Diseases of the Soule. London, 1616. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:23676>.

Aggas, Edard. A Discourse Uppon a Question of the Estate of this Time. London, 1591. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19600>.

Ainsworth, John. The Trying out of the Truth. Amsterdam, 1615. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013.

<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:603>.
Allen, Will. "Laurence Deios." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/7426>
Allyne, Robert. Funeral Elegies. London, 1613.
Andreasen, Nancy. "The Artist as Scientist: Psychiatric Diagnosis in Shakespeare's Tragedies." JAMA 235.17 (1976): 1868-1872.
Aston, Margaret. England's Iconoclasts. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1988.
A True and Plaine Declaration of the Horrible Treasons. London, 1584. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1667>.
Ayres, P. J. "The Revision of Lust's Dominion." Notes and Queries 17.6 (1970): 212 – 213.
Bacon, Francis. Sylua Syluarum: Or a Naturall Historie in Ten Centuries. London, 1626. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.882003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99842617>.
---. Certaine Considerations Touching the Better Pacification, and Edification of the Church. London, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1667>.
---. Cases of Treason. London, 1641. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:51107>.
Barish, Jonas. The Antitheatrical Prejudice. California: U of California P, 1985.
Barker, Francis. The Culture of Violence: Essays on Tragedy and History. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1994.
Barker, Sheila. "Poussin, Plague, and Early Modern Medicine." The Art Bulletin 86.4 (2004): 659-689.
Barnes, Barnabe. The Divils Charter. London, 1607. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:210766>.
---. A Divine Centurie of Spirituall Sonnets. London, 1595. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:14780>.
---. Parthenophil and Parthenophe. London, 1593. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19397>.

---. Foure Bookes of Offices. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:7337>.

Barrough, Philip. The Method Of Phisick: Containing the Causes, Signes, and Cures of Inward Diseases in Mans Body, From the Head to the Foote. London, 1601. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99837045>.

Barlow, William. A Defence of the Articles of the Protestants Religion. London, 1601. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1011>.

Baron, S. A. "Thomas Gainsford." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/10284>

Bauckham, Richard. Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth Century Apocalypticism, Millennarianism, and the English Reformation from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brighton. Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978

Baudin, Maurice. "The Role of the ghost in Hamlet." Modern Language Notes 37 (1922): 185-186.

Battenhouse, Roy. "The Ghost in Hamlet: A Catholic Linchpin?" Studies in Philology 48.2 (1951): 161-192.

Beard, Thomas. The Pope of Rome or The Pope is Antichrist. London, 1625. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1279>.

---. A Retractive from the Romish Religion. London, 1616. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19466>.

Bedle, Thomas. The Princelie Progresse of the Church Militant. London, 1610. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 September 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:8336621>.

Berger, William, and Sidney L. Sondergard. An Index of Characters in Early Modern English Drama: Printed Plays 1500-1660. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1998.

Bell, Thomas. The Popes Funerall: Containing an Exact and Pithy Reply, to a Pretended Answere of a Shamelesse and Foolish Libell, Called, The Forerunner Of Bells Downfall. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99856607>.

---. The Survey of Popery. London, 1602. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 September 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99856607>.
Bennett, H. S. Shakespeare's Audience. Pennsylvania: Folcroft, 1976.
Birnie, William. The Blame of Kirk-Buriall. Edinburgh, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19886>.
Boemus, Johannes. The Fardle of Facions. Trans. William Waterman. London, 1555. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. 20 Oct. 2012 <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:2921>.
Brigden, Susan. "Youth and the English Reformation." Past & Present 95 (1982): 37-67.
Bright, Timothy. A Treatise of Melancholie. London, 1586. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6813>.
Broughton, Hugh. The First Part of the Resolution of Religion. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6813>.
Buccola, Regina. "Virgin Fairies and Imperial Whores: The Unstable Ground of Religious Iconography in Thomas Dekker's The Whore of Babylon." Marian Moments in Early Modern British Drama. Ed. Regina Buccola and Lisa Hopkins. London: Ashgate, 2007. 141-160.
Budiansky, Stephen. Her Majesty's Spymaster: Elizabeth I, Sir Francis Walshingham, and the Birth of Modern Espionage. London: Penguin, 2006.
Burton, Robert. The Anatomy Of Melancholy: What It Is. Oxford, 1621. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:23165>.
Campion, Larry S. Thomas Dekker and the Traditions of English Drama. Michigan: U of Michigan P, 1985.
Capp, Bernard. "Playgoers, Players and Cross-Dressing in Early Modern London: The Bridewell Evidence." The Seventeenth Century 18 (2003): 159-171.
Carruthers, Mary. The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2008.
Cathcart, Charles. "Lust's Dominion; Or, The Lascivious Queen: Authorship, Date, and Revision." The Review of English Studies 52 (2001): 360-375.
Chalk, Darryl. "Contagious Emulation: Antitheatricality and Theatre as plague in Troilus and Cressida." This Earthly Stage: World and Stage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England. Ed. Brett D. Hirsch and Christopher Wortham. Belgium: Turnhout, 2010. 75-101.

---. “To creep in mine eyes: Theatre and Secret Contagion in Twelfth Night”. Rapt in Secret Studies. Ed. Darryl Chalk and Laurie Johnson. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2010.
Chapman, Harmon M. Sensations and Phenomenology. Bloomington: U of Indiana P, 1966.
Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Plough-Mans Tale. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:17670>.
Christianson, Paul. Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1978.
Clapham, Henoch. His Demaunds and Answeres touching the Pestilence. London, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8446>.
---. A Chronological Discourse touching the Church, Christ, Antichrist, Gig & Magog. London, 1609. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8445>.
---. Errour on the Left Hand. London, 1608. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19246>.
---. A Briefe of the Bible. London, 1596. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8441>.
Clark, Glenn. “Speaking Daggers: Shakespeare’s Troubled Ministers.” Shakespeare and Religious Change. Eds. Kenneth J. E. Graham and Philip D. Collington. New York: Palgrave, 2009. 176-195.
Collinson, Patrick. The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: Palgrave Macillman, 1988.
---. “John Fielde.” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/9248?docPos=2>
Cook, Ann Jennalie. The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare’s London 1576-1642. Princeton: U of Princeton P, 1981.
Corthell, Dolan, Highley, and Arthur F. Marotti. Catholic Culture in Early Modern England. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 2007.
Cox, John D. The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama 1350-1642. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2000.
---. “Stage Devilry in Two King’s Men Plays of 1606.” The Modern Language Review. 93.4 (1998): 943-947.

---. “Barnabe Barnes.” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/1467>
Craik, Katharine. Reading Sensations in Early Modern England. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
Craik, and Tanya Pollard. Shakespearean Sensations: Experiencing Literature in Early Modern England. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2013.
Cressy, David. “The Protestant Calendar and the Vocabulary of Celebration in Early Modern England.” The Journal of British Studies 29.1 (1990): 31-52.
Cross, Gustav K. “The Authorship of Lust’s Dominion.” Studies in Philology 55.1 (1958): 39-61.
Cross, Simon. “Bedlam in Mind: Seeing and Reading Historical Images of Madness.” European Journal of Cultural Studies 15.19 (2012): 19-34.
Cummings, Brian. “Religion.” The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2012. 663-679.
Cust, and Ann Hughes. Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642. Michigan: U of Michigan P, 1989.
Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. “Summary Justice in Early Modern London.” English Historical Review 492.41 (2006): 796-822.
Dailey, Alice. The English Martyr from Reformation to Revolution. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 2012.
Danou, Photini. “Catholic Treason Trials in Elizabethan England.” Journal of Early Modern History 14.5 (2010): 393-415.
Dawson, Anthony. “The Secular Theater.” Shakespeare and Religious Change. Eds. Kenneth J. E. Graham and Philip D. Collington. New York: Palgrave, 2009. 238-260.
Deios, Laurence. That the Pope is That Antichrist. London, 1590. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18839>.
Dekker, Thomas. “Lust's Dominion, or The Lascivious Queen.” The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Vol. 4. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1953. 4 vols.
---. “Lust's Dominion, or The Lascivious Queen.” Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama. Ed. John Le Gay Brereton. Vol. 5. Britain: Uystpruyst, 1931. 5 vols.
---. The Double PP. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. University of Southern Queensland. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:5527>.
---. The Wonderfull Yeare. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. University of Southern Queensland. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:191697>.
---. The Magnificent Entertainment. London, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013.

<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10075>.
---. The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:5555>.
---. Jests to Make You Merie. London, 1607. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1442>.
Dent, Arthur. The Ruine of Rome. London, 1607.
Dessen, and Leslie Thomson. A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580-1642. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1999.
Diehl, Huston. Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England. Ithaca: U of Cornell P, 1997.
Dingwall, Helen M. "Peter Lowe." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5431>
"Dissonant, adj." OED Online. Oxford University Press, March 2013. Web. 24 March 2014.
Dolan, Frances E. Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture. Indiana: U of Notre Dame P, 1999.
Downame, George. A Treatise Concerning Antichrist. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:25487>.
Duffy, Eamon. The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580. Yale: U of Yale P, 1992.
Dures, Alan. English Catholicism 1558-1642: Continuity and Change. Harlow: Longman, 1883.
Dyce, Alexander. The Dramatic Works of Robert Greene, To Which Are His Poems With Some Account of the Author and Notes. London: Pickering, 1831.
Earl, Anthony. "Late Elizabethan Devotional Poetry and Calvinism: A Re-Evaluation of Barnabe Barnes." Renaissance Studies 11.3 (1997): 223-240.
Est, William. Sathans Sowing Season. London, 1611. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19183>.
Ewich, Johann Von. Of the duetie of a faithfull and Wise Magistrate. London, 1583. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:1935>.
Fellheimer, Jeannette. "Barnabe Barnes' Use of Geoffrey Fenton's Historie of Guicciardin." 57.5 (1942): 358-359.
Fenton, Roger. A Perfume Against the Noysome Pestilence. London, 1603.

Fielde, John. A Caveat for Parsons Howlet. London, 1581. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18111>.
Fletcher, John. The Humorous Lieutenant. London, 1697. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:40928>.
Floyd-Wilson, Mary. Occult Knowledge, Science, and Gender on the Shakespearean Stage. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2013.
Floyd-Wilson, and Garret A. Sullivan. Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
Folkerth, Wes. The Sound of Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 2002.
Foucalt, Michel. Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. Trans. Jonathan Murphy. London: Tavistock, 1967.
Fox, John. The Pope Confuted. London, 1580. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:16506>.
Gainsford, Thomas. The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seventh. London, 1610.
Gasper, Julia. The Dragon and the Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
Goldberg, Jonathan. Queering the Renaissance. Durham: U of Duke P, 1993.
---. Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities. Stanford: U of Stanford P, 1992.
Gowland, Angus. "The Problem of Early Modern Melancholy." Past & Present 191 (2006): 77-120.
Gosson, Stephen. The School of Abuses. 1587, London. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:5990>.
Grahame, Simion. The Anatomie of Humors. Edinburgh, 1609. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:3538>.
Graves, Michael. "Thomas Norton the Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P. 1559-1581." Historical Journal 23 (1980): 17-35.
Graves, Thornton. "The Adventures of Hamlet's Ghost." Philological Quarterly 4 (1925): 139-150.
Greenblatt, Stephen. Hamlet in Purgatory. New Jersey: U of Princeton P, 2001.
---. Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare. New York: Norton, 2005.
Greg, Walter Wilson. "Hamlet's Hallucination." The Modern Language Review 12.4 (1917): 393-421.

Greene, Robert. The Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Ed. G. B. Harrison. London: R Holden, 1927.
---. The Spanish Masquerado. London, 1589. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6167>.
---. Planetomachia. London, 1585. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6160>.
---. Greenes Vision. London, 1590. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6140>.
---. Mamillia: A Mirrour or looking glasse for the Ladies of Englande. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:20420>.
Grell, Ole Peter. "Plague In Elizabethan and Stuart London: The Dutch Response." Medical History 34 (2009): 424-439.
Gurr, Andrew. The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642. New York: U of Cambridge P, 1992.
Haigh, Christopher. "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation." Past & Present 93 (1981): 37-69.
Hall, Joseph. Virgidemiarum. London, 1598. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:176497>.
Hammill, Graham. "Miracles and Plagues: Plague Discourse as Political Thought." Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies 10.2 (2010): 85-104.
Hamilton, and Richard Strier. Religion Literature & Politics in Post-Reformation England 1540-1688. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1996.
Hankins, Jeffery. "Papists, Power, and Puritans: Catholic Officeholding and the Rise of the Puritan Faction in Early-Seventeenth-Century Essex." The Catholic Historical Review 95.4 (2009): 689-717.
Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Audience. New York: U of Columbia P, 1941.
Harris, Jonathan Gil. "The Smell of Macbeth." Shakespeare Quarterly 58.4 (2007): 465-486.
---. Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1998.
---. Sick Economies: Drama, Mercantilism and Disease in Shakespeare's England. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2004.
Harris, and Natasha Korda. Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2002.
Harrison, John. The Tragicall Life And Death Of Muley Abdala Melek The Late King Of Barbarie. Delph, 1633. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012.

<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:17114>.
Harsnett, Samuel. A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures. London, 1603.
Harvey, Gabriel. Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey. Ed. Edward John Long Scott. Vol. 1. Columbia: Camden, 1884. 33 vols.
Habsburg, Maximilian Von. Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Imitatio Christi 1425-1650: From Late Medieval Classic to Early Modern Bestseller. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.
Hattori, Natsu. "The Pleasure of your Bedlam: The Theatre of Madness in the Renaissance." History of Psychiatry 6.9 (1995): 283-308.
Healy, Margaret. Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
Heidegger, Martin. Being and Time. Boston: Blackwell, 1967.
Heinemann, Margot. Puritanism and Theatre. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1982.
Herbert, William. A Letter Written by A True Christian Catholike, to a Romaine Pretended Catholike. London, 1586. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:13112>.
Herring, Francis. Popish Pietie. London, 1610. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19650>.
Hill, Christopher. Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1971.
---. The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution. Yale: U of Yale P, 1991.
---. Change and Continuity in Seventeenth Century England. Harvard: U of Harvard P, 1975.
Hillgarth, Jocelyn. "The Image of Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 59 (1996): 119-129.
Hillman, David. Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2007.
Hillman. Eds. The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe. London: Routledge, 1997.
Hirsch, Brett D. "From Jew to Puritan: The Emblematic Owl in Early English Culture." This Earthly Stage: World and Stage in Late Medieval and Early Modern England. Ed. Brett D. Hirsch and Christopher Wortham. Belgium: Turnhout, 2010. 131-171.
Hobbes, Stephen. A New Treatise of the Pestilence. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18482>.
Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. London, 1651. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013.

<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:62954:2>
Honigmann, Ernst. Shakespeare: The Lost Years. Manchester: U of Manchester P, 1985.
Hoy, Cyrus. Introduction, Notes, and Commentaries to texts in 'The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker'. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1980.
Howard, Jean. The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England. New York: Routledge, 1994.
Hunt, Mary. Thomas Dekker A Study. New York: U of Columbia P, 1911.
Hunter, Robert G. Shakespeare and the Mystery of God's Judgements. Georgia: U of Georgia P, 1976.
James, King. A Counterblaste to Tobacoo. London, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9591>.
---. Basilikon Doron. Edenburgh, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:5872>.
---. Daemonologie. Edinburgh, 1597. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:7990>.
---. His Majesties Speach in This Last Session of Parliament. London, 1605. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:7990>.
Johnson, Bruce. "Hamlet: Voice, Music, Sound." Popular Music 24.2 (2005): 257 – 267.
Johnson, Richard. A Lanterne-Light For Loyall Subjects. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 January 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844822>.
---. Seven Champions of Christendom. London, 1596. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 January 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99844815>
Jones, Eldred D. The Elizabethan Image of Africa. Virginia: U of Virginia P, 1971.
Jones, John. The Arte and Science of Preserving Bodie and Soule. London, 1579. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:150652>.
Joseph, Miriam. "Discerning the Ghost in Hamlet." PMLA 76.5 (1961): 493-502.

Jowitt, Claire. “Political Allegory in Late Elizabethan and Early Jacobean “Turk” Plays: Lust’s Dominion and The Turke.” Comparative Drama 36.3 (2002): 411 – 443.
Kellwaye, Simon. A Defensative Against the Plague. London, 1593. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9748>.
Kennaway, James. Bad Vibrations: The History of the Idea of Music as a Cause of Disease. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.
Kikuchi, Shigeo. “Unveiling the dramatic Secret of Ghost in Hamlet.” Journal of Literary Semantics 39.2 (2010): 103-117.
Kinder, Gordon A. “Religious Literature as an Offensive Weapon: Cipriano de Valera’s Part in England’s War with Spain.” The Sixteenth Century Journal 19.2 (1988): 223-235.
Knowles, Ronald. “Hamlet and Count-Humanism.” Renaissance Quarterly 52.4 (1999): 1046-1069.
Krantz, Susan. “Thomas Dekker’s Political Commentary in the Whore of Babylon.” Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 35.2 (1995): 271-291.
Lake, Peter. “The Significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist.” Journal of Ecclesiastical History 31.2 (1980): 161-178.
---. “William Bradshaw, Antichrist and the Community of the Godly.” Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36.4 (1985): 570-589.
---. “The Structures of a Prejudice.” Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642. Eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642. Michigan: U of Michigan P, 1989.
Lake, and Maria Dowling. Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England. London: Croom Helm 1987.
Lake, and Michael Questier. “Puritans, Papists, and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context.” The Journal of Modern History 72.3 (2000): 587-627.
---. “Agency, Appropriation and Rhetoric under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England.” Past & Present 153.11 (1996): 64-107.
---. The Anti-Christ’s Lewd Hat. Great Britain: U of Yale P, 2002.
Lamont, William. Puritanism and Historical Controversy. Montreal: U of McGill-Queen P, 1996.
Landau, Aaron. “Let Me Not Burst In Ignorance: Skepticism and Anxiety in Hamlet.” English Studies 82.3 (2001): 218-230.
Leinwand, Theodore B. The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy 1603-1613. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986.
Levine, Laura. Men in Women’s Clothing: Anti-theatricality and Effeminization 1579-1642. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1994.
Lewis, Michael, and Tanja Staehler. Phenomenology. London: Continuum, 2010.
Lezra, Jacques. “A Spaniard Is No Englishman: The Ghost of Spain and the British Imaginary.” Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 39.1 (2009): 119-141.
Lindley, David. Shakespeare and Music. London: Arden, 2006.

Lock, Julian. "How Many Tercios Has the Pope? The Spanish War and the Sublimation of Elizabethan Anti-Popery." The Historical Association 81.262 (1996): 197-214.
---. "William Parry." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/21437?docPos=3>
Lodge, Thomas. A Treatise of the Plague. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9277>.
Lodge, and Robert Greene. A Looking Glasse for London. London, 1594. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10112>.
LoPresto, Michael. "Experimenting with Consonance and Dissonance." Physics Education 44.2 (2009): 145 – 150.
Lowe, Peter. The Whole Course Of Chirurgerie: Wherein is Briefly Set Downe the Causes, Signes, Prognostications & Curations of All Sorts of Tumors, Wounds, Ulcers, Fractures, Dislocations & All Other Diseases, Usually Practised by Chirurgions, According to the Opinion of All Our Auncient Doctours in Chirurgerie. London, 1597. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10183>.
Loyer, Pierre Le. A Treatise of Specters or Straunge Sights, Visions and Apparitions appearing sensibly unto men. London, 1605. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8919>.
Luther, Martin. Special and Chosen Sermons. Trans. W. G. London, 1578. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9413>.
Lynne, Walter. A most necessarie Treatise declaring the beginning and ending of all Poperie or the Popish Kingdom. London, 1588. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:27856>.
---. The Beginning and Endyne of all Popery. London, 1548. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9430>.

MacCaffrey, Wallace. The Shaping of the Elizabethan Regime: Elizabethan Politics 1558-1572. Princeton: U of Princeton, 1969.
MacCulloch, Diarmaid. Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700. London: Penguin, 2004.
Mackay, Hugh. "Lust's Dominion and the Readmission of the Jews." The Review of English Studies 59 (2008): 542-567.
Mallett, Michael. The Borgias: The Rise and Fall of a Renaissance Dynasty. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1969.
Marlowe, Christopher, et al. "Lust's Dominion, or The Lascivious Queen." Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama. Ed. John Le Gay Brereton. Vol. 5. Louvain: U of Louvain P, 1931. 5 vols.
---. Doctor Faustus. Ed. J. B. Steane. London: Penguin, 1969.
---. The Massacre at Paris. Ed. J. B. Steane. London: Penguin, 1969.
Magnus, Laury. "Mimetic Hearing and Meta-Hearing in Hamlet." Who Hears in Shakespeare? Auditory Worlds on Stage and Screen. Ed. Laury Magnus and Walter Cannon. New Jersey: U of Fairleigh Dickinson, 2012.
Marotti, Arthur F. Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 2005.
---. Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts. Northampton: Interlink, 1999.
Mason, Harold A. "The Ghost in Hamlet." Cambridge Quarterly 3.2 (1968): 127-152.
Mason, John. The Turke. London, 1610. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:12733>.
Mason, Thomas. A Revelation of the Revelation. London, 1619. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:25079>.
Mayer, Jean-Christophe. Shakespeare's Hybrid Faith: History, Religion and the Stage. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
Mazzio, Carla. "The History of Air: Hamlet and the Trouble with Instruments." South Central Review 26.1-2 (2009): 153-196.
McGinn, Bernard. "Angel Pope and Papal Antichrist." Church History 47.2 (1978): 155-173.
McCoog, Thomas. "The Flower of Oxford: The Role of Edmund Campion in Early Recusant Polemics." The Sixteenth Century Journal 24.4 (1993): 899-913.
McGrather, Patrick. Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I. London: Blandford, 1967.
McLaren, Anne. "Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism." *The American Historical Review* 107.3 (2002): 739-767.
McNeill, Ronald John. "Gowrie, John Ruthven, 3rd Earl." Encyclopædia Britannica. Ed. Hugh Chisholm. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2010.
Merriman, Roger. "Some Notes on the Treatment of the English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth." The American Historical Review. 13.3 (1908): 480-500.
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. Trans. Colin Smith. New York: Humanities Press, 1962.

Michalski, Sergiusz. Reformation and the Visual Arts: The Protestant Image Question in Western and Eastern Europe. London: Taylor & Francis, 2002.
Misner, Paul. "Newman and the Tradition concerning the Papal Antichrist." Church History 42.3 (1973): 377-395.
Miller, John. "Britain 1600." History Today 50.9 (2000): 35
Milton, Anthony. Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2002.
Milward, Peter. The Catholicism of Shakespeare's Plays. Tokyo: U of Sophia P, 1997.
---. "Thomas Wright." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/30059?docPos=1>.
Misner, Paul. "Newman and the Tradition concerning the Papal Antichrist." Church History 42.3 (1973): 377-395.
Morley, Thomas. A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke. London, 1597. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:12119>.
Munkhoff, Richelle. "Searchers of the Dead: Authority, Marginality, and the Interpretation of Plague in England 1574-1665." Gender & History 11.1 (1998): 1-29.
Naogeorg, Thomas. The Popish Kingdome. London, 1570. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:9789>.
Nash, Thomas. Have With You to Safron Walden. London, 1596. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10621>.
Natoli, Joseph. "Dimensions of Consciousness in Hamlet." Mosaic 19.1 (1986): 91-98.
Neely, Carol Thomas. Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture. Ithaca: U of Cornell P, 2004.
Nelson, Jeffrey. "Lust and Black Magic in Barnabe Barnes's Parthenphil and Parthenophe." The Sixteenth Century Journal 25.3 (1994): 595-608.
Newman, Kira. "Shutt Up: Bubonic Plague and Quarantine in Early Modern England." Journal of Social History 45.3 (2012): 809-834.
Nichols, Stephen. "Prophecy Makes Strange Bedfellows: On the History of Identifying the Antichrist." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 44.1 (2001): 75-85.
Núñez, Rafael V. "Melancholic Sounds: Singing Madness in Restoration Drama." Sederi 13 (2003): 219 – 227.
Oberman, Heiko. "Teufelsdreck: Eschatology and Scatology in the Old Luther" The Sixteenth Century Journal 19.3 (1988): 435-450.
Ochino, Bernardino. A Tragoedie or Dialogie of the Unjuste Usurped Primacue of the Bishop of Rome. London, 1549. Early English Books Online: Text Creation

Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:13756>.
O'Connell, Michael. The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm, Anti-Theatricalism, and the Image of the Elizabethan Theater. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1999.
Okines, Alexander. "Why Was There So Little Government Reaction to Gunpowder Plot?" Journal of Ecclesiastical History 55.2 (2004): 275-292.
Order of Praier and Thankes-Giving for the preservation of the Queenes Majesties life and salfetie: to be used of the Preachers and Ministers of the Dioces of Winchester. London, 1584. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:13802>.
Ozment, Steven. Protestants: the Birth of a Revolution. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
Ormerod, Oliver. The Picture of a Papist. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:13802>.
Panke, John. The Fal of Babel. Oxford, 1608. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:2488>.
Paracelsus. A Hundred and Fourteene Experiments and Cures of the Famous Physitian Philippus Aureolus Theoprastus Paracelsus. Trans. John Hester. London, 1583. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:14432>.
Park, and Lorraine J. Daston. "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century France and England." Past & Present 92 (1981): 20-54.
Parker, Robert. A Scholasticall Discovrse Against Symbolizing With Antichrist In Ceremonies: Especially in the Signe of the Crosse. Middelburg, 1607. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:15726>.
Paster, Gail Kern. Humoring The Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2004.
Pauck, Wilhelm. "The Nature of Protestantism." Church History 6.1 (1937): 3-23.
Payne, Michael. "What's the Matter with Hamlet?" Perspectives on Hamlet. Ed. William Holzberger and Peter Waldeck. Pennsylvania: U of Bucknell P, 1975. 100-111.
Peele, George. The Battell of Alcazar. London, 1594. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:10830>.

Peretz, Isabelle, and Robert Zatorre. "Brain Organization for Music Processing." Annual Review of Psychology 56 (2005): 89-114.
Pettegree, Andrew. "Walter Lynne." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/17272?docPos=2>.
Pettigrew, Todd. Shakespearean and the Practice of Physic. Delaware: U of Delaware P, 2007.
Philaretes. Work for Chimny-Sweepers: or a warning for Tabacconists. London, 1602. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:3747>.
Philopatris. An Humble Petition. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:15710>.
Plutarch. The Morals Written by the Learned Philosophy Plutarch. Trans. Philemon Holland. London, 1603.
Pollard, Tanya. "Beauty's Poisonous Properties." Shakespeare Studies 27 (1999): 187-210.
---. Drugs and Theater in Early Modern England. Oxford: U of Oxford, 2005.
---. "Audience Reception." The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2012. 458-473.
Porter, Roy. Mind-Forg'd Manacles: A History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency. London: Athlone Press, 1987.
Prendergast, Christopher. "Derrida's Hamlet." SubStance 34.1 (2005): 44-47.
Primaudaye, Peter De La. The French Academie. London, 1589. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:8717>.
Price, Daniel. David His Oath of Allegeance to Jerusalem. Oxford, 1613. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:15625>.
---. Spirituall Odours to the Memory of Prince Henry. Oxford, 1613. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:27002>.
Pricket, Robert. Times Anotomie. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:15666>.
Pye, Christopher. The Vanishing: Shakespeare, the Subject, and Early Modern Culture. Durham: U of Duke P, 2000.

---. The Regal Phantasm: Shakespeare and the Politics of Spectacle. London: Routledge, 1990.
Questier, Michael. "Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance." The Historical Journal 40.2 (1997): 311-329.
Rea, John. "Hamlet and The Ghost Again." The English Journal 18.3 (1929): 207-213.
Rhodes, John. An Answere to a Romish Rime Lately Printed. London, 1602. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:25073>.
---. A Briefe Summe of the Treason Intended Against the King and State. London, 1606. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:210096>.
Riordan, and Alex Ryrie. "Stephen Gardiner and the Making of a Protestant Villain." The Sixteenth Century Journal 34.4 (2003): 1039-1063.
Rogers, Thomas. An Historical Dialogve Touching Antichrist And Poperie: Drawen and Published for the Common Benefit and Comfort of our Church in These Dangerous Daies, & Against the Desperate Attemptes of the Vowed Adversaries of Jesus Christ, His Gospell, and this Florishing State. London, 1589. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2012. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:12367>.
Rosendale, Timothy. "Fiery Tounges: Language, Liturgy, and the Paradox of the English Reformation." Renaissance Quarterly 54.4 (2001): 1142-1164.
Rosenthal, David. Consciousness and Mind. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.
Rozett, Martha Tuck. The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy. Princeton: U of Princeton P, 1984.
Salkeld, Duncan. "New Allusions to London Shewes and Playhouses 1575-1604." Early Theatre 8.2 (2005): 101-108.
Sandy, Edwin. A Relation of the State of Religion. London, 1605. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:17153>.
Scott, Sarah. "The Empress of Babylon's 'Carbuncles and Rich Stones': The Metaphorizing of the Pox in Thomas Dekker's The Whore of Babylon." Early Theatre 7.1 (2004): 67 – 95.
Seargeant, Philip. "Discursive Diversity in the Textual Articulation of Epidemic Disease in Early Modern England." Language and Literature 16.4 (2007): 339-360.
Shakespeare, William. Hamlet. The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd ed. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.

---. Cymbeline. The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd ed. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.
---. Macbeth. The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd ed. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.
---. The Tempest. The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd ed. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.
---. A Midsummer Night's Dream. The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Ed. John Jowett, William Montgomery, Gary Taylor, and Stanley Wells. 2nd ed. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2005.
Shell, Alison. Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination 1558-1660. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1999.
---. Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2007.
Smith, Bruce R. The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.
---. "Hearing Green: Logomarginality in Hamlet." Early Modern Literary Studies 7.1 (2001): 1 – 2.
---. Phenomenal Shakespeare. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
Sohn, George. A Briefe and Learned Treatise. Cambridge, 1592. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:14493>.
Sommerville, Johann Peter. Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640. London: Longman, 1989.
Sprunger, Keith L. "Robert Parker." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/21334?docPos=1>.
Taplin, Mark. "Bernardino Ochino." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/2048>
Tarrago, Rafael. "Bloody Bess: The Persecution of Catholics in Elizabethan England." Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture 7:1 (2004): 117-133.
The Earl of Gowries Conspiracie against the Kings Majestie. London, 1603. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:178027:2>.
The Fierie Tryall of Gods Saints. London, 1611. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:6647>.
The Holy Bible 1611 King James Version. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2010.
The Geneva Bible 1560 Edition. Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2007.

Totaro, Rebecca. The Plague Epic in Early Modern England: Heroic Measures, 1603-1721. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.
---. The Plague in Print: Essential Elizabethan Sources 1558-1603. Pittsburgh: U of Duquesne P, 2010.
Totaro, and Ernest B. Gillman. Representing the Plague in Early Modern England. Co-edited with Ernest B. Gilman. New York: Routledge, 2011.
True and Wonderfull. London, 1614. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:4807>.
Twyning, John. "Thomas Dekker." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/7428?docPos=1>
Tyacke, Nicholas. AntiCalvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism 1590-1640. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1987.
Usher, Brett. "Arthur Dent." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/7511>.
---. "Josias Nichols." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/30059?docPos=1>.
Vaughan, Virginia. Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500 – 1800. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 2005.
Viret, Pierre. The Second Part of the Demoniacke Worlde. London, 1583. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:179298>.
Wadsworth, Frank W. "The Relationship of Lust's Dominion and John Mason's the Turke." English Literary History. 20.3 (1953): 194 – 199.
Walsham, Alexandra. "Domme Preachers? Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print." Past & Present 168 (2000): 72-123.
---. "The Fatall Vesper: Providentialism and Anti-Popery in Late Jacobean London." Past & Present 144 (1994): 36-87.
---. "Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England." London: The Royal Historical Society, 1993.
---. "Henoch Clapham." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/5431>
---. "Thomas Bell." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 2004. 2 Dec 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/view/article/2026?docPos=1>
Watt, Tessa. Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640. Cambridge: U of Cambridge P, 1994.
Webster, John. The Duchess of Malfi. The Oxford World's Classics. Ed. René Weis. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1998.

---. The White Devil. The Oxford World's Classics. Ed. René Weis. Oxford: U of Oxford P, 1998.
West, Robert H. "King Hamlet's Ambiguous Ghost." PMLA 70.5 (1955): 1107-1117.
Whetenhall, Thomas. A Discourse of the Abuses Now in Question in the Churches of Christ. Amsterdam, 1606.
White, R. S. Shakespeare: Readers, Audiences, and Players. Western Australia: UWA, 1998.
Whitford, David. "The Papal Antichrist: Martin Luther and the Underappreciated Influence of Lorenzo Valla." Renaissance Quarterly 61 (2008): 26-52.
Wiener, Carol Z. "The Beleaguered Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism." Past & Present 51.5 (1971): 27-62.
Willet, Andrew. A Catholicon, That Is, A Generall Preservative or Remedie Against the Pseudocatholike Religion. London, 1602. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18838>.
---. Synopsis Papismi. London, 1600. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:18838>.
Williamson, Elizabeth. The Materiality of Religion in Early Modern English Drama. London: Ashgate, 2009.
Wirsung, Christof. The General Practise of Physicke. London, 1605. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:19166>.
Woodes, Nathaniel. An excellent new commedie intutled The Conflict of Conscience. London, 1581.
Wolin, Sheldon. "Calvin and the Reformation: The Political Education of Protestantism." The American Political Science Review 51.2 (1957): 428-453.
Wright, Leonard. The Hunting of Antichrist. London, 1589. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013.<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:21112>.
Wright, Thomas. The Passions of the Minde in Generall. London, 1604. Early English Books Online: Text Creation Partnership. U of Southern Queensland Library. Web. 20 October 2013. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:21840>.