



Article scientifique

Article

2000

Published version

Open Access

This is the published version of the publication, made available in accordance with the publisher's policy.

---

## "Enter the Ghost of Andrea": Recovering Thomas Kyd's Two-Part Play

---

Erne, Lukas Christian

### How to cite

ERNE, Lukas Christian. 'Enter the Ghost of Andrea': Recovering Thomas Kyd's Two-Part Play. In: English literary renaissance, 2000, vol. 30, p. 339–372. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6757.2000.tb01174.x

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:11988>

Publication DOI: [10.1111/j.1475-6757.2000.tb01174.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.2000.tb01174.x)



LUKAS ERNE

---

*"Enter the Ghost of Andrea":  
Recovering Thomas Kyd's Two-Part Play*

DESTINY was not kind to Thomas Kyd. Reality caught up with the fiction he had so skillfully plotted when—after imprisonment and torture—he tried to obtain justice with as little success as Hieronimo.<sup>1</sup> History has played him another bad trick. Writing plays from c. 1583 until 1594, "industrious Kyd" no doubt produced a considerable dramatic output, but the greatest part of it has passed into oblivion.<sup>2</sup> More than forty years after his death, Heywood could still refer to him as "famous Kyd," but after four hundred years the epithet no longer applies.<sup>3</sup> Most cruelly, Kyd's pre-1589 *Hamlet* helped prompt Shakespeare to write what is today the most famous of all tragedies, but has itself fallen prey to the ravages of time.<sup>4</sup> Does modern criticism grant the justice that destiny and history have denied Kyd?

It is true that the twentieth century has recognized *The Spanish Tragedy*—probably the most successful play on the public stage up to 1642—as the fine drama it is, and the amount of critical attention it has received has turned the play into one of the canonical classroom texts. On the other hand, Kyd, perhaps more than any other great playwright, has been reduced to one play. *The First Part of Hieronimo* is an interesting albeit problematic companion piece to *The Spanish Tragedy*. *Soliman and Perseda* is in many ways an innovative and daring play which can be ascribed to

1. The best account of Kyd's tribulations with the Privy Council in the last year of his life—famously involving Marlowe, with whom he had been "wrytinge in one chamber"—is in Arthur Freeman, *Thomas Kyd: Facts and Problems* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 25–32. I am grateful to Emrys Jones, Michael Suarez, S.J., Richard Waswo, and Brian Gibbons for their assistance with this project and to the Marquis de Amodio for the Berrow Scholarship at Lincoln College, Oxford, which made research for this essay possible.

2. Thomas Dekker, *A Knights Conjuring*, ed. Larry M. Robbins (The Hague, 1974), p. 155.

3. Thomas Heywood, *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells* (1635), sig. S1v.

4. For a balanced account of the authorship question of the early *Hamlet*, see Freeman, pp. 39–48.

Kyd on good grounds. *Cornelia*, the closet tragedy translated from Garnier, offers a boldly skeptical view of the beginnings of the Roman empire which powerfully resonates in the context of the succession debate of the 1590s. These plays, however, are forgotten by all but specialists.<sup>5</sup> Even Peter B. Murray, who has written a full-length study of *The Spanish Tragedy* with the misleading title *Thomas Kyd*, disposed of them with a few words: "a book about Thomas Kyd turns out to be a book about *The Spanish Tragedy*. And this is as it should be."<sup>6</sup>

The entirety of the dramatic works of Thomas Kyd, whom T. S. Eliot called an "extraordinary dramatic (if not poetic) genius," deserves closer scrutiny than has hitherto been allowed.<sup>7</sup> This essay will begin with *The First Part of Ieronimo. With the Warres of Portugall, and the life and death of Don Andraea* (hereafter "*1 Hieronimo*") which was printed in 1605. I will argue that the play's relationship to *The Spanish Tragedy* has hitherto been misunderstood. It represents a post-1600 revision of Kyd's genuine first part—called "doneoracio" in Henslowe's diary—of which about one-third survives in the text of *1 Hieronimo*. At the end of my analysis, not only *1 Hieronimo* but also *The Spanish Tragedy* emerges as a different play from the one we have hitherto studied. Like the second parts of *Tamburlaine* and *Henry IV* or like *Antonio's Revenge*, it is a sequel that needs to be read in the context of its first part.

## II

Scholarship on the anonymous *1 Hieronimo* has been dominated by the question of its origin and its relationship to the fore-piece to *The Spanish Tragedy* referred to in Henslowe's diary. Among the performances by Lord Strange's Men listed there, the diary features the following entries:<sup>8</sup>

Rd at spanes comodye donne oracioe the 23 of febreary 1591	xiij s vj d
Rd at the comodey of doneoracio the 13 march 1591	xxiiij <sup>s</sup>
Rd at Jeronymo the 14 march 1591	iiij li xj s

5. The best study of Kyd's complete works is still Freeman's.

6. (New York, 1969), p. 5. Peter Happé's recent *English Drama before Shakespeare* (London and New York, 1999) has a subchapter entitled "Thomas Kyd (1558–94)" (pp. 202–10) which similarly confines itself to *The Spanish Tragedy*.

7. *Selected Essays* (London, 1932), p. 142.

8. I quote from *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (Cambridge, 1961), pp. 16–19. It should be noted that Henslowe carried over old-style year-dates well beyond 25 March (Lady Day). Following standard practice, the diary should read "30 of marche 1592" etc. The following year, he applied new-style year-dates (e.g.: "8 of Jenewary 1593"), a practice that was becoming increasingly common.

Rd at Joronymo the 20 marche 1591	xxxviii s
Rd at doneoracio the 30 of marche 1591	xxxix s
Rd at Jeronymo the 7 of ap'ell 1591	xxvjs
Rd at the comodey of Jeronymo the 10 of ap'ell 1591	xxviii s
Rd at Joronymo the 14 ap'elle 1591	xxxiij s
Rd at the comodey Jeronymo the 22 of ap'ell 1591	xvij s
Rd at Jeronymo the 24 of ap'ell 1592	xxviii s
Rd at Jeronymo the 2 of maye 1592	xxxiiij s
Rd at Jeronymo the 9 of maye 1592	xxvj s
Rd at Jeronymo the 13 of maye 1592	iiij <sup>h</sup> 4 <sup>s</sup>
Rd at the comodey of Jeronymo the 21 of maye 1592	xxviii s
Rd at Jeronymo the 22 of maye 1592	xxvij s
Rd at Jeronymo the 27 of maye 1592	xxiiij s
Rd at Jeronymo the 9 of June 1592	xxviii s
Rd at Joronymo the 18 of June 1592	xxiiiij s
Rd at the comodey of Jeronymo the 20 of June 1592	xv s
Rd at Joronymo the 30 of desember 1592	iiij <sup>h</sup> x <sup>s</sup>
Rd at Jeronymo the 8 of Jenewary 1593	xxij s
Rd at Jeronymo the 22 of Jenewary 1593	xx <sup>s</sup>

Sidney Lee believed that "Ieronymo" refers to 1 *Hieronimo*, and that by "spanes comodye donne oracoe," "comodey of done oracio," "done oracio," and "comodey Ieronymo," Henslowe meant *The Spanish Tragedy*.<sup>9</sup> Today most scholars agree that the contrary is true. "Ieronymo" is the title under which Kyd's contemporaries knew and parodied *The Spanish Tragedy*. The entries also document that the companion-piece was clearly less popular and the takings more modest. When "Jeronemo" or "Joronymo" was revived in 1597 for a run of thirteen performances, the "doneoracio" (hereafter "*Don Horatio*") had disappeared from the repertoire. On three occasions, *The Spanish Tragedy* was performed immediately after its companion-piece: March 13 and 14, March 22 (Saturday) and 24 (Monday), and May 21 and 22. This, too, suggests that *Don Horatio* was a fore-piece to, or formed a two-part play with, *The Spanish Tragedy*.

Critics have disagreed about whether *The Spanish Tragedy* was written before or after *Don Horatio*. One reason for assuming the former play to be a sequel is the passages that allude to a conflict preceding the beginning of *The Spanish Tragedy*. The matter to which they refer—centering on an affair between Bel-imperia and Andrea, and Castile's wrath at its discovery—is never explained or developed. I quote the relevant passages:

9. *Dictionary of National Biography*, XI, 349–52.

*Andrea.* In secret I possess'd a worthy dame,  
Which hight sweet Bel-imperia by name. (1.1.10–11)<sup>10</sup>

*Lorenzo.* [*to Pedringano*] Thus stands the case; it is not long thou know'st,  
Since I did shield thee from my father's wrath  
For thy conveyance in Andrea's love,  
For which thou wert adjudg'd to punishment. (2.1.45–48)

*Lorenzo.* [*to Bel-imperia*] Why then, remembering that old disgrace  
Which you for Don Andrea had endur'd (3.10.54–55)

*Cast.* Welcome Balthazar,  
Welcome brave prince, the pledge of Castile's peace:  
And welcome Bel-imperia. How now, girl?  
Why com'st thou sadly to salute us thus?  
Content thyself, for I am satisfied,  
It is not now as when Andrea liv'd,  
We have forgotten and forgiven that,  
And thou art graced with a happier love. (3.14.106–113)

<sup>1</sup> *Hieronimo*, however, does not appear to deal with any of these events. After the King has created Hieronimo Marshall of Spain, news is given of Portugal's refusal to pay tribute to Spain. Andrea is sent to the Portuguese court as an ambassador. Injured in his pride, Lorenzo plans a plot on Andrea's life (1.1). Andrea takes leave of Bel-imperia and entrusts her to Horatio's care (1.2). Lorenzo hires Lazarotto, a "discontented courtier," to murder Andrea on his return from Portugal. The villains' conversation is overheard by Hieronimo and Horatio, who plan to thwart Lorenzo's plot (1.3). Arrived at the Portuguese court, Andrea's claim for tribute is rejected. He declares war on the Portuguese and challenges Balthazar to meet him during the battle (2.1). Forging further Machiavellian plans, Lorenzo asks Alcario to disguise himself as Andrea in order to woo Bel-imperia (2.2). Hieronimo and Horatio write a letter to Andrea to inform him of Balthazar's intentions (2.3). Lorenzo's plans fail as Lazarotto mistakenly kills the disguised Alcario. Lazarotto's murder is discovered, but the courtier is silenced by Lorenzo who, after promising to obtain a pardon, has him killed (2.4 and 2.5). Andrea, only just returned from Portugal and preparing for the battle, is again bidding farewell to Bel-imperia (2.6). Leaders of the two armies meet in verbal skirmishes before the beginning of the actual fight (3.1). During the battle, Andrea is killed

10. *The Spanish Tragedy* is quoted from Philip Edwards' edition in the Revels Plays series (Manchester, 1959). *The First Part of Hieronimo* and Kyd's other works are quoted from *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, ed. F. S. Boas (Oxford, 1901).

by Balthazar and his soldiers, but Horatio revenges his friend's death by taking Balthazar captive and leading the Spanish army to victory (3.2). As the funeral procession passes over the stage, Revenge denies the Ghost of Andrea's request to speak to Horatio (3.3). After Andrea's funeral, the Spanish army, Horatio, Lorenzo, and their prisoner are set to return to Spain. Hieronimo speaks the epilogue (3.4).

Critics have tried to account for the origin of *1 Hieronimo* in two radically opposed ways: one group has argued that *1 Hieronimo* (or the text from which it originates) and *The Spanish Tragedy* form a two-part play by Kyd composed in the order in which the events are dramatized. The other group has held that *1 Hieronimo* is a clumsy attempt by an anonymous and moderately gifted writer to make money from the popularity of *The Spanish Tragedy*. The first group includes F. G. Fleay, Sidney Lee, Dr. Markscheffel, Gregor Sarrazin, Josef Schick, and, among more recent critics, Andrew S. Cairncross.<sup>11</sup> The supporters of the latter group include Rudolf Fischer, F. S. Boas, E. K. Chambers, Félix Carrère, Philip Edwards, Arthur Freeman, and John Reibetanz.<sup>12</sup>

Fleay's, Lee's, and Sarrazin's views were not based on any firm evidence. Schick pointed out significant "stylistic resemblances in tropes and figures, parallel passages, ridiculous puns, common geographical mistakes" (p. xviii) which could argue for Kyd's authorship. In the introduction to his edition of *1 Hieronimo* and *The Spanish Tragedy* as a two-part play, Cairncross gives the reasons for his revival of a view that had not found any prominent supporters since the beginning of the century: "In the last half-century, however, we have had the revolution in the study of Elizabethan texts caused by the 'memorial' theory of corrupt quartos like *1 Hieronimo*; and, if we assume that this is a memorial version of an original first part by Kyd, we may now return to a modified form of the

11. F. G. Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), II, 27; Sidney Lee, in *Dictionary of National Biography*, XI, 349; Dr. Markscheffel, "Thomas Kyd's Tragödien," *Deutsche Schulprogramme* 619 (1886), 1–20; and "Thomas Kyd's Tragödien (Fortsetzung und Schluß)," *Deutsche Schulprogramme* 627 (1887), 1–12; Gregor Sarrazin, *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 54–58; *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Josef Schick, *Temple Dramatists* (London, 1898), pp. xvi–xviii; [*The Spanish Comedy, or The First Part of Hieronimo and The Spanish Tragedy [or, Hieronimo is Mad Again]*], ed. Andrew S. Cairncross, *Regents Renaissance Drama* (London, 1967), pp. 100–12.

12. Rudolf Fischer, *Zur Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie von ihren ersten Anfängen bis zu Shakespeare* (Strasbourg, 1893), pp. 100–12; *The Works of Thomas Kyd*, ed. Boas, pp. xli–xliv; E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), II, 122; II, 210–11; III, 396; IV, 22–23; Félix Carrère, *Le Théâtre de Thomas Kyd* (Toulouse, 1951), pp. 295–98; *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Edwards, pp. 137–38; Freeman, *Thomas Kyd*, pp. 175–77; John Reibetanz, "Hieronimo in Decimosexto," *Renaissance Drama* 5 (1972), 89–121.

earlier view" (p. xiv). . . . "It therefore seems reasonable to suggest as the original of which 1 *Hieronimo* is a memorial version a longer good text by Kyd, *The Spanish Comedy*, which preceded *The Spanish Tragedy* and combined with it to form a two-part play" (p. xix). Unfortunately, Cairncross does not show in detail in what ways the text of 1 *Hieronimo* conforms to what we know about memorially reconstructed texts. He shrewdly observes "the curious contradiction between the skilled, complicated construction and occasional strength of expression and characterization, on the one hand, and the many irregularities and defects of the play, on the other," but his summary statement that this "can be simply explained by imperfect reporting or memorial reproduction of a competent original play by Kyd" (pp. xiv–xv) is not demonstrated with sufficient rigor. Cairncross applies with too much confidence the category of "memorial reconstruction": "The text is indeed extremely corrupt. It is only some 1200 lines long. Even in the absence of a good text for comparison, it seems clear that it is 'memorial' " (p. xv). Surely, texts can be subjected to a corrupting influence in other ways than by "memorial reconstruction." Laurie E. Maguire has recently shown that critics and editors have been too hasty to resort to "memorial reconstruction" when no better answer could be found.<sup>13</sup> Cairncross' edition seems a case in point. Nevertheless, he has usefully reminded critics that the external evidence—the entries in Henslowe's diary and the references in *The Spanish Tragedy* apparently pointing to earlier events—should be borne in mind in any discussion of the origins of 1 *Hieronimo*. His edition may be the reason why two modern professional productions of *The Spanish Tragedy* have included material from 1 *Hieronimo* (see below).

The argument against Kyd's involvement in 1 *Hieronimo* and in favor of the priority of composition of *The Spanish Tragedy* was first articulated by Rudolf Fischer's *Zur Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie von ihren ersten Anfängen bis zu Shakespeare*, an excellent study of which, disappointingly, neither Freeman nor Cairncross seems to have been aware. Fischer usefully opposes the political level ("politischen Theil") of the play to its private level ("familiären Theil"), a distinction we do well to bear in mind. He argues that the political level is handled rather adroitly ("nicht gerade ungeschickt" [p. 102]) by the anonymous playwright whereas the private level is qualified as odd ("eigenthümlich" [p. 103]).

Fischer convincingly demonstrates to what extent the private level is

13. *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The "Bad" Quartos and Their Context* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996).

modeled upon *The Spanish Tragedy*. The intrigues in the two plays run virtually parallel: Lorenzo hates Andrea (Horatio) out of envy for his honor and because of Andrea's amorous liaison with Bel-imperia. He hires an accomplice, Lazarotto (Pedringano), in order to have his rival killed at an encounter with Bel-imperia. Following the murder, Lorenzo gets rid of his accomplice after keeping him quiet by promising to obtain a pardon from the King. Lorenzo is the same Machiavellian villain in both plays; Pedringano and Lazarotto, Lorenzo's tools, are made of the same farcical-comical stuff. The structural debts can be traced even to single words: in both plays, the King, when first addressing Hieronimo, asks him to "frolic."<sup>14</sup> Fischer's conclusion is unequivocal: "It seems impossible to advocate Kyd's authorship of *The First Part of Hieronimo*, chiefly owing to the composition of the play which bears obvious traces of the use and copying it made of *The Spanish Tragedy*" (p. 111, my translation).

Boas' view is largely informed by Fischer's analysis, but he adds useful circumstantial evidence: *1 Hieronimo* may owe its existence to "the excitement caused by the revival of *The Spanish Tragedy* in 1602 with Ben Jonson's 'Additions' to bring out this so-called 'First Part'—a medley of farce and melodrama" (p. xlii). He points out incompatibilities inherent in the plots of the two plays. For instance, the love affair between Andrea and Bel-imperia in *1 Hieronimo* is not a secret as we are told in *The Spanish Tragedy* (1.1.10, 2.1.47), and Hieronimo's farcical paternal pride in *1 Hieronimo* is not in keeping with his dignified character in *The Spanish Tragedy*.

Chambers, Carrère, and Edwards basically agree with Fischer and Boas and add little to their argument. Chambers deviates slightly from Boas, who argued that *Don Horatio* was short-lived and had completely disappeared by the time *1 Hieronimo* was written, by cautiously stating that the quarto of 1605 may be "a later version of the same theme" (IV, 23) as the play recorded by Henslowe. Edwards declares *1 Hieronimo* to be "clearly written after *The Spanish Tragedy* and based on it, and almost certainly intended as a burlesque" (p. 138). Freeman discovered evidence corroborating a dating around the year 1602. He points out that 2.3 is "a semi-parodic imitation" (p. 176) of a scene in Chapman's *The Gentleman Usher*. In the same scene he finds play on the name of an actor of the Children's Company, William Ostler (p. 176), and detects echoes from plays owned by the King's Men, notably *Julius Caesar* (2.3.26 and 2.3.45)

14. "But now Knight Marshal, frolic with thy king" (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.2.96); "Frolick, Ieronimo" (*1 Hieronimo*, 1.1.1).

and *Hamlet* (1.3.106).<sup>15</sup> Even though agreeing with the earlier critics on the matter of the late date, Freeman significantly differs in his view of the play's relationship to the play recorded by Henslowe: "I think it is unlikely that anyone fabricated *The First Part* out of thin air, and far more probable that the extant play represents a revision or rewriting of the original 'spanes comodye,' and hence that it is fairly close, at least in plot, to the early fore-piece" (p. 176).

To sum up: Boas, Freeman, and Cairncross, the play's most influential critics in the twentieth century, all disagree on the provenance of *Don Horatio* and *1 Hieronimo* as well as on the sequence of events:

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Boas:       | 1) <i>Don Horatio</i> (presumably by Kyd)<br>2) <i>The Spanish Tragedy</i><br>3) <i>1 Hieronimo</i> , not based on <i>Don Horatio</i>  |
| Freeman:    | 1) <i>The Spanish Tragedy</i><br>2) <i>Don Horatio</i> by anon. some time before 1592<br>3) <i>Don Horatio</i> revised and printed as <i>1 Hieronimo</i> ("fairly close, at least in plot, to the early fore-piece") |
| Cairncross: | 1) <i>Don Horatio</i> (by Kyd)<br>2) <i>The Spanish Tragedy</i><br>3) <i>1 Hieronimo</i> , put together after 1600, a memorial reconstruction of <i>Don Horatio</i> .  |

Ironically, both Freeman's study and Cairncross' edition were published in 1967, and nobody has attempted to settle the dispute since. John Reibetanz's essay deals with the play as published in 1605. He does not examine the play, however, from the perspective of Kyd criticism, but in the context of the wars of the theater which raged during the first years of the seventeenth century. Apart from this shift of emphasis, Reibetanz is in agreement with Boas and does not address Cairncross' and Freeman's views. Emma Smith's recent edition of *The Spanish Tragedy* includes the text of *1 Hieronimo*, but Smith summarily dismisses Cairncross' argument and sees the "prequel" simply as part of the "afterlife" of *The Spanish Tragedy*.<sup>16</sup>

The purpose of the present survey of criticism has been to bring out the complex and conflicting evidence, the total sum of which no single

15. P. 176. I would add 2.3.37, which seems to echo *Hamlet* 1.1.40, and 1.3.91-94, which anticipates *Hamlet* 2.2.237-39. References are to William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor et al. (Oxford, 1986).

16. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedie, with Anonymus, The First Part of Jeronimo*, ed. Emma Smith, Renaissance Dramatists (Harmondsworth, 1998).

critic seems to have been able to explicate. Boas cannot account for the "stylistic resemblances in tropes and figures, [or the] parallel passages" that Schick mentions, and he has to argue that *Don Horatio* melted into thin air. Freeman's theory fails to account for the allusions in *The Spanish Tragedy* that imply the spectators' knowledge of anterior incidents. Cairncross' theory of memorial reconstruction, finally, falls short of justifying the features of 1 *Hieronimo* that are irreconcilable with *The Spanish Tragedy*.

### III

Although none of the above critics is entirely wrong, I will offer a new account of the provenance, authorship, and textual constitution of 1 *Hieronimo* as well as of its relationship to *Don Horatio*. This explanation introduces a distinction between two textual layers, one "original" and one "revised," which I shall term "A" and "B." This distinction alone can account for the conflicting evidence.

What are the rough characteristics of A and B? A is the older of the two, was written around the time of the composition of *The Spanish Tragedy*, and was in all probability part of *Don Horatio*. If not "by Kyd," it is at least "Kydian." The action is not incompatible with *The Spanish Tragedy* in general and with the allusions to what happened earlier in particular. It is finely harmonized with *The Spanish Tragedy* in mood, characterization and, at times, details of plot. Passages pertaining to A feature characters that reappear or (if dead) are mentioned in *The Spanish Tragedy*. The tone of A is essentially serious, in keeping with the non-comic parts of *The Spanish Tragedy*. Despite the generally corrupt text, A has fairly regularly scanning verse, a mixture, like *The Spanish Tragedy*, of blank verse and rhyme, with slightly more rhyme than its companion piece. Style and language are reminiscent of (albeit not of quite the same quality as) *The Spanish Tragedy*.

Textual layer B was written substantially later, after the turn of the century. It is neither by Kyd nor Kydian. Its action is not compatible with *The Spanish Tragedy* and evidently does not try to be. Its genre is a mixture of farce, parody, and grotesque. Its characterization is not harmonized with *The Spanish Tragedy*, most notably in the case of Hieronimo, who is turned into a ridiculous buffoon. B contains all the references to Hieronimo's small stature and all the echoes of what must have been recent plays when B was composed: *Julius Caesar*, *Hamlet*, and Chapman's *Gen-*

tleman Usher. It carries further noticeable features such as topical references and repetitions of phrases. Its language mixes prose and verse which is frequently less regular or scans more roughly than that of A.

A and B more or less correspond to Fischer's political and private level. A centers on Andrea's progress in the "wars of Portugal" (as the play's subtitle has it), from his election as ambassador and his presence at the Portuguese court to the final battle and his funeral, interspersed with passages that show him torn between his public duties and his private affections for Bel-imperia. B, on the other hand, deals with Lorenzo's envy and his plot against Andrea's life in which he involves Alcario and Lazarotto.

What appears to have happened is that someone who had come into the possession of a manuscript of *Don Horatio* largely rewrote the play, omitting the "private level" of the original play dealing, among other things, with Andrea's secret love for Bel-imperia and Castile's wrath at its discovery, as we learn from *The Spanish Tragedy*. For this he substituted Lorenzo's unsuccessful plot against Andrea's life (B). The "political level," however, was largely left intact (A), albeit possibly cut and further transformed by additions relating to Hieronimo.<sup>17</sup> For example, the battle scenes making up most of Act 3 basically belong to A, but Hieronimo's presence at the battle is an addition. Some of his lines are noticeably grafted upon the original text (for instance 3.2.1-5, 3.2.171-76, and 3.4.7-16). As the (re-)writing was manifestly aimed at burlesquing the hero of *The Spanish Tragedy*, even the political portions of *Don Horatio* seem not to have been spared when the writer saw a possibility to ridicule Hieronimo. While some scenes or passages can be attributed to A or to B with some confidence, the occasional intrusions of B into the play's political portions sometimes make it extremely difficult to distinguish one textual layer from the other. The numerous corruptions also contribute to this difficulty.

A and B can also be distinguished by their respective casts. Hieronimo (spelled "Ieronimo"), Horatio, Andrea, the King of Spain, Lorenzo his nephew, Bel-imperia ("Bellimperia"), the Spanish Lord General, the King of Portugal, and Balthazar his son (called "Balthazer" in 1 *Hiero-*

17. This is not the only instance of a play that was put together by the addition of new scenes to parts of an old play. Massinger's *Cleander* (1634) is a revision of Fletcher's *The Lover's Progress* (1623); Heywood used parts of *The Golden Age* (1611) and *The Silver Age* (1613) for *The Escapes of Jupiter* (c. 1624); and Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, allowed a company to "add scenes to an old play, and give it out for a new one" (see Eric Rasmussen, "The Revision of Scripts," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and D. S. Kastan [New York, 1997], p. 449).

nimo) appear in both. Characters belonging to A, the Kydian part, are Castile (the brother to the King of Spain), Rogero (a Spanish courtier), Pedringano, Villupo ("Don Volluppo" in 1 *Hieronimo*), and Alexandro, all of whom reappear or are mentioned in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Added to these should be Phillippo and Cassimero, two ghost characters appearing in a stage-direction in 3.4 who seem to have played a minor role in the part of *Don Horatio* that was omitted in the reworking. The characters confined to B consist of Lazarotto (a discontented courtier, a "malcontent"), the Duke of Medina, and Alcario (son of the Duke of Medina, in love with Bel-imperia). What is notable about them is not so much that they do not reappear in *The Spanish Tragedy* (two of the three are killed), but that they are never made mention of, even in situations where the lack of retrospection seems unaccountable.<sup>18</sup>

A is consistent with and sometimes carefully harmonized with *The Spanish Tragedy*, as several passages demonstrate. The following short scene occurs before the decisive battle against the Portuguese in the course of which Andrea will be killed:

- Bel.* You came but now, [and] must you part agen?  
 You told me that your sperit should put on peace;  
 But see, war followes war.
- And.* Nay, sweet loue, cease,  
 To be denide our honour, why, twere base  
 To breath and liue; and wars in such a case  
 Is euen as necessary as our bloud.  
 Swordes are in season then when rightes withstood.  
 Deny vs tribute that so many yeeres  
 We haue in peace tould out? why it would raise  
 Spleene in the host of Angels: twere enough  
 To make [the] tranquile saints of angry stuffe.
- Bel.* You haue ore wrought the chiding of my breast;  
 And by that argument you firmly proue  
 Honor to sore aboute the pitch of loue.  
 Lend me thy louing and thy warlicke arme,  
 On which I knit this softe and silken charme  
 Tyed with an amorous knot: O, may it proue  
 Inchaunted armour being charmed by loue;  
 That when it mounts vp to thy warlick crest,

18. It is reasonable to assume that Isabella, Hieronimo's wife, appeared in *Don Horatio*, even though in the surviving quarto of 1605 she is confined to two short appearances (1.3.90–103, 2.3.87–118) that seem to belong to B.

It may put by the sword, and so be blest.

*And.* O what deuinity proceeds from loue.  
 What happier fortune, then, my selfe can moue?  
 Harke, the drum beckens me; sweet deere, farwell.  
 This scarfe shall be my charme gainst foes and hell.

*Bel.* O, let me kisse thee first.

*And.* The drum agen.

*Bel.* Hath that more power than I?

*And.* Doot quickly then:

Farewell.

*Exit Andrea.*

*Bel.* Farewell. O cruell part;

*Andreas* bosome bears away my hart.

*Exit Bellimperia.* (2.6.1-28)

The scene does not stand in contradiction to any of the allusions to prior events in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Andrea and Bel-imperia are alone and nothing indicates that their love relationship is generally known. It is possible that the scene was originally longer, and minor metrical imperfections, such as line 2.6.27 (which is one foot short), can be explained by the corrupt text. In general, however, the verse scans well and the passage has by all means a Kydian ring. It is reminiscent of Horatio's encounter with Bel-imperia (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.4.1-49) and of Ferdinando's with Lucina (*Soliman and Perseda*, 2.1.1-25). The seemingly random alternation of rhyme and blank verse may seem odd, but closely corresponds to both of the above-mentioned scenes, as a comparison of the rhyme scheme in the opening verses of each scene will demonstrate:

*1 Hieronimo*, 2.6:           a b b c c d d e f g

*The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.4:   a b b c c d e f g h

*Soliman and Perseda*, 2.1:   a b c c d e e f g

The scene bears further characteristics typical of Kyd. Physical action is dexterously integrated into the language: the tying of the scarf (*1 Hieronimo*, 2.6), the "love combat" (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.4), and the handing over of the carkanet (*Soliman and Perseda*, 2.1). There is nothing parodic or burlesque about the scene. It is as straightforwardly Kydian as any, even though of perfunctory brevity and devoid of the highlights that occur in Kyd's greatest play.

In addition to these likenesses in style and dramatic technique, a plot detail links the scene to *The Spanish Tragedy*. It seems odd that this important connection has never been pointed out. When in *1 Hieronimo* Andrea

has died in the battle and Horatio has captured Balthazar, the scarf present in the above excerpt returns:

*Hor.* Come then, my friend, in purple I will beare  
Thee to my priuate tent, and then prepare  
For honord Funerall for thy melting corse.  
*He takes his scarfe and ties it about his arme.*  
This scarfe ile weare in memorie of our soules,  
And of our muteall loues; heere, heere, ile wind it,  
And full as often as I thinke one thee,  
Ile kisse this little ensigne, this soft banner,  
Smeard with foes bloud, all for the maisters honer. (3.2.161–68)

In *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.4, when Horatio reports to Bel-imperia the circumstances of her lover's death in battle, he says:

*Hor.* This scarf I pluck'd from off his liveless arm,  
And wear it in remembrance of my friend.  
*Bel.* I know the scarf, would he had kept it still,  
For had he liv'd he would have kept it still,  
And worn it for his Bel-imperia's sake:  
For 'twas my favour at his last depart. (1.4.42–47)

Kyd was an expert in the use he made of stage props: rope, knife, box, paper, pen and many more objects are employed in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Besides being literally tied about the characters' arms, the scarf in 1 *Hieronimo* and *The Spanish Tragedy* metaphorically ties sequences together, thereby giving them additional meaning. Several critics have noticed the importance of the scarf as a recurring prop in *The Spanish Tragedy* without, however, referring to 1 *Hieronimo*.<sup>19</sup> If a two-part play was intended when the last scenes of *Don Horatio* were written, Horatio's kiss and taking Andrea's scarf may well have been intended to foreshadow the transference of Bel-imperia's affection onto the surviving friend of her former lover. The scarf thus stretches over the full two-part play, passing from Bel-imperia to Andrea (1 *Hieronimo*, 2.6.16–24), from the dead Andrea to Horatio (1 *Hieronimo*, 3.2.164–68), from the dead Horatio to Hieronimo (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.5.51–56) who inadvertently offers it to Bazulto (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 3.13.86–89) and finally shows it to the courtly audience after his deadly play (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 4.4.122–29). The carkanet in *Soliman and Perseda* fulfills a similar role as it

19. See Ejner J. Jensen, "Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*: The Play Explains Itself," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 64 (1965), 7–16; John Kerrigan, "Hieronimo, Hamlet and Remembrance," *Essays in Criticism* 31 (1981), 107; and Marion Lomax, *Stage Images and Traditions: Shakespeare to Ford* (Cambridge, Eng., 1987), pp. 34–44.



Which paunch'd his horse and ding'd him to the ground.  
 Then young Don Balthazar with ruthless rage,  
 Taking advantage of his foe's distress,  
 Did finish what his halberdiers begun,  
 And left not till Andrea's life was done. (1.4.13–26)

Fischer (p. 111) and Boas (p. xlv) held that the accounts in the two plays are at odds with each other and argue against Kyd's authorship of 1 *Hieronimo*. The absence of halberdiers and horses can be explained by the limitations of stage realism, imperfections which members of an audience are asked to piece out with their thoughts. Apart from this, 1 *Hieronimo* and Horatio's report in *The Spanish Tragedy* agree in nearly every detail. Whether Balthazar finished off what the other Portuguese began, or whether he got back and vaunted over him once he was already dead seems a petty detail, and one Andrea—who arrives after his friend's death according to the stage-direction—would be unlikely to judge accurately. Nor, surely, would this have mattered much to Kyd.

After Andrea's death, Horatio strikes back at the Portuguese prince:

*Horatio has Prince Balthezer downe; then enter Lorenzo and  
 seizes his weapon.*

*Hor.* Hand off, *Lorenzo*; touch not my prisoner.

*Lor.* Hees my prisoner; I seizd his weapons first.

*Hor.* O base renowne,

Tis easie to seize those were first laid downe.

*Lor.* My lance first threw him from his warlicke steede.

. . .

*Hor.* Well, peace; with my blood dispençe,

Vntill my leedge shall end the difference.

. . .

*Hor.* Speake, prince, to whether doost thou yeeld?

*Bal.* The vanquisht yeilds to both, to you [the] first.

*Hor.* O object prince, what, doost thou yeild to two? (3.2.126–43)

The quarrel between Lorenzo and Balthazar continues in *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.2:

*King.* To which of these twain art thou prisoner?

*Lor.* To me, my liege.

*Hor.* To me, my sovereign.

*Lor.* This hand first took his courser by the reins.

*Hor.* But first my lance did put him from his horse.

*Lor.* I seiz'd his weapon and enjoy'd it first.

*Hor.* But first I forc'd him lay his weapons down.

*King.* Let go his arme, upon our privilege.

*Let him go.*

Say worthy prince, to whether didst thou yield?

*Bal.* To him in courtesy, to this perforce:

He spake me fair, this other gave me strokes:

He promis'd life, this other threaten'd death:

He wan my love, this other conquer'd me:

And truth to say I yield myself to both. (1.2.153-65)

Similarly, both plays stress Horatio's funeral for his dead friend. *The Spanish Tragedy* has:

*Andrea.* By Don Horatio, our Knight Marshal's son,  
My funerals and obsequies were done. (1.1.25-26)

*Hor.* I took him up and wound him in mine arms,  
And welding him unto my private tent,  
There laid him down and dew'd him with my tears, (1.4.34-36)

*Hor.* I saw him honour'd with due funeral: (1.4.41)

Like the passage dealing with the scarf, these references are of little importance in themselves, and a spectator or reader is unlikely to remember them. They have their significance, though, as they look back to an action that had greater prominence in *Don Horatio*:

*Hor.* Come then, my friend, in purple I will beare  
Thee to my priuate tent, and then prepare  
For honord Funerall for thy melting corse. (3.2.161-63)

The stage-direction at the beginning of 3.3 reads:

*Enter two, dragging of ensignes; then the funerall of Andrea: next Horatio, and Lorenzo, leading prince Balthezer captiue; then the Lord General with others mourning.*

Finally, the last scene begins as follows:

*Hor.* These honord rights and worthy duties spent  
Vpon the Funerall of *Andreas* dust,  
Those once his valliant ashes—march we now  
Homeward with victory to crowne Spaines brow. (3.4.1-4)

Andrea's funeral—briefly mentioned in *The Spanish Tragedy*—was therefore an important contribution to the pervasive pageantry in *Don Horatio*.

A further correspondence between 1 *Hieronimo* and *The Spanish Tragedy* that needs to be mentioned is that Don Pedro, brother to the Por-

tuguese King and Don Rogero, a Spanish courtier, who both fight in the battle (1 *Hieronimo*, 3.1.0.s.d., 3.2.19.s.d.), are mentioned by name in the General's report to the King in *The Spanish Tragedy* (1.2.40, 1.2.43).<sup>20</sup> Finally, Cairncross, in his edition, points out that Andrea's "Are all things aboard?" and the King's "Our selfe in person / Will see thee safe aboard" (1 *Hieronimo*, 1.2.52; 2.1.89–90) contain the same geographical oddity as *The Spanish Tragedy*, where the Portuguese Viceroy is said to have "cross'd the seas" in order to get from the Portuguese to the Spanish court (3.14.11).

The evidence suggests that a certain number of verses, possibly about four hundred, which were written around the time of and in conjunction with *The Spanish Tragedy* survive in the text of 1 *Hieronimo*. To the Kydian portion A belong 2.1, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 without some short parodic additions related to *Hieronimo*, and probably parts of 1.1 and 1.2.<sup>21</sup> The internal evidence outlined above as well as the external evidence inherent in the entries in Henslowe's diary and the allusions to prior events in *The Spanish Tragedy* argue for Kyd's authorship: it is plausible to assume that a two-part play performed by one company during the lifetime of the well-established author of one of the two parts was written by one pen.

#### IV

As we have seen, the multiple close correspondences in plot, motivation, characterization, style, and tone between A and *The Spanish Tragedy* argue against a hack writer's having burlesqued Kyd's masterpiece in order to profit from its popularity early in the seventeenth century. This seems to have been the precise motive, however, behind the writing of B. In order to analyze its characteristics and demonstrate its incompatibility with *The Spanish Tragedy*, I will touch upon features of plot as well as characterization and genre.<sup>22</sup>

In 1.3 of 1 *Hieronimo*, Hieronimo and Horatio overhear Lorenzo and Lazzarotto's plot to murder Andrea. They are infuriated at the prince's

20. There is an inconsistency between the two plays in that Don Pedro dies in 1 *Hieronimo* (3.2.90.s.d.) but is alive in *The Spanish Tragedy* (3.14, 4.4.209), reappearing in a scene of reconciliation between Spain and Portugal in which the two kings and their two brothers salute each other. Kyd may have chosen, late in the composition of *The Spanish Tragedy*, to reuse Don Pedro for the sake of symmetry (King and Viceroy, Castile and Don Pedro). If so, the only adjustment that would have been necessary is a slight change in one stage direction in the fore-piece so as to omit Don Pedro's death, which is incidental to the plot of 1 *Hieronimo*.

21. Added passages seem to be 3.1.31–48, 3.1.104–06, 3.1.124–34, 3.2.1–5, 3.2.120–21, 3.2.132, 3.2.139–40, 3.2.144–46, 3.2.171–76, 3.4.7–16.

22. That the language of B is not Kydian no longer needs demonstration: in 2.3, for example, Hieronimo and Horatio are made to speak prose throughout, a practice hardly attributable to Kyd.

villainy and write a letter to Andrea to warn him. If *1 Hieronimo* and *The Spanish Tragedy* formed a continuous two-part play, it would be difficult to account for the fact that there is no mention of this in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Hieronimo's skepticism when he receives Bel-imperia's letter stating that Lorenzo and Balthazar killed Horatio would be especially inexplicable: "My son slain by Lorenzo and the prince! / What cause had they Horatio to malign?" (3.2.33-34).

Furthermore, we learn from *The Spanish Tragedy* that the love relationship between Andrea and Bel-imperia was a secret and that its discovery triggered her father's wrath (1.1.10-11, 2.1.45-48). In the 1605 text, however, there is nothing secret about the relationship between Andrea and Bel-imperia. When Castile hears Lazarotto reveal the whole story, he does not show any signs of surprise (2.5.27ff.). A further feature of *1 Hieronimo* that makes it appear less than plausible that it was conceived before *The Spanish Tragedy* is that the King is acquainted with Horatio in *1 Hieronimo*, placing him "next vnto his royall bosome" (1.1.63), whereas he does not recognize him in *The Spanish Tragedy* (1.2.114-15).

Arguing that *1 Hieronimo* is a memorial reconstruction of *Don Horatio*, Cairncross tried to anticipate these objections by suggesting that "a hack writer using the material of *The Spanish Tragedy* was likely to produce a version of a fore-piece consistent with it; a memorial version by one or more actors, on the other hand, was likely to show gaps and inconsistencies, as in recognized Elizabethan bad quartos" (p. xvii). *Hamlet* Q1 probably is a "bad" quarto (despite occasional attempts to show the contrary), a memorial reconstruction by an actor who, it seems, played Marcellus. Yet, its relationship to Q2 and F appears to be of a very different kind from that of *1 Hieronimo* to a fore-piece consistent with *The Spanish Tragedy*. The order of scenes in *Hamlet* Q1 differs slightly from the more authoritative texts: one short scene has no correspondence in Q2 and F; the language is at times corrupt and many speeches are shortened. The plot, however, is that of Q2 and F. It seems unlikely that actors would have failed to remember some of the essentials of the play's story-line.

We might thus expect even a badly remembered version to contain aspects of the conflicts alluded to. Cairncross has to take considerable liberties with the evidence in order to make it suit his argument. His point that Andrea's "In secret I possess'd a worthy dame" may imply that it was "the 'possession,' not the whole affair, that was secret" (p. xviii) seems strained. According to Cairncross' argument, what would have been the procedure of reconstruction his "one or more actors" followed? On the one hand, they would have had an extremely close look at *The*

*Spanish Tragedy* to make their reconstruction compatible with such an unimportant feature as Andrea's scarf. On the other hand, they would have disregarded gross incompatibilities in plot such as Hieronimo's unawareness of Lorenzo's villainy and suggestions of Castile's wrath at the discovery of Andrea's love for Bel-imperia in *The Spanish Tragedy*. This is hardly plausible.

As for the differences in characterization, Lorenzo's familiar intercourse with Alcario sharply contrasts with his aristocratic demeanor in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Bel-imperia, a "most weeping creature" at the beginning of 1.2, seems a parodic version of the very determined character in the second part of the diptych. The prime target of the intentional burlesque, however, is clearly Hieronimo. His opening lines show him to be little more than a buffoon: "My knee sings thanks vnto your highnes bountie; / Come hether, boy *Horatio*; fould thy ioynts" (1.1.4-5). The writer of B added short speeches or soliloquies by Hieronimo at the end of 3.1, the beginning and the end of 3.2, and the end of 3.4. In each case the parodic intent is evident; for example: "So now kisse and imbrace: come, come, / I am wars tuter; strike a larum, drum" (3.1.133-34). On several occasions, Hieronimo's care for the memory of his son in *The Spanish Tragedy* is turned into ridiculous paternal pride:

*Ier.* O valiant boy; stroake with a Giants arme  
His sword so fals vpon the Portugales,  
As he would slise them out like Orenge,  
And squeeze their blouds out. (3.2.1-4)

*Bal.* [*to Horatio*] Hath war made thee so impudent and young?  
My sword shall giue correction to thy toong.

*Ier.* Correct thy rascals, Prince; thou correct him?  
Lug with him, boy; honors in bloud best swim. (3.2.118-21)

Allusions to the small stature of the actor playing Hieronimo, no doubt a child, add further comic business at the expense of the Knight Marshall (e.g. 1.3.114, 2.3.65, 3.1.33-38, 3.1.46, 3.4.10-11). Around the time when *The Spanish Tragedy* was once again in the theater, augmented with Jonson's additions, the writer of B provided a parodic counterpart to Kyd's hero.

## V

If, as seems likely, *Don Horatio* and *The Spanish Tragedy* were both written before 1588, they probably preceded Kyd's *Hamlet*. In his edition of Shakespeare's play, Harold Jenkins suggests that the name of Hamlet's

confidant goes back to *The Spanish Tragedy*.<sup>23</sup> More likely, the name was suggested by the loyal friend in *Don Horatio*, rather than the romantic lover in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Horatio pondering suicide at the death of Andrea (3.2.149–52) is reminiscent of Horatio in *Hamlet* (5.2.292–94). In general, the character constellation Andrea–Horatio–Bel-imperia–Lorenzo–Castile corresponds in many ways to Hamlet–Horatio–Ophelia–Laertes–Polonius. Like Hamlet and Ophelia, Andrea and Bel-imperia form a social mismatch and are actively opposed by her father. As the King makes Andrea ambassador to Portugal to claim the overdue tribute, so Claudius pretends to send Hamlet to England “[f]or the demand of our neglected tribute” (3.1.173).

It has already been pointed out that the text of the 1605 quarto shows signs of major corruption. Cairncross suggested that its cause was memorial reconstruction, a suggestion I have tried to discredit. A close look at a few examples, drawn from both A and B, may help us understand the nature of the text’s faultiness.<sup>24</sup>

*Med.* Who names *Alcario* slaine? aie me, tis he:

Art thou that villaine?

*Laz.*

How didst know my name? (2.5.13–14)

Here a line in which the Duke of Medina mentions Lazarotto’s name is likely to have dropped out of the text. This seems all the more plausible as verse 2.5.13 is preceded and followed by a rhyming couplet which suggests that the missing line would have rhymed with verse 2.5.13. Before the decisive fight between Horatio and Balthazar, Horatio’s last words are: “If thou beest valliant, cease these idle words, / And let reuenge hang on our glittering swords, / With this proud prince, the haughty *Balthezer*” (3.2.124–26). It is not quite clear how the last line follows upon the preceding two. Markscheffel conjectures: “Enough! I speak no more, and Ill now war / With this proud prince, the haughty *Balthezer*” (p. 15). These passages further discredit Cairncross’ suggestion of memorial reconstruction. Reporters are likely to miss puns, add actors’ interjections, spoil images. Incoherent syntax as shown above, however, seems the result of poor copying rather than memorial reconstruction. At the ultimate reason for the faulty textual transmission—a disorderly, barely-readable copy? a short-hand version?—one may only guess.

23. *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins, Arden Shakespeare (London, 1982), p. 163.

24. For the following examples and the emendations, I am largely indebted to Markscheffel, “Thomas Kyd’s Tragödien” (1886), pp. 15–16. The conclusions I draw, however, are mine.

Many rhyming couplets have one verse consisting of a few syllables only. For example:

*Ier.* But my leedg,

Heere must be kind words which doth oft besiege (1.1.46–47)

J. Le Gay Brereton lists six pages of doubtful readings with attempts at emendation in the 1605 text and in Boas' edition.<sup>25</sup> For instance:

*Laz.* I see an excellent villaine hath his fame

As well as a great courtier.

*Med.* Speake, villain: wherefore didst thou this accursed deed? (2.5.15–17)

"Speake, villaine" should clearly be placed at the end of 2.5.16. Although the text is corrupt beyond the redemptive help of any editor's emendations, Boas does too little, it seems, to rearrange some of the play's lines when the verse in the 1605 quarto looks more like doggerel.

I have hitherto postponed discussion of an important reference that is in all probability related to 1 *Hieronimo*. Scholars have not ceased to grapple with a passage from Marston's play *The Malcontent*. The third quarto, printed like the previous two in 1604, added various passages to Q1 and Q2, most notably an induction featuring actors of the King's Men:

*Sly.* I would know how you came by this play.

*Cundale.* Faith sir the book was lost, and because twas pittie so good a play should be lost, we found it and play it.

*Sly.* I wonder you would play it, another company having interest in it?

*Cundale.* Why not Malevole in folio with us, as Ieronimo in Decimo sexto with them? They taught us a name for our play, we call it *One for Another*.

*Sly.* What are your additions?

*Burbidge.* Sooth not greatly needefull, only as your sallet to your greate feast, to entertaine a little more time, and to abridge the not received custom of musicke in our Theater.

(Induction)<sup>26</sup>

"Folio" and "Decimo sexto" refer to the size of the child and adult actors. *The Malcontent* was originally written for the Children of the Chapel who had leased the Blackfriars buildings from Richard Burbage. Critics have

25. "Notes on the Text of Kyd," *Englische Studien* 37 (1907), 87–99.

26. Marston is quoted from *The Plays of John Marston*, ed. H. Harvey Wood (Edinburgh, 1934–39).

struggled to reconcile the conflicting evidence suggesting, on the one hand, that the Children of the Chapel apparently stole a play—referred to as “Jeronimo”—from the King’s Men, and, on the other, that there are various references in 1 *Hieronimo* which seem to indicate that the play was performed by a boys’ company. Now if we consider that 1 *Hieronimo* consists of two textual layers, one “old” and one “new,” a case for a coherent interpretation can be made: *Don Horatio* appears to have been a Chamberlain’s/King’s play. When it passed into the hands of someone who adapted it for the Children of the Chapel, cutting most of the original play and adding an original intrigue, views on the legality of the undertaking may have differed. Whereas the King’s Men considered it a breach of their rights and retaliated by appropriating *The Malcontent*, the Children’s company may have thought of it as an original play. Examples such as *Selimus* and *Lochrine* or *King John* and *Troublesome Reign* indicate that playwrights felt free to draw upon other plays and the boundaries between what was objected to and what was tolerated seem to have been fluid.

This interpretation is supported by the nature of the two textual levels: for instance, by the complete absence of references to the actors’ small statures and of burlesque material in general from the “old” portion (A). In addition, an attempt on the borders of legality and an attempt to burlesque a play from the adult companies seems to be in keeping with the part the Children of the Chapel took in the wars of the theaters, as exemplified by the biting satire in *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix*.

*The Spanish Tragedy* was entered in the Stationers’ Register on October 6, 1592, within eight months of the seven recorded performances of *Don Horatio*. The figures in Henslowe’s diary suggest that the popularity of *Don Horatio* had been considerable, especially considering that it was coming of age in 1592. The intake for *Don Horatio* on May 21, 1592 (“xxviiij s”) was not less than the next four performances of *The Spanish Tragedy* (“xxvij s,” “xxiiij s,” “xxviiij s,” “xxiiij s”). Only four plays, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *The Jew of Malta*, *Henry VI* (often assumed to be Shakespeare’s “First Part”), and *Mully Mulloco*, were performed more often from the beginning of Henslowe’s entries (February 19, 1592) until acting stopped because of plague (June 22, 1592).<sup>27</sup> It is not easy to explain what

27. Note also that the play appears to have been performed as late as 1626 in Dresden under the title “Komödie vom König in Spanien mit dem Vice-Roy in Portugall” (Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, 22–23).

kept Lord Strange's Men from having both parts published, as Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* had been two years earlier.<sup>28</sup>

A further question to which there is no easy answer concerns the titles by which Henslowe designates the fore-piece. So far, I have simply referred to the play as "Don Horatio." In fact, the entries read:

spanes comodye donne oracioe  
comodey of doneoracio  
doneoracio  
comodey of Jeronymo [3x]  
the comodey Jeronymo (pp. 16–19)

That the play was called a comedy does not pose a serious problem since Elizabethan generic distinctions were more vague than ours today. Nor is it difficult to account for "Jeronymo" in the title, which was probably a result of the popularity of *The Spanish Tragedy* and does not necessarily reflect the importance of Hieronimo's role in the fore-piece. The mention of Horatio, however, is not easy to explain, as nothing in the extant text or in *The Spanish Tragedy* indicates that he may have been the play's hero. Wrestling with the conflicting evidence, Freeman writes: "Horatio is the lover of the tragedy proper, but not of the action summarized by Andrea's ghost, and if the fore-piece was the comedy of Horatio, one can explain the situation only as the outcome of an effort to capitalize on the popularity of the tragedy by 'inferring' a comedy concerning the romantic hero of the popular play in happier times" (p. 177). This, however, appears to contradict the point he makes a page earlier: "I think it is unlikely that anyone fabricated *The First Part* out of thin air, and far more probable that the extant play represents a revision or rewriting of the original 'spanes commodye,' and hence that it is fairly close, at least in plot, to the early fore-piece" (p. 176). A play close in plot to 1 *Hieronimo* is clearly not a comedy on Horatio "in happier times." The evidence is conflicting, but Freeman wants to have it both ways. Perhaps we should beware of making too much of Henslowe's precise wording. As his "titus & ondronicus" illustrates, Henslowe did not go out of his way to get the titles exactly right. Moreover, most of *Don Horatio* is lost, and it is possible that Horatio played an important part in the lost romantic part. Alter-

28. The early printing history of 1 and 2 *Henry IV* is not so different. While the first part was printed in 1598, 1599, and in six more quarto editions before 1642, the second part appeared in print in 1600 independently of its forepiece and was not reprinted outside the Folios before 1642.

natively, the title may have been intended to indicate the continuity of the two-part play, the first ending with Horatio's revenge for his friend's death, the second ending with Hieronimo's revenge for his son's death.

## VI

Parts of *Don Horatio*, then, are preserved in the text of *1 Hieronimo* and *Don Horatio* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, which Henslowe's diary shows to have been repeatedly performed on two consecutive evenings, formed a two-part play. Theater directors have long realized that *The Spanish Tragedy* gains from being considered in the context of its fore-piece. *1 Hieronimo* makes clear that Andrea's death is not the accidental result of the ravages of the battle, but the outcome of Balthazar's challenge to Andrea at the Portuguese court (2.1.50ff.). As the pride of the Portuguese is offended by Andrea's request for tribute, Balthazar presents the Spanish prince with "my gage, a neuer fayling pawne" (2.1.52). The spiral of revenge dramatized in *The Spanish Tragedy*—moving from Andrea, to Bel-imperia, to Lorenzo, to Hieronimo—had its origin in an even earlier causal link in *Don Horatio*. The productions at the Citizens Theatre Glasgow (1978) and at the Shakespeare Center in New York (1986) both made use of *1 Hieronimo* which makes it seem all the more surprising that most critics have refused to consider *The Spanish Tragedy* in the context of its fore-piece.<sup>29</sup>

If *The Spanish Tragedy* was conceived after *Don Horatio* as the passages referring to specific past events imply, its dramatic architecture becomes more intelligible. It has often been pointed out that the structure of *The Spanish Tragedy*, especially its beginning, is in some respects rather odd.<sup>30</sup> Granted, the first act, if well performed, can evoke an effective atmosphere of unease as the spectators try in vain to make sense of the outcome predicted by Revenge on the one hand (1.1.86–89) and the unfolding of the events on the other. Even so, it is surprising that Hieronimo, under whose name the play was generally known during its time, is a secondary character until 2.5. He is a minor figure at court, father of one

29. The two existing accounts of *The Spanish Tragedy* on the modern stage (*The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. J. R. Mulryne, rev. ed., New Mermaids [London, 1989], pp. xxxi–xxxiii, and *The Spanish Tragedie*, ed. Smith, pp. xxvi–xxx), do not show knowledge of the 1986 New York nor of a 1983 Los Angeles production.

30. For instance, by F. T. Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587–1642* (Princeton, 1940), pp. 66–68; Moody E. Prior, *The Language of Tragedy* (London, 1947), pp. 46–47; and W. Farnham, *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy* (London, 1936), pp. 393–94.

of the central characters in the romantic plot, and the Master of the Revels who presents a masque to a courtly audience. In many ways his role is that of Egeus in the Folio text of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.<sup>31</sup> Only after Horatio's murder does Hieronimo have the role of protagonist thrust upon him. Thereafter, the primary interest clearly centers on the revenge for the murder of Horatio, and not for the killing of Andrea. "From this point," Bowers writes, "the ghost and his theme, which was to be the core of the play, are superfluous; and, indeed, need never have been introduced" (p. 68).<sup>32</sup>

The play's singular dramatic architecture becomes clearer if we realize that *The Spanish Tragedy* was constructed to be continuous with but also understandable without the first part. In fact, the opening scenes represent a detailed and somewhat laborious transition from the chief concern of *Don Horatio* to that of *The Spanish Tragedy*. There is something highly meticulous about Kyd's plotting. In *Soliman and Perseda*, he goes to great lengths to adapt the story of the loss and recovery of the carkanet found in his source. Only when the chain is restored to its owner and Erastus goes into exile after murdering Ferdinando does the central conflict involving Soliman, Perseda, and Erastus get under way. In *The Spanish Tragedy*, he similarly spends much time tracing the transition from the fore-piece to Hieronimo's revenge. Kyd's painstaking dramaturgy may at times appear counterproductive, at the expense of greater dramatic dynamics. Kyd's weakness, however, is at the same time his strength, as it is bound up with his interest in complex causality, which he dramatized as no other English playwright had before him.

If *The Spanish Tragedy* is a sequel to a play that dramatized "the Warres of Portugall," as the subtitle of 1 *Hieronimo* has it, then the thematic relevance of the Portuguese subplot becomes more easily understandable.<sup>33</sup> Even Villuppo's treachery may have been prepared for in *Don*

31. Philostratus, Master of the Revels in Q, is absent from F and his lines are given to Egeus.

32. Considering the relative critical neglect of the sequence prior to Horatio's murder, it is noteworthy that Frank Whigham's dense analysis of "fantasies of power and control and achieved security" (p. 22) in *The Spanish Tragedy* centers on the first two acts. See *Seizures of the Will in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge, Eng., 1996), pp. 22–62.

33. Edwards held that "the Portuguese court could have been introduced more economically and the relevance of theme is very slight" (*The Spanish Tragedy*, p. liii). For attempts to argue for the relevance of the subplot without reference to the forepiece, see Ken C. Burrows, "The Dramatic and Structural Significance of the Portuguese Sub-Plot in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Renaissance Papers* (1969), 25–35. According to Burrows, the subplot has the purpose of "reinforcing and highlighting, not only the grief of Hieronimo, but his total dilemma and action" (p. 27). Another article stressing the relevance of the subplot is William H. Wiatt, "The Dramatic Function of the Alexandro-Villuppo Episode in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Notes & Queries* 203 [n.s. 5] (1958), 327–29, rpt. in

*Horatio*. In the verbal confrontation between the Portuguese and the Spaniards preceding the battle, Vollupo and Don Rogero challenge each other to meet during the combat. As the battle is raging, we see Rogero on the lookout for Vollupo:

*Enter Rogero.*

*Rog.* Ha, *Vullupo*?

*Bal.* No; but a better. (3.2.19–20)

As it turns out, Vollupo is the one character who is conspicuously absent from the battle. Don Rogero is finally killed not by Vollupo, but by Alexandro, who is the target of Villuppo's treachery in *The Spanish Tragedy*. Even though Vollupo's villainy is nowhere commented upon, his absence from the battle is surprising, and the original text of *Don Horatio* may well have elaborated his character and further motivated the subplot in *The Spanish Tragedy*.

The repercussions of the impact of the fore-piece upon *The Spanish Tragedy* extend as far as the final catastrophe. Hieronimo's killing of innocent Castile (4.4.201.s.d.), whom Kyd had made a point of showing as a benevolent peacemaker between Lorenzo and Hieronimo (3.14), has understandably puzzled critics. Various explanations for Hieronimo's rash deed have been advanced. Bowers interpreted it as a reflection of contemporary abhorrence of private revenge, Freeman as redress of an imbalance ("Balthazar for Bel-imperia, Lorenzo for Horatio, Castile for Hieronimo"), while Hammersmith argued that "the thematic design of the play, not the plot, generates the inevitability of Castile's death."<sup>34</sup> While none of this is wrong, it is important to add that Kyd's concern again appears to have been the unity of his dramatic diptych: the first part dramatized Castile's fierce opposition to Andrea and Bel-imperia's love—his wrath having been such that Bel-imperia still fears it late in *The Spanish Tragedy* (3.14.106–113)—while the second part contains the corresponding punishment administered by Revenge and approved of by the Ghost of the wronged Andrea.

If we assume, therefore, as seems indeed likely, that Kyd wrote *The Spanish Tragedy* as a sequel, we are in a position to appreciate more fully the dramaturgical problem he faced: aware that the narrative of the sec-

---

*Shakespeare's Contemporaries*, ed. Max Bluestone and Norman Rabkin, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, 1970), pp. 57–60.

34. Bowers, pp. 80–82; Freeman, p. 95; James P. Hammersmith, "The Death of Castile in *The Spanish Tragedy*," *Renaissance Drama* 16 (1985), 3.

ond part was to move away from Andrea, the hero of the first part, he was nevertheless anxious to preserve a unity over the entirety of his two-part play. The use of the handkerchief which appears and reappears in various episodes throughout the two parts, thereby tying sequences and characters together, has been shown above. Another ingenious device that allowed Kyd to strengthen the unity of his two-part play was to provide *The Spanish Tragedy* with a frame that would recall the first part. As Andrea's premature death in unfair battle (1 *Hieronimo*, 3.2.106–10; *The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.4.16–26) and Bel-imperia's consequent feelings of revenge (1.4.65) bridge the two plays, so the Ghost of Andrea and Revenge carry the drama of *Don Horatio* over into its sequel and keep it alive throughout the play. After Horatio's death in 2.4, Revenge and the Ghost of Andrea on the one hand and the characters of the play proper on the other seem to have different concerns. While Hieronimo and even Bel-imperia are bent on revenging Horatio and have forgotten Andrea, the Ghost of Andrea reminds us that the play's initial concern was with having his death revenged. While the play proper stresses the central interests of *The Spanish Tragedy*, the frame keeps us aware of the wider perspective of the two-part play. Kyd's device is much more than a makeshift solution: it simultaneously allows him to dramatize the play's central tension between a determinist universe suggested by the frame where the outcome of the action is known from the beginning (1.1.85–89) and a world of human causality implied by the "play within" where Hieronimo shapes and acts out his own destiny.

## VII

Two-part plays were a common feature of Elizabethan theater. Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* are the most famous but by no means the only examples. Even before c. 1587 when Marlowe and Kyd completed their two-part plays, Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra* had been published in two parts (1578) and Tarleton's *Seven Deadly Sins* appears to have been performed in two parts. It was after 1587, however, that the real vogue for two-part plays began. Among the fully extant two-part plays are 1 and 2 *Edward IV* (c. 1592–1599), presumably by Heywood; Chettle and Munday's 1 and 2 *The Downfall and Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (1598); Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge* (also called 1 and 2 *Antonio and Mellida*) (1599–1601); Heywood's 1 and 2 *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1603–1605); Dekker and

Middleton's 1 and 2 *The Honest Whore* (1604–1605); Chapman's *Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of Byron* and *The Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*; and Chapman's *Bussy d'Ambois* (1607) and *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* (1610/11). In the years immediately following the two-part plays by Marlowe and Kyd, Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon* (c. 1587) announced in its last chorus a sequel that does not seem to have been written. In *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1589), Robert Wilson added a sequel to his earlier *The Three Ladies of London* (c. 1581); *The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England* was printed in two parts (1591), presumably in order to recall the *Tamburlaine* plays printed the year before; *Selimus* (c. 1591) was projected as a two-part play of which only the first part was written; and Strange's Men performed 1 and 2 *Tamar Cham* (of which only a transcript of the plot of the first part survives). Finally, besides 1 and 2 *Henry IV* (1597–98), Shakespeare wrote two plays on the War of the Roses, or on the "Contention" between the houses of York and Lancaster as the titles of the early quartos (1594/95) have it, which may also be considered as a two-part play: 2 and 3 *Henry VI*.

The Elizabethan two-part play has had its share of critical attention. G. K. Hunter analyzes it in relation to Shakespeare's 1 and 2 *Henry IV*, and Clifford Leech opposes the structure of 1 and 2 *Tamburlaine* and their two-part offspring to that of Shakespeare's 2 and 3 *Henry VI*.<sup>35</sup> Despite the unambiguous evidence from Henslowe's diary showing that *Don Horatio* and *The Spanish Tragedy* were repeatedly performed on successive nights at a time when Kyd was alive and well, neither of the two articles mentions Kyd. Now that I have argued that *Don Horatio* partly survives in the Kydian portion of 1 *Hieronimo*, it seems particularly appropriate to consider Kyd's hitherto neglected place in the history of the Elizabethan two-part play.

Hunter and Leech argue that a number of Elizabethan two-part plays were written under the influence of *Tamburlaine*. While I agree, I would like to suggest, in a way which complements rather than contradicts their arguments, that some two-part plays may also owe certain debts to Kyd's *Don Horatio* and *Spanish Tragedy*. It is surely remarkable that Kyd's is by no means the only two-part play of which the second part is a revenge play. Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* (c. 1599/1601), the sequel to *Antonio and Mellida* (c. 1599/1600), acknowledges from the beginning its indebted-

35. G. K. Hunter, "Henry IV and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play," *Review of English Studies* 5 (1954), 236–48; Clifford Leech, "The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* 94 (1958), 90–106.

ness to *The Spanish Tragedy*: the “poniard” and the “cord” mentioned in the opening stage direction are reminiscent of Hieronimo who enters with “a poniard in one hand, and a rope in the other” (3.12). Like Horatio, Feliche has been murdered at night, hanged on stage, and his mangled body, like Horatio’s, is hidden behind a curtain before being shown to the audience. As G. K. Hunter has pointed out, “Andrugio, the deprived father of the play, is obviously modeled on Kyd’s Hieronimo.”<sup>36</sup> These examples could be multiplied.

Reavley Gair, editor of *Antonio’s Revenge* for the Revels Plays, agrees that Marston’s play “adheres rigidly to [the] form of revenge tragedy,” but thinks that “*Antonio’s Revenge* is exceptional in that it is ostensibly the second part of a play which began as a comedy.”<sup>37</sup> Yet judging by the extant evidence, Kyd’s *Don Horatio*, which Henslowe repeatedly called a comedy, was just as generically mixed as *Antonio and Mellida*. So, while it has long been recognized that the second half of Marston’s two-part play is in many ways a reworking of *The Spanish Tragedy*, as an intentional burlesque or not, critics do not seem to have considered that Marston also followed Kyd in writing a two-part play consisting of a generically mixed play and a revenge tragedy.<sup>38</sup>

*The Tragedy of Hoffman, or Revenge for a Father*, for which Chettle received payment from Henslowe on December 29, 1602, may be a further revenge tragedy that was written as a sequel. On July 7 of the same year Henslowe had paid Chettle one pound for the now lost “danysh tragedy” which Greg, following earlier critics, imagines “was a fore-piece dealing with the story of Hoffman’s father, such as the extant work throughout presupposes.”<sup>39</sup> Like *Antonio’s Revenge*, Chettle’s play does not hide its debts to *The Spanish Tragedy*: Hoffman, like Hieronimo, “Strikes ope a curtaine where appears a body” (1.1.8.s.d.), and a bloody handkerchief spurs the hero to vengeance.<sup>40</sup> As the brothers Mathias and Lodowick are clearly meant to recall the paired characters of the same

36. G. K. Hunter, “English Folly and Italian Vice: The Moral Landscape of John Marston,” in *Dramatic Identities and Cultural Tradition: Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Liverpool, 1978), p. 107.

37. (Manchester, 1978), p. 22.

38. For the view that Marston’s plays burlesque the revenge tradition, see R. A. Foakes, “John Marston’s Fantastical Plays: *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio’s Revenge*,” *Philological Quarterly* 41 (1962), 229–39.

39. *Henslowe’s Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg (London, 1904–1908), II, 223. This view had been advanced earlier by F. G. Fleay, II, 76; and A. H. Thorndike, “The Relations of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays,” *PMLA* 17 (1902), 135.

40. Chettle’s play is quoted from *The Tragedy of Hoffman*, ed. Harold Jenkins, Malone Society Reprints (London, 1951).

names in *The Jew of Malta*, the echoes of the names Jeronimo, Lorenzo, Horatio, and Isabella in Jerome, Lorrique, Hoffman, and Lucibella may be more than coincidence. It seems at least possible that Chettle's two-part structure was also inspired by Kyd's.

Chapman's *Bussy d'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* constitute a third two-part play that conforms to the pattern established by Kyd and followed by Marston and possibly Chettle. Even though several years elapsed between the original writing of *Bussy d'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, Chapman appears to have revised *Bussy* around the time he wrote *The Revenge*, smoothing out the transition between the two plays in the process; moreover, it has been argued that *The Revenge* "was intended as a genuine dramatic sequel to the revised *Bussy*."<sup>41</sup> Even though adopting the external form of the revenge tragedy, Chapman's dramatization is as much his criticism of the genre as his own contribution to it, casting Clermont as the stoic and morally responsible counterpart to the impassioned revenger of *The Spanish Tragedy* and its progeny. That Chapman adopted the two-part structure of the prototype for this criticism may be significant.

Why did several playwrights follow Kyd by adding a revenge tragedy as a sequel to a first part? The revenge tragedy is a subgenre of the tragedy of intrigue, its peculiarity being that it dramatizes the reaction to, rather than the instigation of, a crime—typically a murder. By definition, the revenge forms a sequel, a "second part" in a course of events. Andrea, Andrugio, Hoffman's father, and Bussy have all been killed before the revenge tragedies begin and the ensuing action follows naturally upon what precedes. If the revenge is to preserve its dramatic urgency, not only the revenger but also the spectators must remember the cause. If an audience has seen the first part, possibly even on the eve of the sequel as audiences of *The Spanish Tragedy* could have in 1592, then the emotional background against which the revenge tragedy is placed is ideally present to the audience. The revenge tragedy sequel, even if it is an afterthought, as it certainly was in Chapman's case and may have been in Kyd's, therefore gains in unity by having its central concern already prepared for: the quest for vengeance.

According to Hunter, unity in the Elizabethan two-part play "depends

41. Albert H. Tricomi, "The Revised *Bussy D'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*: Joint Performance in Thematic Counterpoint," *English Language Notes* 9 (1971-72), 255. See also Gunilla Florby, *The Painful Passage to Virtue: A Study of George Chapman's The Tragedy of Bussy d'Ambois and The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* (Kävlinge, 1982), pp. 150-80.

on a parallel setting-out of the incidents rather than on any picking-up of all the threads of Part One. The two-part plays we have examined all use this method, with a greater or lesser degree of success, and it is the only method I have been able to find." Nevertheless, Kyd was not content to construct his two-part play with a unity of theme, but elaborately dramatized the trajectory of his plot from the first to the second part in order to preserve dramatic unity in this regard. Although "the greater number of surviving two-part plays of the Elizabethan period are not unified in any way," Kyd's clearly is.<sup>42</sup>

Clifford Leech singled out 2 and 3 *Henry VI* as an example of two closely related plays with "a continuous action running through the two Parts."<sup>43</sup> It thereby resembles what the extant evidence allows us to gather about Kyd's two-part play, composed a few years earlier. Kyd and Shakespeare terminate the first part with an important battle, bringing about a provisional result after which the play can pause. Both effect a smooth transition from the first to the second part. At the beginning of 3 *Henry VI*, the play, in Samuel Johnson's words, "is only divided from the former for the convenience of exhibition; for the series of action is continued without interruption."<sup>44</sup> The first part ends with Warwick and York determined to pursue the King, and the second part opens with the same two characters recognizing that the King has managed to escape. Kyd's first part presumably ended with the Lord General's declaration that "The day is ours and ioy yeelds happy treasure; / Set on to Spaine in most triumphant measure" (3.4.5–6).<sup>45</sup> In the same vein, after Andrea has recalled the highlights of the first part, the sequel begins with the Spanish King's "Now say Lord General, how fares our camp?" (1.2.1). Apart from the introduction of the frame in *The Spanish Tragedy*, both plays start *in medias res* and the action continues where the first part left off.

42. Hunter, "Henry IV and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play," pp. 243, 237.

43. "The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare," p. 100. Of course 2 and 3 *Henry VI* can be considered part of a trilogy or a tetralogy rather than a two-part play. However, they can legitimately be viewed as a two-part play in subject (the War of the Roses in the reign of Henry VI), in printing history as the titles of the two early quartos suggest ("The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster" of 1594 and "The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke . . . with the whole contention betwene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke" of 1595), and probably in stage history ("harey the vj" in Henslowe is generally identified with 1 *Henry VI* and thus seems to have been staged separately).

44. Johnson on Shakespeare, ed. Arthur Sherbo, *The Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson* (New Haven, 1968), p. 597.

45. In 1 *Hieronimo*, this couplet is followed by a ten-line epilogue: "Enter Ieronimo Solus: Foregod, I haue iust mist them: ha" (3.4.7), etc. It was clearly added as part of the burlesque revision in c. 1603/04.

Even though 2 and 3 *Henry VI* are not normally thought of as revenge plays, they do dramatize, like *Don Horatio* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, a spiral of revenge that stretches over both parts. In Kyd's two-part play, this spiral moves from Balthazar's offended pride at Andrea's request for tribute (1 *Hieronimo*, 2.1); to his killing Andrea in unfair battle (1 *Hieronimo*, 3.2); to Bel-imperia's revenge through "second love" (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.4); to the killing of Horatio (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.4); and finally to Hieronimo and Bel-imperia's revenge in the bloody play-within-the-play (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 4.4). In Shakespeare's two-part play, having vainly claimed his right to the crown, York kills Clifford in the battle of St. Albans, whereupon Young Clifford vows revenge (2 *Henry VI*, 5.2) and kills both York's son Rutland (3 *Henry VI*, 1.3) and York himself (3 *Henry VI*, 1.4). York's sons, in turn, revenge their father by defeating the Lancastrians at the battle of Towton where Clifford is killed (3 *Henry VI*, 2.6) and, after further reversals, at Tewkesbury, whereupon Richard, Duke of Gloucester kills Henry VI in the Tower (3 *Henry VI*, 5.6).

Besides these structural analogies, some local resemblances are even more specific, suggesting that Shakespeare was consciously recalling Kyd's two-part play while composing his: Margaret, wailing over Prince Edward's stabbed body with "How sweet a plant have you untimely cropped!" (3 *Henry VI*, 5.5.61), recalls Hieronimo's "Sweet lovely rose, ill-pluck'd before thy time" (2.5.46) as he mourns over Horatio who has just been butchered; Gloucester's "If any spark of life be yet remaining" (3 *Henry VI*, 5.6.66) resembles Hieronimo's "O speak, if any spark of life remain" (2.5.17); and Gloucester reproduces Hieronimo's wordplay on "leave" (3 *Henry VI*, 3.2.34-35 and *The Spanish Tragedy*, 3.11.2-3). Both sequels refer to the same chapter of Elizabethan "popular history":<sup>46</sup>

John of Gaunt,  
Which did subdue the greatest part of Spain; (3 *Henry VI*, 3.3.81-82)  
Brave John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster,

. . .

He with a puissant army came to Spain,  
And took our King of Castile prisoner. (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 1.4.164-67)

Shakespeare further takes up Kyd's device of the blood-stained napkin serving as an emblem of revenge by having Margaret dip it into Rutland's blood and present it to York before she stabs him (3 *Henry VI*, 1.4.80-82, 1.4.157-59, 2.1.60-63). Compare, in particular, York's

46. On Kyd's use of popular history in *The Spanish Tragedy*, see Freeman, *Thomas Kyd*, p. 55.

See, ruthless Queen, a hapless father's tears.  
 This cloth thou dipped'st in blood of my sweet boy,  
 And I with tears do wash the blood away. (1.4.157–59)

and Hieronimo's

And here behold this bloody handkercher,  
 Which at Horatio's death I weeping dipp'd  
 Within this river of his bleeding wounds: (4.4.122–24)

Even the closing line of Shakespeare's two-part play looks like a conscious inversion of the final couplet in Kyd's:

For here though death hath end their misery,  
 I'll there begin their endless tragedy. (*The Spanish Tragedy*, 4.5.47–48)

For here, I hope, begins our lasting joy. (3 *Henry VI*, 5.7.46)

The certainty of Kyd's bleak afterworld is adapted to the uncertainties and hopes of Shakespeare's unstable historical landscape. In conclusion, Kyd and Shakespeare were the first dramatists of the public stage to write tightly and coherently organized two-part plays with a continuous plot; it seems that Shakespeare owed more than some occasional hints to his predecessor.

I have argued for a new interpretation of the textual history of 1 *Hieronimo*. Critics have hitherto taken one of two diametrically opposed views, one claiming that Kyd wrote *Don Horatio* and that 1 *Hieronimo* is a version of it, the other holding that 1 *Hieronimo* was written much later in an attempt to profit from the popularity of *The Spanish Tragedy* and is not related to *Don Horatio*. The two views only become compatible if we realize that the play is made up of two textual layers of a completely different generic nature and with radically different relationships to *The Spanish Tragedy*. One level, "A," is compatible in plot, tone, and characterization with its companion piece. It is indeed finely harmonized with the plot details of its sequel and dramatizes the material of which the opening scenes in *The Spanish Tragedy* represent a faithfully reported summary. The other textual level, "B," is in every respect incompatible with *The Spanish Tragedy*. Whereas the first layer is generically mixed, a "tragical-comical-historical-pastoral" in the words of Polonius, the second is an intentional burlesque.

The first level, I have argued, is a textually corrupt version of parts of *Don Horatio*, the first half of a continuous and interrelated diptych of which the second part is *The Spanish Tragedy*. Kyd appears to have been

the writer of a large-scale two-part play of which more is extant than has been supposed, and it seems that Kyd, along with Marlowe, triggered the vogue for the contemporary two-part play. The intrinsic value of what is extant of *Don Horatio* does not add much to Kyd's reputation. It is nevertheless of considerable importance to the study of Kyd, and at least three inferences about *The Spanish Tragedy* can be drawn from it: the vicious circle of revenge has long begun when Andrea speaks the prologue to *The Spanish Tragedy*, the play's complex and puzzling structure results from the connection with the prequel, and the subplot seems to grow out of its more complex counterpart in the first part. *The Spanish Tragedy*, that is, needs to be read with what is extant of *Don Horatio*.

UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA

