

Thomas Heywoods's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Parts I and II: A Study in Contextualization

Dr. Mohammad Jalal OSMAN*

□ ABSTRACT □

Thomas Heywood (c. 1570-1641) occupies a prominent position among his fellow Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists. His contributions to the drama of that time are numerous. However judged by the studies and the criticism allocated to him, one feels that Heywood should have faired a better treatment.

In the following pages an attempt is made to study one of Heywood's well known, but underservedly neglected plays. If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody in its two parts. The approach adopted, throughout, is to compare the play in question with other plays of the period, and to trace in it its depiction of current affairs and contemporary problems.

* Lecturer at the Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Tishreen University, Lattakia, Syria.

مسرحية (إذا كنت لا تعرفني فأنت لا تعرف أحداً) لتوماس هيوود بجزئتيها الأول والثاني: دراسة مقارنة

الدكتور محمد جلال عثمان*

□ الملخص □

يحتل توماس هيوود (1570-1641) موقعاً مميزاً بين كتاب المسرح في العهدين الاليزابيثي وعصر جيمس الأول. تتميز مساهمته في حركة المسرح لتلك الفترة بخصامتها. ولكن إذا نظرنا إلى الدراسات المتعلقة به والنقد المكرس له نشعر بأن هيوود يستحق معاملة أفضل.

في الصفحات التالية قمنا بمحاولة لدراسة واحدة من أعمال هيوود المعروفة ولكن المهملة. المسرحية هي بعنوان (إذا كنت لا تعرفني فأنت لا تعرف أحداً) في جزئيهما. أما المنهج المتبع خلال الدراسة هو مقارنة المسرحية مع مسرحيات تنتمي إلى نفس الفترة، وتقصي تصوير المسرحية للمشاكل الجارية والأحداث المعاصرة في فترة كتابتها.

* مدرس في قسم اللغة الإنكليزية - كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية - جامعة تشرين - اللاذقية - سورية.

In *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*, Thomas Heywood returns to a dramatic kind, virtually forgotten by playwrights, the history play. As for his subject, Heywood chooses a critical stage of England's history, the transfer of authority from Queen Mary to her sister Queen Elizabeth.

It is well known that the transfer was not peaceful, rather it was accompanied by a lot of bloodshed and atrocities. The ruling family was split by sharp division which alienated the two sisters from each other. Queen Mary remained, because of her mother's influence, a devoted Catholic, whereas Elizabeth was a good protestant, following the stream adopted and proliferated by her father, King Henry VIII. In his play Heywood is obsessed by doing two things: giving many details about the hostile nature of the relation that existed between the two sisters, while increasing our awareness of Elizabeth's discretion and thoughtfulness; thus preparing us to the moment when she ascends the throne and starts her golden age, the Elizabethan Age. To confirm this belief, Heywood chooses as an end to his play, a spectacular moment, when he makes Elizabeth walk on the stage holding an English version of the Bible.

Heywood seems to be fascinated by reporting Elizabeth's ordeal and her survival for by the year 1631, Heywood returned to the same subject when he produced his prose account of Elizabeth's life up to her ascension to the throne.

As for Heywood's method in writing a history play, he is known for his closeness to his sources⁽¹⁾. This technique brought to Heywood both blame and commendation. Mawbray Velte considers the play as 'essentially history dramatized, no more than a series of incidents in the life of young princess slenderly linked together into a play.'⁽²⁾ Louise B. Wright does not see in Heywood's adherence to his sources any damaging or depreciatory element in the play. By remaining exceptionally faithful to his sources, Thomas Heywood has found and introduced a new approach to the dramatising of history. Wright believes that, 'Heywood is modern in his feeling that fact ought to be reported faithfully without the colouring of personal bias. He is careful to reproduce even fictional matter as the stories have been handed down without the intrusion of personal opinion.'⁽³⁾ Thus Wright reverses defect to virtue and he recommends Heywood's approach, or the only means to spread accurate knowledge, and to make it accessible to broader section of society. Following his strong conviction, Wright launches his definition of Heywood as a 'popularizer of history' and of his historical writing a 'popular history'. This idea is endorsed by F. Smith Fussner who believes that 'Heywood was simply a more able and amusing writer than most who catered to the popular taste for gossip in the plain warpper of history.'⁽⁴⁾

These views reflect the controversy surrounding Heywood's play. However it is not the purpose of the present essay to continue this 'for' and 'against' debate. Rather it can be admitted that if the rejection of the play is unfair, the belief that the play has something unprecedently peculiar is somehow exaggerated.

The present essay aims to see the play in its relation to other plays, or to contextualize the play as much as possible with the main stream of other plays which handled a similar situation. Among the points which Heywood's play shares with other plays and which form the main body of this essay are: first the glorification of Queen Elizabeth; the second point is the conflict between Princess Elizabeth and Queen Mary's court; third the impact of this conflict on social life in the country.

The first part of the play, *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* or *The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth*, deals with the obstacles which stood in Princess Elizabeth's way to the throne. The play expounds in exposing the indignities which Elizabeth has suffered at the hands of other Catholic adversaries. Up to this point, *Part I*

offers nothing new because anti-Catholicism sentiments have been a common feature in many plays of the period. In *Dr. Faustus* (III. i. ii), Christopher Marlowe presents the Catholic Pontiff in a very contemptuous manner. In *Edward II*, the anti-Papal feeling is bluntly displayed. King Edward is annoyed with what he deems as an interference of Rome in his kingdom's internal affairs:

Why should a king be subject to a priest?
Proud Rome, that hatchest such imperial grooms,
For these thy superstitious taper-lights
Wherewith thy anti-Christian churches blaze,
I'll fire thy crazed buildings, and enforce
The Papal towers to kiss the lowly ground;⁽⁵⁾ (I. iv. 96-101)

The speech reflects the feeling the Elizabethans held against Rome. Such expressions as 'proud Rome, 'superstitious taper-lights' represent stereotypical impressions which are traceable in every play which treated the subject. However it is with Shakespeare's *King John* that we watch a serious, confrontation between Rome and England with damaging consequences. Cardinal Pandolph, the Pope's envoy, insists that King John must explain why he refused to comply with Rome's decision to appoint certain bishop as Archbishop of Canterbury. Apart from the Cardinal's clear hauteur, his demand is interpreted by the king as a meddling with a privilege which the King believes is utterly monarchial and above all exclusively English:

What earthly name to interrogatories
Can task the free breath of a scared King?
Thou canst not. Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous
To charge me to answer, as the Pope.⁽⁶⁾ (3.173-77)

In this speech, the English King has stripped the Pope of his traditional holiness, also the king has divorced the King's authority from the Pope's mandate. Among the hostile sentiments which Shakespeare wants to muster against Rome is an increase in our awareness of the Cardinal's un-Christian approach to solve his dilemma. The Cardinal associates the Pope, the mortal, with Christianity, the religion; and on this unreasonable basis the Cardinal groups other Christians into infidels and true believers. In this respect King John's refusal to subject his decision to the Papal wish is rendered by the Cardinal as a withdrawal from Christianity itself, and the King is decreed as 'cursed and excommunicate'(173). The main conflict in such a situation which Shakespeare insists on is between independence -at least in decision making- and accepting foreign mandate. In another word, it is between nationalism and subjection. What King John has done is an exercise of his just and legal prerogative. In *Henry VIII*, Shakespeare devotes the whole action to expose the stratagems of two Catholic Bishops -Cardinal Wolsey and the Bishop of Winchester- to undermine the stability of the Court, by provoking the King against his courtiers and against Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury.

If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody joins this stream of plays which either hinted at or detailed in revealing the Protestant-Catholic conflict. This issue in Heywood's play. *Part I*, is not a causal incident; rather it engages almost the whole action. Heywood adds to this concept of the play -an English King facing a Papal intervention- a new dimension, when he reverses this equation altogether. In *If You*

Know Not Me, You Know Nobody the Pope's representative is Queen Mary herself. The conflict centres on the Queen court's attempts to annihilate the existence of the Protestant Princess, Elizabeth, and to curb any inspiration which her belief may inspire in her followers. In this conflict our sympathies are voluntarily directed towards the defenceless Princess. The very actions of Queen Mary, Winchester, Benningfield and the Constable are so repulsive that it is they who provoke our denunciation against their practice. Also Heywood succeeds in unifying this conflict and in creating of it a national issue which involves England as a whole. The safety of Elizabeth –Heywood has made it clear- will bring with it more hope to the English people, and will help to assert the independence of England.

The immediate effect of Elizabeth's victory which ends Part I expresses itself in the atmosphere of commercial expansion, friendly diplomatic relations, and military superiority. These aspects constitute the main body of *Part II, If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*. Though Queen Elizabeth, does not appear till relatively too late in *Part II*, yet her presence is felt from the first scene. The impression that *Part II* tries to give is that the state of prosperity which England enjoys has been bound with Elizabeth's survival. The absence in *Part I* of any scene dealing with trade transaction is the result of the atmosphere of austerity, insecurity and terror by which Winchester and Benningfield were running the country. This deduction of the relation between the monarch's policy and the state of the country is surmisable from a line in *Woodstock*.

When the head aches, the body is not healthful⁽⁷⁾ (I. I. 143)

Among Queen Elizabeth's legacies which dominate action in *Part II* is the spirit of forgiveness which Hobson generally displays; Timothy Thinbeard's theft is tolerated; John Rowland Townicoat's offence is forgiven; John Gresham's recalcitrance is charitably redressed. This spirit of forgiveness is matched by another aspect of good conduct that is endurance in a moment of material loss. So with the accession of Elizabeth and the removal of all deteriorating elements in the Court, London is shown to be resuming its normal healthy life. Heywood seems anxious not to include in *Part II* any sad moment which might reverse the atmosphere of national celebration. The death of Sir Thomas Ramsey, an important character in the play, is stoically predicted, and when it occurs, it passes almost unnoticed. Also there is no hint to the question of succession or the death of the Queen as any biography is supposed to do. Rather, Heywood chooses to terminate his play with a great moment of England's history, the victory over the Spanish Armada.

Out of this sketch, the unity between *Part I* and *Part II* -despite the difference in tone between the two- is easy to establish. Both parts are unified through the character of Elizabeth as a Princess and a Queen. The movement from *Part I* to *Part II* is not, a departure from one world to another. Rather it is a journey which traces the history of England in two phases of its history. These two 'phases' correspond in their atmosphere, intensity, and problems to two stages in the life of Queen Elizabeth.

'Mirror of vertue and bright natures pride'

With Elizabeth, the virgin queen, is associated the term greatness, for her age is one of the brightest eras in England's history. For the politicians other time, it was she who led England to all its victories; for her people she was the chosen child of God appointed to lift England from the nightmarish days other sister Queen Mary. The poets, who found themselves in this fertile literary period, did their best to panegyricize the age and extol its founder, the Queen, who had -for literature- the most

supporting mind and nurturing taste. As such the poets and dramatists found themselves transcending their time and locality because of their Sovereign's reputation; she, herself, is being eternized through the eternity of their works.

In this part of the essay we are concerned with 'virginity' and the role it played in Elizabeth's political career. It is this gift in which Thomas Heywood like most of his contemporaries showed a great interest. In *Cynthia* (1595), Richard Bamfield (1574-1627) reveals to what extent the exaltation of this tribute has reached:

Thus sacred virgin. Muse of chastitie,
This difference is betwixt the Moone and thee:
Shee shines by Night, but thou by Day do'st
shine:
Shee Monthly changeth; thou dost here decline:
And as the Sunne, to her, doth lend his light,
So hee, by thee, is onely made so bright:

As such, 'virginity' has given the already ennobled character of the queen an additional aesthetic dimension. Because of her commitment to 'virginity', Bamfield confers upon his queen a new and permanent value: consistency, which outshines the changeable beauty of other heavenly planets. The comparison between queen Elizabeth and mythological divinities or heavenly objects, which the dramatists and poets were fond to draw, is to show that the queen does outshadow any other virtue which was held to be absolute. Near the end of *King Henry VIII*, William Shakespeare through the Archbishop of Canterbury, shows how Elizabeth's virginity and her leadership have been predicted, and have received their due acclaim since the day she was christened:

She shall be, to the happiness of England,
An aged princess. Many days shall see her,
And yet no day without a deed to crown it.
Would I had known no more. But she must die-
She must, the saints must have her- yet a virgin,
A most uspotted lily shall she pass
To th' ground, and all the world shall mourn her. (5.4.56-62)

The concept of virginity as a sort of loftiness over the mundane desires and instincts of the body is a striking feature in Heywood's plays. More than those who wrote about the same theme, Heywood universalizes the virtue of virginity. In *The Fair Maid of the West, Part I*, we learn that the Queen's reputation has reached Barbary:

- Mullisheg:

That English earth may well be term'd a heaven,
That breeds such divine beauties. (V.i.43-4)

and when the King of Fez realizes that Bess's name is Elizabeth, he contemplates:

There's virtue in that name.
The *virgin queen*, so famous through the world,
The mighty empress of the miden isle, 87-9

- Bess:

Mighty Fez,
She is the only phoenix other age,
The pride and glory of the Western Isles.⁽⁸⁾ (V.i.98-100)

In *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part 7*, Heywood repeats the same motif of universalizing the reputation of Elizabeth, remarkably as a princess surrounded by hostile courtiers. Not all the defamatory remarks in the Court have stimulated the Spanish prince to change his belief in the goodness of Elizabeth:

Philip:

But royall Queene we want
One Ladie at this hye solemnitie:
We have a Sister called Elizabeth,
Whose vertues and endowments of the mind
Hath fil'd the eares of Spaine (Scene iv.277-281)

Though 'virginity' and 'leadership' are two tributes possessed and well preserved by the same person, queen Elizabeth; nonetheless they are incompatible with each other. To achieve this kind of equilibrium between the requirements of her natural body and the responsibilities of the national body politic, queen Elizabeth has sacrificed the first to achieve the second. In a way Elizabeth's 'virginity' has become a voluntary measure adopted by the queen to concentrate more on her rule. Both her subjects as well as, Fredrick Boas argues, "see her proudly confronting every threat and peril; loyal to her ideas of duty, first as subject, then as sovereign, even when in conflict with her womanly instincts; a virginal figure mated only to her England and its people; not without an alloy of ill-temper and passion, but in the fullest sense of a patriot princess and queen"⁽⁹⁾ Elizabeth makes this point clear when she tells her weeping guards:

weepe not I pray,
Rather you should rejoyce:
If I miscarry in this enterprise, and aske you why,
A Virgin and a Martyr both I dy. (scene v. 339-342)

When Elizabeth became a queen the idea of marriage failed to prevail with her. Though her marriage at this stage of her life -politically speaking- would have resolved the question of succession, and would have kept the Tudor dynasty on the throne; nonetheless -she might have felt- her would-be new obligations as a wife and as a mother would distract her attention from other crucial issues touching the national interests of her country and the welfare of the people. The concept that Elizabeth gave herself for the sake of her country was widely accepted and applauded by many Elizabethans. Anthony Munday (c. 1553-1633) confirms this image of the queen, 'her Highness is the most loving Mother and Nurse of all her good Subjects, and is likewise the husband of the common weale, married to the Reame, and the same by ceremony of Ring as solemnly signified, as any other marriage'⁽¹⁰⁾ In Part II of Heywood's play, this image is reiterated, when Hobson calls Elizabeth 'England's Nurse' (scene vii.1 119). At the end of Part I, Heywood illustrates how Elizabeth conceived the English people as her own 'issue', she addresses a copy of the English Bible:

Your names shall be in eternall scrowie;

Who builds on this, dwell's in a happy state,
This is the fountaine cleere and immaculate,
That happy issue that shall us succeed,
And in our populous Kingdome this booke read:
For them as for our owne selves we humbly pray
They may long blest; so lead the way (Scene xxiii. 1592-8)

Any attempt trying to study or search for distinct features of Elizabeth's body natural, one must resort to the components other political leadership, which in their turn contributed to England's autonomy, success and progress. Both bodies, natural and political, are unified in the person of the queen. Devoting this considerable part of the essay to the concept of Elizabeth's 'virginity' and the queen's marriage to England is to draw attention to queen Mary's approach to politics which stands in a completely opposite direction, queen Mary -as we shall see in the following section- has 'divorced' her self from England and its people. While Elizabeth was winning the hearts of the people and consolidating her way to the throne, queen Mary was losing both.

**'Madm, in brief your foes are the Queen's friends,
Your friends her foes'**

Putting the struggle in this simple frame, Thomas Heywood seems to be presenting a commonplace situation which has been treated in other plays such as: Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II*, the anonymous *Woodstock*, and its sequel Shakespeare's *Richard II*. As the plays expound in illustrating the damage created by the monarch's policy, the plays reveal how the struggle is resolved in favour of the oppressed. The defeat of the aggressor is accepted irrespective of what this defeat would have created of demystification to the values by which the monarch has equipped his herself with.

In *Edward II*, the king entrusts the ill reputed Gaveston with his seal to 'save condemn, and in our name command;/ What so thy mind affects of fancy likes'(I. I. 168-9). In *Woodstock* the King appoints a group of flatterers to the key positions in the kingdom while neglecting the honest advice of his relatives:

Young Henry Greene shall be Lord Chancellor,
Bagot, Lord keeper of our privy seal,
Tresilian, learned in our kingdom's laws,
Shall be Chief Justice: by them and their directions
King Richard will uphold his government. (1.3. 184-8)

This stupid whimsicality, which the two kings extravagantly display, reflects a sick outlook towards social, political relations as well as towards life values in general.

The profligacy which has swayed the thinking of Edward and Richard, soon plunges the country into a state of overwhelming corruption and terror. Both plays insist that the financial corruption is the problem from which the people are complaining. The poor state of the country is made credible by the fact that both kings have their desires to spend all their revenues, and to bestow on their minions many additional- and costly titles. This aspect of violating the monarchial title is prominent in *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody*. Yet because of the peculiar nature of the struggle -religious and sectorial- the picture in Heywood's play is much gloomier, and the human cost is greater. From the outset, queen Mary is presented as an unjust ruler.

Worse than both Edward and Richard queen Mary is not given to recklessness or wantonness, rather like her advisers, she is motivated by merciless hatred towards all the Protestants in her kingdom. 'The fierce glare of [Catholic] religious passion,' Professor Bindoff states 'blinded her to the softer lights of humanity and good sense'⁽¹¹⁾. What urges us to look from this perspective at queen Mary's policy and the dissolute conduct of both Edward and Richard, is that -like them- the queen's best judgement is ministered by a severe antipathy towards all those other Court and country who have opted for a new religious belief. More damagingly, the queen neglects her position as a queen over a large empire, and sets herself with her courtiers -who share the same belief- as persecutors of a wide section of the English people. Dodds, on behalf of his city Suffolk, implores the queen to allow them to practise 'and use that faith/ Which in King Edward's days was held Canonical' (scene i.84-5). Dodds expects, in return for their enormous help to the queen (scene 1.3 8-40), that Mary should grant them this request as a gesture of gratitude from a monarch towards faithful subjects. Instead of responding to Dodd's appeal, the Queen accepts Cardinal Winchester's inculpative interpretation of Dodd's words, 'They tie you to conditions, and set limits to your liking' (scene 1.87), and asks Winchester to punish Dodds and his followers. Winchester seizes upon this opportunity and sends Dodds to the Tower:

Away with him, it shall be thoroughly scand,
And you upon the pillory, three days to stand, (scene 1.93-4)

the queen responds to all her courtiers' accusations against all the Protestants in her country, not sparing her own sister whose name is implicated as 'a favorite of these heritique' (scene L97). When Sir W. Sentlow -like Kent in *King Lear*(l.l. 13 6-45)- tries to defend Princess Elizabeth, the Queen banishes him from the court:

Away with him teach him know his place
To frown when we frown, smile on whom we grace (scene I. 122-3)

Also and with this spirit of indiscriminate anger, the queen inflicts upon Young Courtney, Earl of Devonshire, a very humiliating punishment just because of his alleged sympathies with Elizabeth:

Commit him to the Tower,
Till time affords us and our Counsel breathing space, (scene I. 130-1)

As early the first scene, Thomas Heywood increases our suspicion about the queen's discretion. The first scene besets us with an atmosphere of fear, horror and insecurity. The absence of justice is made clear by the fact that Elizabeth is not present on the stage to deny or to confirm the accusations raised against her. Heywood wants to confirm that Mary's treatment of her sister is unfair and her rage is totally unjustified. Also this early session of policy making in the Court increases our pessimism about the prosperity of the future of England.

Like King Edward and Richard, queen Mary commits the same error of relying on some chosen courtiers in carrying out her own duties. This aspect of arbitrarily sharing the royal prerogative is disclosed when the queen appoints a committee of biased advisers to question Princess Elizabeth:

..... Lord of Winchester, my Lord of Sussex,
Lord Howard, Tame, and Shandayse,

Take you Commission to examine her
Of all supposed Crimes; so to our Nuptials (scene iv. 302-5)

With this speech, the queen virtually disappears till the end where she has a brief meeting with Princess Elizabeth before the queen dies. This early abandonment of her sister presents the queen as negligent as the other two kings. The unfairness of Elizabeth's trial is supported by the Court's obsession with extinguishing any flicker of hope for change, which Elizabeth may -if her life is spared - inspire:

Beningfield:

Such is your sister,
A mere opposite to us in our opinion and besides
She's next successive, should your majesty Die
issuless,

.....
The state of our religion would decline (scene ii. 104-7.9)

For the Court, the trial is the place where law can be twisted so that Elizabeth can be incriminated. The trial itself is dominated by hostility and intimidation. Although Sussex clears the princess of all the accusations raised against her (scene v. 398-401), Winchester and the rest remain adamant that Elizabeth must confess her instigation to all the rebellions which faced the Queen, 'Madam, the Queen must *here* you sing another song' (scene v.414). Witnessing that this trial has nothing to do with an honest inquiry, the princess does protest that the procedure is unprecedented. The devoutly pious Princess gives in to a heavenly Court where pravity never exists:

Thou power eternal. Innocents just guide,
That sways the Scepter of all Monarchies,
Protect the guiltless from ravening Jaws,
That hideous death presents, by Tyrants Laws,
And as my heart is known to thee most pure
Grant me release, or patience to endure, (scene v. 425-30)

In Heywood's play there is no reference to financial corruption as the case in both *Edward II* and *Woodstock*. Rather *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* shares the other plays' concern that the monarch's policy -whether financial or religious- is responsible for originating a wide rift between the Court and people. What Heywood introduces as the blemish of Mary's reign is terror against Elizabeth and her sympathetic supporters. Oppression against the State's alleged disbelievers is the prominent feature of the play. Almost the whole action is devoted to disclose the methods adopted by Winchester, Beningfield and the Constable to inflict upon princess Elizabeth and the people some of the severest and most humiliating torture.

The first time we meet princess Elizabeth we see her 'in her bed, [attended] by Doctor Owin, and Doctor Wendith' (s.d. scene iii). We understand from Master Gage that the princess is 'A poor weak Lady, near at poyni of death' (scene iii. 171). Although Dr. Wendith states that the princess's state is not deadly, albeit dangerous, the men sent to fetch her insist that 'To morrow eralie then you must prepare' (scene iii.223). The order to summon the princess does not necessitate this urgency, yet it has become known that the objective of exposing Elizabeth to the rigor of the law is to cause her more harm and to worsen her physical state. Also the State officials reveal

another aspect of hostility towards her, when they ignore Elizabeth's status as a princess and the future queen. Watching this impertinence towards his mistress, Master Gage implores Tame and Shandayse in the name of the princess's father, brother and the queen, to show some respect and to consider Elizabeth's poor condition (scene iii. 177-180). The same situation occurs, later in the play, when the same Gage conjures the Constable's love for King Edward (scene ix. 689), and asks the Constable to treat his prisoner -the Princess- in a more humane way. This amount of cruelty towards the defenceless princess has become a source of pleasure and satisfaction for her persecutors. When Gage asks the Constable, 'Why should you take delight/ To torture a poore Lady innocent?' (scene viii. 702-3); the latter, sadistically, replies:

She is my prisoner, and if I durst,
But that my warrant is not yet so strict,
I'd lay her in a dungeon where her eyes,
Should not have light to read her prayer book,
So would I danger both her soul and body, (scene ix. 716-720)

The state's oppression, which some officials have callously shown towards Elizabeth, does not justify the State's claim that the princess is a threat. Rather the State's policy, under the facade of securing the country -has confirmed the authoritarianism of Queen Mary's regime. If the State officials with the consent of the queen try to present their policies as self-protective measures which their beliefs require, these very policies have presented these officials as the enemy -from within- to both England and the English people. The mere existence of a sick princess, whose activities can be easily curtailed, does not predict a national crisis in England. The atrocities of Winchester, Beningfield and the Constable are presented as growing from these officials' hatred rather than from their insistence to maintain order or to clear England from a 'deviant heretic'. As such, the State's constant attempts to crush Elizabeth's 'deviancy', are themselves a deviancy from the true spirit of Christianity. It is a situation which is made clear by Master Gage:

O thou all-seeing heavens, with pitious eyes,
Looke on th' oppressions of their cruelty!
Let not thy truth, by falshood be opprest,
But let her vertues shyne and give her rest,
Confound the flights, and practise of those men,
Whose pride do kicke thy seat of heaven, (scene vii. 660-5)

For Master Gage, Elizabeth and the Court have changed positions in their relation to Christianity. Elizabeth stands for true religion, whereas the Court stands for heresy and 'falsehood'.

My Lords, my Lords, if it were held fowl treason,
To grieve for her hard usage, by my Soul
My eyes would hardly prove me a true Subject:
But 'tis the Queen's pleasure, and we must obey:
But I shall mourn, should the King and Queen say nay. (scene vii. 553-557)

The State's hostility towards Elizabeth has defined the relation between the State and the country as a whole. The State has directed and shaped its policy towards the English people in the light of the latter's response to Elizabeth's case. It is true that any action concerning England as a whole is not openly debated; yet the play offers a strong evidence which illustrates the State's thinking and its methods in tackling the national response towards Elizabeth. Three stages are inferable in queen Mary's policy towards England.

In scene (vi) -while waiting for the princess to prepare herself for her journey to London- few soldiers choose to talk about the current situation. The discussion reflects the popular opinion of Elizabeth, and their concern over her bad treatment, 'That the Lady Elizabeth is both a lady,/And Elizabeth, and if I should say she were vertuous Princess'(478-9) This sympathetic statement confirms that no enmity exists between Elizabeth and the people, rather this enmity is confirmed within a small circle between the princess and the Court. What is important about the whole scene is the atmosphere of fear and horror which haunts these soldiers as they proceed in their conversation. The statements which they keep using such as 'where there any harme in that?' (480. 485. 499. 508. 513); or 'I'll keep myself within my compase I warrant you'(486); or 'But beware of talking of the Princesse'(482); or 'that word Sister goes hardly downe'(489), imply the soldiers' fear lest their words be conveyed to, or misinterpreted by the Court.

In scene (xi) the English people are more generous in their support of the princess. Although the support is seen at its best as spontaneous, it is faithful, and far from volatile, 'The Lord preserve thy Sweete Grace'(848); and 'Now the Lord blesse thy sweete Crace'(854). The princess rejoices in this ebullient support. 'Give them this Gold, and thanke them for their loves'(852). Benningfield envisages in this heart-to-heart support the failure of the State's policy to pressure the people not to align themselves with Elizabeth:

Traytors and knaves ring Bells,
When the Queenes enemy passeth through the towne,
Go set the knaves by 'the heales their pates ring noone, (870-872)

What this scene offers is the atmosphere of polarization now dominant in the country and prevailing with the Court's thinking. With this spirit of ferocious hatred the fanatics in the Court respond to the pardon sued by Philip - which is reluctantly granted by the queen to her sister. This 'pardon' marks the end of a long contrived plan to kill Elizabeth and to revive Catholicism in England:

For our true religion will decay,
I do divine who ever lives seaven year,
Shall see no Religion here but heresy. (scene xviii. 1323-5)

This anguish at their defeat has led the fanatics in the Court to embark on severe atrocities against other Protestant figures in the country. Heywood informs us:

Cardinal Poole with the rest of that surviving faction,
seeing things thus rettogade to their desires, perceiving the
discontents of the Queene, and that but a few sands were
left in the glasse of her time, they, *Nebuchndezzar-like*,
heated the oven of their presecution seaven times hotter

than before. For having already burned five Bishops, twenty one Doctors, eight Gentlemen, eighty foure Artificers, an hundreth Husbandmen, Servants, and labourers, twenty six wives, twenty Widows, nine Virgins, two boys, two infants, the one whipped to death the other sprange out of its Mothers wombe being at the stake, and was crulley cast into fire againe; Sixty four persecuted, whereof seven whipped to death, 16 dyed in prison and were in Dung-hils, many in Captivity abroad, leaving all they had, only for conscience sake.

Quis taliafando, temperet a lachrimis?

If the hostility towards Elizabeth helped to increase her popularity; the atrocities against the people turn to be counterproductive. Like all the other monarchs referred to so far, queen Mary fails to make her policies appealing to her people. Instead of convincing her people with the claim that Elizabeth is their enemy, the queen and her Court are isolated in their own country.

Both Marlowe and Heywood reveal to what extent this havoc, which has been wrought by the Court's policy, has damaged the status of the country. Edward's prodigality has led to the loss of Normandy (III.ii. 59-65). Likewise Heywood attributes the seizure of Calice by the French to queen Mary's policy⁽¹²⁾. Professor Bindoff sums up England's state at the end of queen Mary's reign, 'politically bankrupt, spiritually impoverished, economically anarchic, and intellectually enraveted, Marian England awaited the day of its deliverance'⁽¹³⁾. If Heywood has distributed such pessimistic image throughout his play, he adovacates Bindoff s belief that the situation is ripe for change:

Sussex:

This realm will never stand in perfect state,
Till all their *faction* be clear *ruinate* (scene xx. 1390-1)

However radical Sussex's words may seem, their envisagement of the solution to the crisis, which the monarch has created, confirms the point of no return which the political situation has reached. Such an extreme resolution is deemed necessary and urgent. This situation offers only two options: either the irresponsibility of the monarch, and the percinciousness of this close allies, or the people will take the initiative to bring about a change, together with the leader around whom they thronged. By losing public support so overtly, the monarch loses the main source of his authority. The legitimacy of his/her rule begins to totter because of growing opposition. However the aim of this fundamental interpretation of the final stage which proceeds the fall of the monarch is not to propagate a certain theory of deposing a fickle or a tyrannous ruler. Rather such an interpretation is intended to explain the causes and justify the ensuing change which culminates in the disgraceful fall and the spectacular rise of Kings.

Endurance and patience are the two weapons by which Princess Elizabeth has survived her ordeal. Both elements have shrapened Elizabeth's commitment to her people and her belief. Instead of giving in to the pressure, Elizabeth's autonomy –in what concerns her religious belief- is consolidated by the very elements, religion, state and family, which tried to obliterate it. Thus the Court's schemes are thwarted by Elizabeth's steadfastness. Frustration, which the Court has tried to extract from

Elizabeth, retorts to the Court and causes its defeat. The life of Elizabeth's adversaries is consumed by bitterness and anger. The idea that frustration can be more effective than the 'blows of arms' is evident in *Henry VIII*, where Shakespeare reports how Cardinal Wolsey unceremoniously perished of despair when he saw all his dreams vanish before his eyes. In a quick movement, Thomas Heywood dispenses with all the princess's enemies. Whether because of some unexpected sickness or of their fiasco, Winchester and Pool undignifiedly leave the action. Unapologetically, Sussex expresses a feeling of relief at the two Cardinals' demise:

Winchester's dead, O God even at his death,
He shewd his mallice to the sweete young Princess

.....
Let him go [Pool] why, then ther's a fall of Prelates, (scene xx. 1378-9 1389)

The death of queen Mary, also from sadness, is reported, however, with due respect:

Howard:

Whether in sorrow for the King's departure,
or els for greife at *Winchesters* decease,
Or els that Cardnials is sodaynely dead,
I cannot tell, but shee's exceeding sick (scene xx. 1400-1403)

The kind of resistance which Elizabeth exemplifies; and which Heywood does recommend is passive resistance. It is passive in the sense that it does not depend on armed struggle or violence, two features common in every history play. Rather by increasing her awareness of her right together with her endurance Elizabeth has resolved the struggle in her favour. What the State forgets is the strength of Elizabeth's belief. However physically weak, yet her belief and the love she bears her people have outpowered all the State's instruments of torture and persecution. As the jubilant messengers race to bring Elizabeth the happy news of her election as the new queen, Elizabeth recuperates from her ordeal and assumes her rule:

Some we intend rayse, none to displace; (scene xxiii. 1561)
And now to *London* Lords lead on the way,
Praying the King [God], that all Kings els obey (scene xxiii. 1569-1570)

Notes

* All the quotations to be found throughout this essay are taken from the Malone Society Reprints' edition of *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (Oxford, 1968). The modernization has affected some letters such as: f=s, u=v, v=u, i=j, otherwise the spelling and punctuation have remained the same. Concerning other plays, the reference to their sources will be made when they occur.

1. In an essay entitled. The Sources of Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* Part I, *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 39(1924), (220-222), Robert Grant Martin concludes that 'the main source of the play is, then, Foxe's narrative, whether read in the original or in Holinshed, and thus the play follows with great closeness, not in incident, but often in phraseology', p.222.
2. Mawbray Velte, *The Bourgeois Elements in The Dramas of^m Thomas Heywood* (New York, 1966), p.33.
3. Louise B. Wright, "Heywood and the popularising of *Irlistory*" *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 43 (1928), (287-293), p.290.
4. F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640* (London, 1962), p. 184.
5. Quotation from *Edward II* are taken from *Christopher Marlowe: Complete Plays and Poems*, ed., E.D. Pendry and J.C. Moxwell (London, 1983).
6. References to Shakespeare's plays, wherever they occur, are taken from *William Shakespeare The Complete Works*, ed., Stanley Wells and Gray Taylor (Oxford, 1986).
7. References to Woodstock are taken from *Woodstock: A Moral History*, ed., A.P. Rossiter (London, 1946).
8. From *The Fair Maid of the West, Part I and II*, ed., Robert K. Turner, JR, (London, 1968).
9. Frederick S. Boas, *Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies*, (London, 1950), p.35.
10. Quoted by Elkin Callouen Wilson in *England's Eliza*, no further details is given, p.218.
11. S.T. Bindoff, *Tudor England*, (Harmondsworth, 1982), p.178.
12. In *England's Elizabeth*, ed., Philip R. Rider (New York and London, 1982), Thomas Heywood amplifies the importance of *Calice*, 'News came over that *Calice* in *France*, a towne of great import, was recovered by the French, having belonged to the Crowne of *England* two hundred and eleven years, and herin the losse of *Calice* was most memorable', p. 104.
13. Bindoff, p. 182.