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As H. B. Charlton and many others have noted, firsthand experience of Greek tragedy was rare in Renaissance England. It is no accident, then, that when Shakespeare wanted to parody the high style of early English tragedy, he drew on Seneca, at least indirectly, in the meter of his Elizabethan translators. Not surprisingly—especially in light of the prolonged agony of the hero in Seneca’s *Hercules Oetaeus*—Bottom dies in “Ercles’ vein” (*MND* I.ii.40):

```
Come, tears, confound,
Out, sword, and wound
The pap of Pyramus;
Ay, that left pap,
Where heart doth hop. [Stabs himself.]
Thus die I, thus, thus, thus.
Now am I dead,
Now am I fled;
My soul is in the sky.
Tongue, lose thy light,
Moon, take thy flight,
[Exit Moonshine.]
Now die, die, die, die, die. [Dies.] (V.i.295-306)
```

Seneca stood as virtually the sole classical model for tragedy—and perhaps mock-tragedy as well. Thus, along with the de casibus narrative tragedies and the moralities, Senecan drama reveals something of the complex nature of “classical example” in the Renaissance. In the case of tragedy, the Elizabethan

---


2. Both of Seneca’s *Hercules* plays, *Hercules Oetaeus* and *Hercules Furens*, were available to Shakespeare in several Latin editions and in Thomas Newton’s *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English*. The attribution of *Hercules Oetaeus*, as well as *Octavia*, to Seneca is disputed, though the Renaissance generally accepted his authorship. In the first case, the burden of proof still falls to those who would deny Senecan authorship. *Octavia*, on the other hand, is generally attributed today to an unknown imitator of Seneca.

translations of Seneca’s plays, accomplished by various hands beginning in 1559 and collected by Thomas Newton in 1581, occupy a special place.\(^4\)

Newton’s own *Thebais* (1581), which is his translation of Seneca’s *Phoenissae*, and his Introduction to the whole collection, *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English*, present Senecan tragedy as a model for giving dramatic form to ethical concerns.\(^5\) Though Gordon Braden’s excellent work, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition*, has reopened interest in Renaissance tragedy’s Senecan roots generally, to my mind he brushes off such “English Seneca” much too hastily (172–73). According to Walter Benjamin, translation is not “the sterile equation of two dead languages,” but rather “of all literary forms ... the one charged with the special mission of watching over the maturing process of the original language and the birth pangs of its own” (73). Given the linguistic and literary volatility of Elizabeth’s England, we should certainly attend to the work of translators like Newton.

Like Sidney’s “Apologie” (138), Newton’s brief Introduction to the collected translations praises Seneca’s “peerelesse sublimity and loftinesse of Style” and the didactic import of the eloquent Latin tragedies (I, 5). But Newton also recognizes the centrality of character—Oedipus, Antigone, Polynices, Jocasta—in Senecan tragedy; he realizes that character is a primary conveyor of meaning in dramatic tragedy. The fact that he translates *Thebais*, a fragment devoid of choral commentary, probably heightens this emphasis on characterization as well. Newton also attacks the critics of the new theater for not recognizing how characterization contributes to moral effect: “some squeymish Areopagites surmyzed, that the readinge of these tragedies, being enterlarded with many Phrases and sentences, literally tending (at the first sight) sometime to the prayse of Ambition, sometyme to the mayntenaunce of crueltie, now and then to the approbation of incontinencie and here and there to the ratification of tyrannie, cannot be digested without great daunger of infection” (I, 4–5).\(^6\) Newton responds that character and dramatic context—“the circumstaunces, why, where, and by what manner of persons such sentences are pronounced” (I, 5)—answer all such objections.

Built into this response to inadequate *readers* is Newton’s sense of Seneca’s

---

\(^4\) The most accessible edition of Thomas Newton’s 1581 collection is the 1927 reprint of *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English*. The modern reprint, which is introduced by Eliot's essay on “Seneca in Elizabethan Translation,” was reissued again in 1967 by AMS Press in New York. Neither reprint edits the original text or modernizes spelling and punctuation; they often retain the original printer’s errors.

The 1581 collection contains translations of all ten works the Renaissance usually attributed to Seneca. Jasper Heywood translated *Troas* (1559), the infamous *Thyestes* (1560), and *Hercules Furens* (1561). Though his work was not published until 1563 and was substantially revised and corrected for the 1581 edition, a sixteen-year-old Alexander Neville put *Oedipus* into English verse in 1560. John Studley’s versions of *Agamemnon* and *Medea* first appeared in 1566, and his *Hercules Oetaeus* and *Hippolytus* are most likely from the same period (Spearing 37). Thomas Nuce translated the pseudo-Senecan historical tragedy *Octavia* (1566–67), in which Seneca himself appears as adviser to Nero. Newton’s *Thebais* (1581) completed the enterprise. For further background on the texts and the translators, see E. M. Spearing, *The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca’s Tragedies*, passim, and Douglas E. Green, “Seneca’s Tragedies: The Elizabethan Translations,” passim.

\(^5\) Hereafter *Thebais* is cited parenthetically by volume and page number only, usually followed by the appropriate line numbers of the Loeb edition of Seneca’s *Phoenissae*, the standard Latin name for the play: e.g. (I, 104; 71–76).

\(^6\) I have replaced the *tilde* of the original text with “n” in such words as “sentences” and “mayntenaunce.” I have also added the “n” to “daunger,” where the mark was missing. In subsequent quotations I do not remark the changes.
tragedies as essentially \textit{dramatic}; their didactic lessons and moral sentences seldom find, except in the choruses, direct expression. Since this mimetic form’s every speech entails character, Newton is warning the public against reading Seneca’s tragedies as one would, say, the \textit{de casibus} narratives. Any judgment must weigh not only the matter, the content of an utterance, but the dramatic context—the speaker’s character and circumstance—as well. Newton’s admonition suggests that such critical judgments were relatively new and the “squeamish Areopagites” sufficiently numerous to necessitate so basic an explanation of the nature of drama, as well as to compel the alteration of characters like Antigone and Jocasta to accommodate, as we shall see, his own mimetic and moral ends in translating \textit{Thebais}.

The appearance of Oedipus in \textit{Thebais} is unintentionally suggestive of the translator’s aims, for as Barbara Johnson notes, “through the foreign language we renew our love-hate intimacy with our mother tongue” (143). At the end of the “Argument” with which Newton prefaces his translation, he acknowledges flaws in the Senecan text and asks the reader to “note that this Tragedie, was left by the Authour unperfect, because it neyther hath in it, chorus, ne yet the fifth Acte” (I, 99). Modern editors consider even the two sections patchworks: one with Oedipus, Antigone, and a messenger, on the old man’s final days; the other with Jocasta (in this variant of the myth still alive), a messenger, Antigone, and Polynices (Eteocles does not speak in the text from which Newton works), just before the strife between the two brothers. But unlike other translators of Seneca, such as Neville and Heywood, Newton remains more or less faithful to his “unperfect” text. He does not complete this fragmentary work. On the one hand, Newton privileges these fragments of Latin over his own, peculiarly English, dramatic sense; Seneca, his classical exemplar, can do no wrong. For Newton the two main fragments must form a coherent, if unfinished, piece. On the other hand, the “unperfect” condition of the text allows Newton to undertake the transformation of his “mother tongue.” In a special sense, Newton is responding to the Senecan text as a translator, according to Derrida, must: “if the original calls for a complement, it is because at the origin it was not there without fault, full, complete, total, identical to itself” (188). Newton’s enterprise entails not only the translation into English, via Seneca, of the classical achievement in tragedy but also the transformation of English itself, undertaken as well by Sidney, Gascoigne, and others, into a medium for high artistic expression.

Newton finds the “unperfect” Latin original an occasion to expand the capacities, as he sees them, of his native language and literature. The translator concentrates on the “speakability” of his version and develops further both the implications of the Latin play’s diverse matter and the psychology of its characters. Newton’s translation does indeed manifest a sensitivity to the limitations of fourteener couplets as a dramatic medium; a concern with capturing, extending, and even surpassing the dramatic force of Seneca’s

\textsuperscript{7} In \textit{The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca’s Tragedies} E. M. Spearing suggests that the original text consists of “two fragments of plays on the Oedipus legend” (46).
language, particularly its irony; and finally a sense of character as central to and inseparable from dramatic form. Such concerns anticipate later developments in Elizabethan tragedy, manifest in works ranging from Kyd’s *Spanish Tragedy* to Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*.

Nevertheless, the collector of the Senecan tragedies “Englished” between 1559 and 1580—the term is used in the headings to Heywood’s *Thyestes* and Neville’s *Oedipus* (I, 53, 183)—renders *Thebais* rather conservatively. Following his predecessors, he relies, even as late as the 1580s, on the traditional but cumbersome fourteener couplet, in which each line usually lumbers eight syllables to a strong caesura and then bounces six more to the rhyming word. But he handles this difficult medium well. Here, for example, Antigone declares her devotion to her father, while passionately arguing against the suicide Oedipus desires:

> What say you? shall wee drench our selves within this fomy Flood?  
> Goe where you wil, take which you list, do as you deeme it good.  
> Conditionally that I may first receyve the wound of death:  
> I recke no whit, I ready stand to yeld up vitalI breath.  
> I neyther draw you to nor froe: but even as best you thinke  
> So doe, so deale. Would you so fayne Deathes bitter cup to drinke?  
> My lord and Father, take you death so greate a Boone to bee?  
> If that you dye (this I assure) die first you shall me see. (I, 104; 71–76)

Given the essentially traditional choice of meter, Newton’s enjambment and caesural variation suggest a sensitivity to the balance between meter and inflection in English dramatic verse. In the passage above, Newton’s fourteener couplets approximate the heightened “naturalness” of blank verse. Furthermore, if one recalls the sometimes monotonous lines of Sackville and Norton’s *Gorboduc* (1561), one must admit that, at least prior to Marlowe, blank verse was not the evidently superior medium we assume.

Newton’s metrical versatility often corresponds to the semantic variation with which he expands, for his own ends, Seneca’s lines. His additions, furthermore, do not simply result from the length of the fourteener. They contribute to and even heighten the original. Thus, when Antigone attempts to dissuade her father from suicide, Newton emphasizes her stoic plea for moderation:

> But chaunge this mynde wherein you rest, take hart a grace, and show  
> The noble magnanimity that earst in you did flow;  
> Resist these panges, subdue these dumpes by valour of the mynd,  
> Let manly courage qualify these your affections blynd.  
> Tis great dishonor thus to yeeld your selfe to dolor thrall,  
> No storme of adverse hap thus ought a Princes hart t’appall. (I, 104)

8. Here is the Latin text from the Loeb edition:

> vis hanc petamus? hic rapax torrens cadit  
> partesque lapsi montis eexas rotat;  
> in hunc ruamus? dum prior, quo vis eo.  
> non deprecor, non hortor. exinqui cupis  
> votumque, genitor, maximum mors est tibi?  
> si moreris, anteceuo; si vivis, sequor. (71–76)
Although Newton never quite captures Antigone’s terse summary—that, according to the Loeb, “amidst such woes, to be conquered is to die” (79)—his elaboration of the three-line Latin passage significantly enriches the translation with his own Renaissance concerns.

For example, the *pectus antiquum*, Oedipus’ “old-time courage” in the Loeb version (77), is not merely a personal attribute in the Elizabethan text. Seneca’s text addresses starkly, directly, the issue at hand—courage in the face of adversity and, in particular, the courage characteristic of Oedipus in the past. Newton’s text, on the other hand, elevates that *pectus antiquum*; it becomes in a sense the heart of the Ancients, a “noble magnanimity,” a “manly courage”—the classical virtues the Renaissance so admired. Moreover, whereas Antigone’s speech in Latin appeals to reason and simultaneously incorporates the emotional crisis in its pointed phrases, Newton’s Antigone inspires in her father and us an awareness of her rational moderation, her “vertuous gyftes,” as Newton’s Oedipus calls them (I, 104). Newton’s Antigone does plead passionately against her father’s rash impulse, but her passion is tinged with Renaissance idealism and faith in reason and thus with the profitable didacticism, wrapped in delight, that Elizabethan tragedy sometimes offers.

In this respect, Newton’s addition of the phrase, “affections blynd.,” is particularly interesting. For the words concisely express the irrational impulses against which she counsels reason, the dangerous surrender of Oedipus to his “blynd” passions, and the connection between his present outburst and the passions that have resulted in his physical blindness. Such elaboration is typical of Newton’s *Thebais*; it enhances the meaning of the original, especially the irony so characteristic of Seneca and beloved of the Elizabethans.

But Newton’s metrical variety and telling elaboration serve, I think, his special interest in characterization. We understand better the motivations of Oedipus because of Antigone’s reference to “affections blynd.” We also realize the intelligence and spiritual strength that make Antigone herself so exceptional. In the case of Jocasta and Polynices, who replace Oedipus and Antigone as the central characters, Newton greatly expands several passages. Though his rendering sometimes lacks the terseness of Seneca’s verse, his method captures well the psychological appeal of Seneca’s characters.

Thus, when Jocasta asks Polynices, “Dost thou distrust thy Mothers love?” and in Newton’s text adds, “thinkst thou her kindnes razd?” (I, 126; 477), Polynices is now responding to the inadvertent pun on “kindnes,” meaning *accordance with nature* as well as *kindliness*, that Newton has incorporated into her speech. He replies: “Dame Natures lawes are flung a heele, and naught esteemed be” (I, 126; 478). For Polynices, as a member of the House of Laius,
all kindred, all natural relations, and even natural law itself are suspect. Consequently, Polynices does not trust his mother’s loving kindness, as the added line with which he continues reveals: “No fayth in kindred planted is, ne true sincery” (I, 126). He expects from his mother “prankes as bad” as his brother Eteocles—or at least such unintended disaster as her love brought his father. Newton’s Polynices expresses the deep fear only implied in Seneca’s brief timeo: “I feare in deede, distrusting sore, Syre, Damme and all my kinne” (I, 126; 478). Newton’s elaboration—certainly no mere filler, as the telling spondee “Syre, Damme” indicates—reveals a fascination with the psychological sources of Polynices’ anxiety—the Oedipal character of the child of such a house. It may also reveal that peculiar Elizabethan concern with the natural relations among members of the ruling family, particularly as they affect the succession—and thus the whole kingdom.10

Jocasta, too, receives a new Renaissance existence from Newton. Like Antigone, she pleads in both the Latin and the English texts against the rash violence her sons intend:

... thy brother feareth thee:  
And thou fearest him: and I feare both. But this my feare you see  
Is nothing for my selfe at all, but for th’ avayle of both. (I, 126; 488–89)

In Seneca the moderation for which Jocasta begs is not evident, as the messenger’s comment reveals, in her own passionate demeanor: “Shee runnes apace, like one of wit and senses all distract” (I, 122; 427).11 Seneca’s Jocasta pleads feelingly but has not entirely surmounted the affliction against which she warns. Unlike Antigone, she appears the victim of passion; if she counsels moderation, she does so out of fear—and firsthand knowledge of the consequences of “affections blynd.”12 Nevertheless, in Seneca’s text, if only because the passionate mother argues so strenuously against fraternal strife, Jocasta ultimately does transform herself into the rational, if not quite stoic, advocate of moderation and peace: “In seeking thus a countreys rule: a countrey thou destroyest” [petendo patriam perdis?] (I, 130; 558).

Here the original text provides sufficiently rational argument on Jocasta’s part for Newton’s interpretation; for this Elizabethan the line’s strong ironic element signifies not ungoverned passion but forceful dissuasion. In Newton’s translation Jocasta becomes, despite her initial agitation, the spokeswoman for “Reasons lore” (I, 126). The stoic portrait of Jocasta in Seneca’s Oedipus, where she commits suicide (the only rational course of action under the circumstances), may also have influenced Newton’s treatment. Still, the translator does temper

10. Seneca, too, may have had such concerns about Nero and his powerful and influential mother Agrippina.
11. The original text is slightly different: Vadi furenti similis aut etiam furit or, as the Loeb translates it, “She goes like a mad thing, or is mad indeed” (427). The messenger’s point here is that she is either like a mad person or truly mad, whereas Newton simply takes the two alternatives as indicators of the intensity of a single condition—her agitation.
12. In Thebais Jocasta is still alive and thus not free from the taint of her crime. But in Seneca’s Oedipus Jocasta is the stoic hero who, in accordance with the doctrines of stoicism, commits suicide when reason permits no other course; her masochistic son, on the other hand, opts for life at any price. Both versions thus diverge from Sophocles’ treatment of her character, though in different ways; moreover, both Senecan plays give more importance to Jocasta than does Sophocles’.
the forceful logic of Jocasta’s case with emotional, though not blindly passionate, interjections: “Ah, canst thou finde in hearte to burne, and spoyle these houses brave?” (I, 130). Newton’s Jocasta combines rational argument and affective appeal; we assent to her didactic pronouncements and sympathize with her maternal concern: “Ridde countrey out of trembling feare, and parentes dole forestal” [libera patriam metu, / luctu parentes] (I, 133; 642-43). For despite a few notable exceptions, the Renaissance could not quite accept a full-fledged female stoic—hence the union of queenly argumentation and maternal pathos in Newton’s text.

Indeed, through his depiction of Jocasta, Newton is attempting to clarify the lessons of mimetic characterization and adapt them to Elizabethan views. In his Introduction to the 1581 collection, Newton suggests that Seneca’s dramatic presentation of moral sentence and tragic lesson, which requires the extraction of the ethical significance from a mimetic form, challenges Elizabethan readers (and, we might add, audiences). For Newton, Seneca validates dramatic tragedy precisely because such extraction is possible:

I doubt there bee any amongst all the Catalogue of Heathen wryters, that with more gravity of Philosophicall sentences, more weightynes of sappy words, or greater authority of sound matter beateth down sinne, loose lyfe, dissolute dealinge, and unbridled sensuality: or that more sensibly, pithily, and bytingly layeth doune the gue[r]don of filthy lust, cloaked dissimulation and odious treachery: which is the dryft, whereunto he leveleth the whole yssue of ech one of his Tragedies. (I, 5)

Newton clearly values the “Philosophicall sentences” of Seneca’s tragedies, but his emphasis on their existence in these works is but one justification for mimetic drama. Whereas the tragic narratives of the de casibus tradition and even the miracle and morality dramas present more or less directly an ethics to the reader or spectator, Senecan tragedy, like its Elizabethan counterpart, represents an ethics through mimetic action—“the sound matter” that “beateth down sinne.”

That is one reason why Newton offers a collected edition of these translations, rather old-fashioned ones even in his own day, to educated Elizabethans. For Newton, the dramatic lessons of the Senecan tragedies—in the original and in translation—seem as significant as the sententious moral lessons. For him and for the other translators, Seneca is the most accessible and therefore the primary classical exemplar of tragic drama—its form as well as its content. By 1589 Thomas Nashe was condemning those playwrights who rifled “English Seneca” for “good sentences” and “tragical speeches” (637); as far back as 1893, Cunliffe had traced many of the direct borrowings. But the old debate about the extent of the collection’s influence, which concentrated on borrowed lines and generic elements like the vengeful ghost, has obscured other possible effects.

For playwrights like Kyd and Marlowe, who undoubtedly knew the Latin, Seneca His Tenne Tragedies brings together not only various kinds of Senecan

13. It is, of course, not the sole justification. Newton, like Sidney in his “Apologie for Poetrie,” seems acutely aware of the powerful “speaking picture” that poets, in this case dramatic poets, create.
drama—including the pseudo-Senecan Octavia, a historical tragedy—but also various approaches to classical models. Some translators, like Jasper Heywood, feel free to add to or amend the plays. Others, like Newton, exploit dramatic possibilities that later classicists, partial to the Greeks, no longer associate with Seneca. If only by demonstrating the inadequacy of the fourteener even in some fairly accomplished hands, the collection would have contributed to the search for a medium that would enable English dramatists to achieve the effects of the ancient tragedians. As we noted in the case of Newton’s own translation of Thebais, Seneca’s language offered the opportunity to develop rich, ironic dialogue in English. Above all, the centrality of character to Senecan tragedy, as well as the translators’ attempts to re-create these ancient tragic figures, is certainly consonant with and may have contributed to the Elizabethan fascination with character—sometimes at the expense of the action, as in Doctor Faustus or Hamlet. Indeed Newton and his contemporaries find in Seneca’s drama a literal and dramatic fulfillment of Sidney’s notion of “speaking picture” (105). The whole of Newton’s 1581 collection thus offers the Roman playwright’s example “Englished” at the very moment when Elizabethan tragedy is moving from didactic presentation of morality to mimetic representation of characters involved in an ethical action.
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