

TRAGEDY AT COURT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
JEALOUSY, HONOUR, REVENGE AND LOVE  
IN JOHN FORD'S *LOVE'S SACRIFICE* AND  
LOPE DE VEGA'S *PUNISHMENT WITHOUT REVENGE*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MERVE AYDOĞDU

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

JANUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro (METU, FLE) \_\_\_\_\_

Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman (Hacettepe, IDE) \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Sevil Onaran (METU, FLE) \_\_\_\_\_

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last Name: Merve Aydođdu

Signature :

## ABSTRACT

TRAGEDY AT COURT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
JEALOUSY, HONOUR, REVENGE AND LOVE  
IN JOHN FORD'S *LOVE'S SACRIFICE* AND  
LOPE DE VEGA'S *PUNISHMENT WITHOUT REVENGE*

Aydođdu, Merve

M.A., Department of Foreign Language Education

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

January 2013, 156 pages

The aim of this study is to demonstrate the destructive effects of infidelity in the old-aged husband-the young wife marriages which end up with tragedy. In John Ford's *Love's Sacrifice* (1633) and Lope de Vega's *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631), tragedy turns out to be the inevitable consequence of the plays since the motives of jealousy, honour, revenge and love converge and lead people to commit sinful crimes. Within this scope, the first chapter of the thesis is devoted to the historical information about the state of English and Spanish theatres together with the biographies of the playwrights. In the second chapter, the tripartite relationship between jealousy, revenge, and honour is dealt with based upon examples from the primary sources in a historical framework. The reasons and results of these themes are studied through the characters in the plays. The third chapter covers the theme of love, its history and its influence on characters. In this chapter, the nature of love between the characters and its consequences are examined. The conclusion asserts that the old-aged husband and the young wife create a mismatched union and accompanied with the motives of honour, jealousy and revenge, the institution of marriage breeds tragic consequences. The analysis of the above mentioned themes is based on a historical context and it is also concluded that although *Love's Sacrifice*

(1633) and *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631) belong to the Renaissance age, both plays bear the influences of the Greco-Roman drama tradition. Thus, the similarities and differences between classical and Renaissance tragedy are demonstrated.

Key Words: Spanish Golden Age, revenge tragedy, Renaissance drama, classical drama.

## ÖZ

SARAYDA TRAJEDİ: JOHN FORD'UN *LOVE'S SACRIFICE* VE LOPE DE VEGA'NIN *PUNISHMENT WITHOUT REVENGE* ADLI YAPITLARINDA KISKANÇLIK, ŞEREF, İNTİKAM VE AŞK İLİŞKİLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Aydođdu, Merve

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dürrin Alpakın Martinez Caro

Ocak 2013, 156 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, trajediyle sonuçlanan yaşlı koca-geç hanım evliliklerinde sadakatsizliğin yıkıcı etkilerini gözler önüne sermektir. John Ford'un *Love's Sacrifice* (1633) ve Lope de Vega'nın *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631) adlı yapıtlarında, kıskançlık, şeref, intikam ve aşk duyguları bir araya gelerek karakterleri suç işlemeye teşvik eder ve bu sebeptendir ki trajedi her iki oyunda da kaçınılmaz bir son olarak yansıtılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, bu tezin ilk bölümü oyun yazarlarının yaşam öykülerinin yanı sıra İngiliz ve İspanyol tiyatrolarının o dönemdeki durumları hakkındaki bilgi verme amacına adanmıştır. İkinci bölümde, kıskançlık, intikam ve şeref temaları arasındaki üçlü ilişki temel metinlerden örneklendirmelere dayanarak tarihi bir çerçevede ele alınmıştır. Bu kavramları doğuran etkenler ve onların sonuçları karakterler bağlamında incelenmiştir. Üçüncü kısım aşk temasını, aşk kavramına tarihsel süreçte yüklenen anlamları ve aşkın oyunlardaki karakterler üzerindeki nüfuzunu kapsamaktadır. Bu kısımda, karakterler arasındaki aşkın niteliği ve doğurduğu sonuçlar tartışılmıştır. Kapanış bölümü, yaşlı koca-geç hanım çiftinin birbirine uymayan bir evlilik vücuda getirdiğini ve kıskançlık, şeref ve intikam güdülerinin de dahil olmasıyla, evlilik kurumunun ölümcül sonuçlar doğurduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Yukarıda adı geçen temalar tarihi bir bağlamda

incelenmiştir. Bu sebeple, *Love's Sacrifice* (1633) ve *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631) her ne kadar Rönesans dönemine ait eserler olsalar da, her iki oyunda da antik tiyatro etkilerinin görüldüğü gözlemlenmiş ve bu çerçevede Rönesans trajedisi ile antik tiyatro arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar gösterilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İspanyol Altın Çağı, intikam trajedisi, Rönesans tiyatrosu, antik tiyatro.

To my family



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Dürrin Alpakin Martinez Caro, who has supported and patiently listened to me in every stage of this thesis writing process. It is because of her valuable advice and feedback that this thesis has become what it is now. I would like to thank her since her Renaissance course made me aware of Lope de Vega.

I sincerely thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman and Dr. Sevil Onaran as they have volunteered to take part in my thesis committee. They have read my thesis and contributed to it with their invaluable comments. I should also mention that Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman always gave me support and encouragement throughout my undergraduate studies at Hacettepe University.

I would like to thank my dearest friend Lejla Biogradlija for being an unconditional confidante and supporter in every phase of my life.

Also, I would like to express my wholehearted gratitude to Burak Arıtürk for his unlimited support, help, encouragement, understanding, love and affection throughout the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my family members who have always struggled for my education, happiness and comfort. I would not be where I am today without their support. I dedicate this thesis to my parents Nebahat-Mehmet Aydođdu and to my grandparents Sebahat-Mümin Öztürk.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ .....	vi
DEDICATION .....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 John Ford and Renaissance Drama.....	14
1.2 Lope de Vega and Spanish Golden Age Drama.....	20
2. THE TRIPARTITE RELATIONSHIP: JEALOUSY, HONOUR, REVENGE .....	33
2.1.1 Jealousy.....	33
2.1.2 Honour.....	36
2.1.3 Revenge.....	41
2.2 Jealousy, Honour, Revenge in <i>Love's Sacrifice</i> .....	43
2.3 Jealousy, Honour, Revenge in <i>Punishment Without Revenge</i> .....	63
3. LOVE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.....	88
3.1 Love as A Historic Concept .....	88
3.2 Love and Its Consequences in <i>Love's Sacrifice</i> .....	95
3.3 Love and Its Consequences in <i>Punishment Without Revenge</i> ..	113
4. CONCLUSION.....	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	146
APPENDICES.....	156
Appendix A: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu .....	156

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a study of the devastating effects of infidelity in the old-aged husband-the beautiful, young wife marriages which result in tragedy. As the examination will demonstrate, tragedy is the consequence of the mergence of many elements in Lope de Vega's *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631) and John Ford's *Love's Sacrifice* (1633). Namely, while love for wives triggers jealousy, it arouses the feeling of revenge for the sake of restoring honour and good reputation. Based on the ground of these themes, before starting to analyse the plays, the first chapter of the thesis will be allotted to the historical information about the condition of English and Spanish theatres together with references to the playwrights. In the second chapter, the tripartite relationship between jealousy, revenge, and honour will be discussed based upon examples from the texts. The reasons and results of these themes will be analysed through the characters in the plays. The third chapter will cover the theme of love and its effects on characters. In this chapter, the nature of love between the characters and its consequences will be examined. The conclusion will assert that the old-aged husband and the young wife establish a mismatched union and accompanied with the motives of honour, jealousy and revenge, the institution of marriage begets tragic consequences. The analysis of the afore-mentioned themes will be based on a historical context and it will also be concluded that despite being written during the Renaissance period, both *Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge* bear the features of the Greco-Roman drama. Thereby, the differences between classical and Renaissance tragedy will be evaluated.

The history of drama began in the ancient Greece four centuries before the birth of Jesus Christ. The mere form of drama was tragedy then and

it was based on the imitation of the humankind. Aristotle (384 BC–322 BC), who formed the critical standards of a tragedy in his *Poetics* (335 BC), emphasized its imitative quality and defined it as follows:

A tragedy, then, is the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the work; in a dramatic, not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions. (Bywater 35)

The Athenians celebrated the rites of Dionysus, held festivals in his honour each year and tragedy evolved out of the dithyrambic songs-hymns sung by a chorus of fourteen members- which dealt with life, birth, death, rebirth and the seasonal changes (Rogers 6). Circa 534 BC, tragedy became an official part of the spring festivals of Dionysus during which the competitors produced three tragedies and a satyr play and tragedy got its name from these plays as the combination of *tragos* and *ode*- the *goat song* (Rogers 9-13).

Now that the Renaissance drama –or European drama as a whole- has its roots in the goat songs of the ancient times, it would be better to start by listing the characteristics of the Greek tragedy.

In those plays, all the performers were male and they used to wear masks so that one actor could perform more than one role. There were no female performers and thanks to the masks, the actors could perform the woman roles as well (Sacks 242). The plays usually started with a prologue in which the playwright presented his subject and there was always a chorus which would be considered as the voice of wisdom. The chorus was usually composed of fifteen members with one chorus leader and their duty was to foretell the future dangers, the course of events and to present the audience with values and norms through which they could judge a play. The chorus also used to give advice, express opinion and sometimes interfere with the action (Watling 10-11).

Content wise, in these tragedies, all the characters belonged to the nobility; the kings, the queens, the leaders and the commanders used to hold the stage. Language was lofty and elevated and there was no violence on the stage. Rape, murder and suicide were only reported by

the chorus or a messenger. As Aristotle prescribed, the three unities of time, action and place were strictly observed. *Deus ex machina*, which was introduced by Horace (65 BC-8 BC) in *Ars Poetica* (18 BC) and which can be translated as the interference of gods, was used as a technical device to solve the problems when the events got too complicated to overcome (Rogers 11).

As Aristotle in his *Poetics* explained, in those Greek plays, there was always hero's downfall because of his tragic flaw: *hamartia*, excessive feelings a character had, resulted in his fall. *Hubris* –pride- was an important factor as well as the role of fate since the hero could neither do anything to change his destiny chosen by the Gods nor could he control his fate such as the Oedipus of Sophocles's *Oedipus Rex*. *Peripeteia* was the reversal of everything in the life of a hero after which he could realize the fatal mistake he committed: *pathos* followed *anagnorisis* since it resulted in his suffering. Punishment for the mistake –*nemesis*- was inevitable and finally it led to *catharsis*- the purification of the sentiments of the audience.

The three important tragedy writers of the ancient Greece were Aeschylus (525? BC-456 BC), Sophocles (495? BC-406 BC) and Euripides (485 BC-407 BC) as well as one comedy writer, Aristophanes (444? BC-380 BC) (Watling, Introduction 8). Aeschylus was the first Greek tragedian and his major contribution to the stage was the introduction of the second actor which enabled the introduction of the dialogue instead of the monologue on stage (Rogers 11). Aeschylus's main concern was the portrayal of human condition (Vellacott, Introduction 9) and with the introduction of the dialogue he reduced the importance of the chorus. His trilogy -the only surviving one- *Oresteia* (458 BC) consisted of *Agamemnon*, *Libation Bearers* and *The Eumenides*. Sophocles, the successor of Aeschylus, abandoned writing in trilogies; he also reduced the importance of the chorus and added the third actor on the stage (Rogers 11). He penned *Oedipus Rex* (429 BC), *Ajax* (circa 450 BC-430 BC), *Antigone* (before 441 BC), *Philoctetes* (409 BC) and *Oedipus at Colonus* (401 BC) in which he dealt with the human relationships. Euripides followed the two and in his plays he reflected the human

suffering. *Medea* (431 BC), *Hecabe* (425 BC), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (414 BC), *Heracles* (420 BC) *Alcestis* (438 BC), *Hippolytos* (428 BC) and *Electra* (415 BC) were among his plays which bore psychological insights into the human psychology (Vellacott, *Euripides* 7-14).

With the expansion of the Roman Empire into the Greek territories, the Greek drama got united with the Roman one and although the Greek performances continued, from 2 BC onwards, the Roman drama marked its sovereignty over the Greek plays.

In the broadest terms, Roman drama refers to any dramatic form- tragedy, comedy, farce, mime, and pantomime- composed in the Latin language, a language used by the inhabitants of the city of Rome and that eventually became the administrative language of the Roman Republic (509-30 BC) and the Roman Empire (30 BC-476 AD). (Rogers 19)

Terence (195/185 BC-159 BC) and Plautus (254 BC-184 BC) wrote comedies and they became major influences on the Renaissance playwrights such as Shakespeare (1564-1616), Tirso de Molina (1679-1648) and Lope de Vega (1562-1635).

Another influence on the Renaissance tragedy was the Roman Seneca (4 BC-AD 64) who was famous for his bloody revenge tragedies. He wrote closet dramas which were written to be read rather than performed. The Senecan tragedies were composed of five acts; while the speeches were elaborately constructed, they contained brief conclusions. In these tragedies, the characters were generally dominated by a single motive driving them to their doom. The plays included sensational themes and events such as adultery, incest, infanticide and there was always violence and bloodshed. The works of Seneca were mainly concerned with the portrayal of intense emotion and *Phaedra*, *Thyestes*, *Hercules Oetaeus*, *Octavia Praetexta* and *Troas* (Rogers 26) were his plays which had a considerable influence on the Elizabethan mind.

These tragedies display both basic structural similarities to the older Greek and Roman tragedies (prologues, episodes broken up by Choral interludes) as well as general thematic parallels (intrigue, recognition, and the fall of characters of great social status or power). (Rogers 27)

During the centuries that followed the fall of the Roman Empire, the classical Greek and Roman tragedies were almost forgotten since many of the theatrical activities were oppressed by the Church. Until Renaissance humanists unearthed the wealth of the ancients, drama served only for the religious purposes. Its result was the emergence of liturgical drama, whose first example was *Quem Quaeritis?*- *Whom Do You Seek?* Which belongs to the tenth century, in which the church teachings were performed so that the illiterate public could understand Catholicism better (Kennedy 83). Theatre activities during the Middle Ages continued with mystery, miracle and morality plays all of which dealing with biblical themes (Kennedy 86).

When the clergy stopped acting and the laymen replaced them, however, the secularization process of the drama began and it reached its peak in the Renaissance. Tragedy refers to a kind of play but it should be stated that

in pre-Renaissance England, the major form that the genre took was not that of a play but of a narrative poem telling the story of the fall and usually death of some great man or woman of the past. (Smith and Sullivan 3)

Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375) in *De casibus virorum illustrium- The Falls of Famous Men* (1360) presented these stories depicting the fall of great men *historia- histories* (Smith and Sullivan 4). The contemporary of Boccaccio, Geoffrey Chaucer, (1343-1400) in the Prologue to the Monk's Tale of *The Canterbury Tales*, however, called that kind of narrative *tragedy*:

Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie,  
As olde books maken us memorie,  
Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,  
And is yfallen out of heigh degree  
Into mysterie, and endeth wrecchedly. (Leech, *Tragedy* 2)

The definition of tragedy passed on to the English writers two centuries later and it was John Lydgate (1370-1451) who first called Boccaccio's histories *tragedies* "and it was through this medium that this idea of tragedy was passed on to early Renaissance writers in England" (Smith and Sullivan 5).

There was an interest in the classical forms of theatre as it was the time of the revaluation of the ancient works (Barker and Hinds 2) and Plautus was first performed in England at Christmas, 1536, at St. John's College (Schelling 5). George Buchanan (1506-1582) was among the first humanists who applied classical drama to the education. He translated two tragedies of Euripides into Latin and the tradition of writing a Latin play based on a classical example became a tradition both in England and on the continent (Schelling 6-7) due to his efforts. As a whole, it was Plautus for comedy and Seneca for tragedy who were imitated. It is probable that Seneca's treatment of psychological subjects, his concern with the human nature and his style free of restraints appealed to the Elizabethans. Thomas Sackville (1536-1608) and Thomas Norton (1532-1584) wrote *Gorboduc* (1561) –first English tragedy written in blank verse- and it was thanks to their play that the Roman influences manifested themselves. Furthermore, Jasper Heywood (1535-1598) translated into English three plays of Seneca, *Troas* (1559), *Thyestes* (1560) and *Hercules Furens* (1561) (Schelling 11-12).

It seems that the plays of the Roman author Seneca (4 BC-AD 64) deeply appealed to the contemporary people and inspired the Renaissance tragedy, especially after the publication of *Seneca, His Tenne Tragedies Translated into English* in 1581 under the editorship of Thomas Newton (Schelling 12). Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*- written sometime between 1582 and 1592- was an early example of the Senecan tradition much as Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Mariam* (1613) both because of its interest in revenge and also due to the fact that it was a closet drama like Seneca's plays (Barker and Hinds 5). Indeed, it was Seneca who instructed the Renaissance dramatists and who gave them certain characteristics of playwriting. As T.S Eliot commented: "No author exercised a wider or deeper influence on the Elizabethan mind or upon the Elizabethan form of tragedy than did Seneca" (MacKendrick and Howe 310).

In pursuit of blood for blood and influenced by him, revenge tragedies became popular eventually. While Thomas Kyd was the pioneer of revenge plays, Shakespeare was the one who perfected the pattern of



Seneca. Under the influence of *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Titus Andronicus* - written sometime between 1588 and 1593- was Shakespeare's first attempt at the genre and afterwards he placed it to the highest level with *Hamlet* (1603- the First Quarto). Christopher Marlowe also contributed to the tradition with the Machiavellian protagonist of *The Jew of Malta* (1589-1590). Later, John Marston (1576-1634) with his tragedy of *Antonio's Revenge* (1602) added to the mainstream and future playwrights of revenge tragedies, instead of drawing from Seneca, made use of the works of Kyd, Shakespeare and Marston to write their works.

To list the characteristics of a revenge tragedy, it is suitable to start with the perpetrators: the revenge may be acted by the hero or the villain to adjust a wrong caused by jealousy, vendetta, insult, humiliation or resentment (Bowers 64) and the murderers cannot avoid death. Smith and Sullivan relate that avengers are frustrated people who pursue retribution for a crime that remains unpunished. They try to take law into their own hands and struggle to satisfy their demand for revenge in pursuit of justice (59). Only through revenge can they soothe their disturbed mentality. The incidents in a revenge tragedy may form a chain. An action leads to revenge; that revenge may lead to counter-revenge and thus the people are affected by those chain of events.

Murder was a prerequisite for those tragedies. The common belief was that tragedy had to end in death because "[w]ith Seneca the very nature of things was disastrous, and calamity was irresistible and inescapable. There was nothing left for man but to endure, and in endurance lay his only hope" (Craig 33).

Dumb shows, choruses, ghosts asking for vengeance, madness, insanity, intrigues, soliloquies, sentiments loftily expressed, morals delivered through Delphi oracles, classical names, gods and allusions, rage, blood, horror over horror, cruel scenes to stimulate emotions, momentary hesitation of the revenger, waiting for the best opportunity to act and several deaths were among the general characteristics of the Senecan-tradition-plays (Schelling 13-17). The passions of jealousy, hatred, ambition, love were used frequently on stage. Foreign settings enabled

playwrights to criticize political and social situation of contemporary England. Italy became the conventional setting for these tragedies:

[Catholic countries such as Spain or Italy] were thought of as places of excess and uncontrolled appetites. Not only were these Mediterranean societies seen as being obsessed with revenge, but all aspects of their culture were thought of as lacking control and regulation. . . . A particular preoccupation for English writers was with Italian sexual mores, often thought to be perverted, outlandish, and undignified. In the realm of politics, Italy was singled out as a loose web of states which rivalled one another in corruption, opportunism and political intrigue. (Barker and Hinds 9)

Typically, Machiavelli was the villain for the Elizabethan mind (Bowers 49). It meant deceit, murder, treachery, ruthlessness towards the emotions of the others. It was the indifference to the sufferings of other people, using deceitful ways to achieve what one wants, manipulating others to get what one aims at (Bowers 76). Lorenzo of *The Spanish Tragedy* was the typical example of the Machiavellian villain.

The Elizabethans recognized that the deeds of violence were the core of the Senecan tragedy. It is obvious that Seneca was the source of inspiration for the Renaissance stage. The exhibitions of violence and blood were the essential ingredients of the tragedies and they were not perceived oddly by the audience because they used to see the scene of blood due to public executions. The tragedies represented the acts of violence, lust, villainy, murder which ended up by being punished in the presence of the audience. In this respect, there was the concept of divine justice.

As Bowers summarizes in *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy*, the revenge tragedies of Kydian formula used to be serious since they had moral and philosophical overtones. Besides, there was a kind of sacred duty to pursue revenge. However, this early period of Kydian revenge tragedy was replaced by the villains holding the stage from 1607 to 1620. This time the emphasis shifted from the theme of revenge to the intrigues and villains. The antagonists of earlier tragedies- the Machiavellian- became the protagonists at this phase. These villain plays showed a disapproval of revenge, but this was merely an implication (280-81). The serious tone

of the first stage of plays became lighter, as the emphasis on the intrigues got heavier. “The world of tragedy [turned out to be] a dark world of corruption, perversion, blood and passion” (Carter and McRae 116). From 1620 onwards, the revenge tragedies shifted the aim from the representation of revenge to the problem of the morality of revenge. Massinger, Ford, Rowley, and Middleton wrote their plays in a manner treating revenge as cruel, mistaken, and wrong:

The plays of Massinger, Rowley, and Ford [were] frequently replete with blood, horrors, and many of the conventional situations of the old revenge tragedy. It [was] conclusions of their tragedies, the larger interest apportioned to the problems of ethics in vengeance, and the decreased interest in the depiction of villainy, which mark the difference. (Bowers 186-87)

However, it was equally significant to affect the audience. As the years passed by, the terror on stage got more massive and stronger incentives were needed to stimulate the people.

That is why the Caroline dramatist turned more and more for his subject matter to the daring, the immoral, the unnatural; that is partly why Ford, among others, sought subjects like incest and adultery and was content to have Giovanni appear with Annabella’s bleeding heart on his dagger. (Oliver 3)

England was not the only country that was influenced by Greco-Roman drama. In Spain, the translation activities from the Roman playwrights were taking place as well. Euripides’s *Hecuba* and Sophocles’s *Electra* as *Revenge for Agamemnon* were translated into Spanish by Fernan Perez de Oliva in 1528 and Pedro Simon de Abril translated Aristophanes’s *Plutus* into Spanish in 1577. Also, Plautus’s *Amphitriyon* was translated in 1515 by Francisco Lopez de Villalobos and in 1525 by Fernan Perez de Oliva. In 1577, Pedro Simon de Abril produced the Spanish translation of Terence’s *The Eunuch* (Hight 120-22) and the earliest dramatic translation of Seneca was a version of *Medea*, *Thyestes*, and *The Trojan Women* made in Catalan by Antonio Vilaragut” (Hight 122).

As the historical data suggest, it is an undeniable fact that in Europe during the Renaissance age, the literary people struggled for the

rediscovery of the classical works and the result was the considerable impact of Greco-Roman drama on the Renaissance literary pieces. As Shakespeare made Polonius state in *Hamlet*, however, it was not the Greeks but Plautus and Seneca who really affected the Renaissance dramatists:

The best actors in the world, either for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral, scene individable, or poem unlimited: Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light. For the law of writ and the liberty, these are the only man. (II.II.402-08)

As Hight summarizes, during the Middle Ages, the plays were performed by amateurs and laymen and the theatre activity was not accepted as a craft. Renaissance drama, however, was a high-culture-art since only the knowledgeable elites of the aristocracy could understand Greek and Latin culture and texts. The realization of drama as a type of literature distinct from narrative only became possible in the fifteenth century when a body of works were translated and their imitations were put on the stage in Italy and France (127-28).

The modern structure of drama reached Europe from Greece via Rome and the following elements were imported: the proportion of plays which last from two to three hours; the symmetrical division of a play into three, four or to five acts and the chorus were all Greek inventions. The intricate plot was also Greco-Roman transmission to the Renaissance stage. Influenced by them, Renaissance playwrights created complex stories and characters, conflicts between people, intrigues, suspense and emotional tension to compose their works (Hight 130-31).

It was Seneca who instructed the Renaissance dramatists of Europe. They inherited from him certain characters, attitudes and devices such as the ambitious, ruthless tyrant of Shakespeare's *Richard III* (1623-First Folio) (Hight 132). The cruel tyrant figure was taken up by the Italians later and was transformed into a Machiavellian character. Besides, it was Seneca "who stimulated the Elizabethan dramatists to the tremendous outbursts of pride and passion, half heroic and half insane" (Hight 133). Indeed, Seneca represented their passion for the darker side of life:

for witchcraft and the supernatural (as in *Macbeth*), for madness impending or actual (*Hamlet*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *The Duchess of Malfi*, *King Lear*), for the display of torture, mutilation, and corpses (*King Lear*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Orbecche*, *The Duchess of Malfi*), and for murder committed and multiplied before the eyes of the audience. (Highet 133)

Renaissance was a cultural movement originating from Florence, Italy and spreading throughout Europe between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries (Johnson 4). As the historical data related prove, it was the revival of the works and the culture of the ancients. The Renaissance man was influenced by the ancient authors in terms of form and patterns of expression (Craig 22), besides the ancient world served as a Muse for them. The Renaissance age improved the styles used by poets and writers; the ancient literary forms of tragedy, comedy, epic, and satire were resuscitated by the Renaissance artists. As Schelling notes, it enabled the resurrection of Seneca (4 BC-AD 64), Plautus (254-184 BC) and Terence (195/185-159 BC), Aristophanes (444? BC-380 BC) on stage (4). It was through the Greek and Roman authors that the Renaissance man reached the wealth of the ancient past. Their works provided the foundation for the creation of world masterpieces of authors from Italy, Spain and England. Now that the Renaissance idea was based on imitation, its people did not hesitate to imitate the ancients in their works. As Craig evaluates:

[The Renaissance] rests ultimately upon the great doctrine of similitude. Renaissance looked upon man as a universal being repeating in his life the deeds of all men. If man is a universal being, his conduct will always follow a pattern. . . . A man who absorbed the ancients was rendered like the ancients. By saying their words and thinking their thoughts he became like them. He acquired their virtues. Renaissance imitation was, in a universe thus patterned, methodologically inevitable. (24)

During the Renaissance, due to royal marriages and political conflicts, England and Spain frequently interacted. As part of the Anglo-Spanish War (1585-1604), for instance, the Spanish Armada sailed against England with the hopes of dethroning Queen Elizabeth I. As a counter one, English Armada, led by Sir Francis Drake, attacked the Spaniards

and the English defeated the naval forces of Spain (Soergel 156). While in the political realm the relationships were not pleasing, in literary sphere the interactions advanced in a more promising way.

In compliance with the Renaissance spirit of imitation and due to the close bonds between the two countries, it is possible to trace the influence of Spanish drama on Elizabethan theatre. For instance, Schelling notes that John Fletcher (1579-1625) was among the early dramatists to base his tragicomedy *Philaster* –first published in 1620- on Spanish *comedias de capa y espada* (cape and sword plays) created by Lope de Vega. In addition, Cervantes (1547-1616) was Fletcher's favourite and he was fond of his works. Besides Cervantes and Lope de Vega, Juan de Flores (1455-1525) and Gonzalo de Céspedes (1585?-1638) had influence on four of Fletcher's plays. Although he could not read them in their original language, Fletcher was acquainted with them through translations to English and French (118-20). Schelling also lists that a tragicomedy *The Spanish Gypsy* (1623) of Middleton and Rowley was a combination of two stories of Cervantes; a comedy *The Maid in the Mill* (first performed in 1623) of Rowley and Fletcher was based on a story of Gonzalo de Céspedes; a tragicomedy *The Renegado* (1630) of Massinger (1583-1640) was based upon a play *Los baños de Argel* (1615) by Cervantes. Similarly, Shirley (1596-1666) is reported to draw upon a comedy of Tirso de Molina (1579-1648) in *The Opportunity* (1640) and he is stated to be influenced by one of Lope de Vega's comedies in *The Young Admiral* (1637) (121). To summarize:

Spanish literary influences on the drama in Tudor times were slight and confined, almost entirely, to an occasional plot, derived as a rule through a French or English translation as an intermediary. In the reign of James, Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and William Rowley, alone among the dramatists of note, drew on Spanish sources for their plays. . . . In the reign of King Charles I, the relations of England and Spain became closer. (Schelling 127)

The early decades of the seventeenth century witnessed the effect of Golden Age Spain on English stage though it was short-lived. After 1640s, Spain involved in international wars; its financial situation deteriorated and it lost its dominant influence on Europe (Soergel 154).

The flowering of Spanish and English drama was simultaneous. If England had Shakespeare (1564-1616), Lope de Vega would be his rival in Spain. In both countries, the playwrights put their talents on stage, thereby made their bread out of drama. It was a source of income and popularity, since acting companies shared their income with the playwrights. The development process of theatre was also similar. Although there were no properly established theatres in the early decades, later many purpose-built places accommodated several plays in Spain and England.

[T]he English and Spanish dramatists assimilated much of the classical drama, and added their own imagination to it, reshaped its characters, its humour, and its conventions to suit their peoples, and left the rest. The magnificent result was Marlowe, Lope de Vega, Webster, Calderón, [and] Shakespeare. (Hight 128-29)

In different countries, Lope de Vega and his fourteen years junior John Ford produced revenge tragedies making use of similar themes: love, jealousy, revenge, and honour. As Orlin epitomizes, the basic tenet of the Renaissance thought was that there was Great Chain of Being. According to this idea, the universe was in a hierarchical order and man was holding the place between the angels and the beasts. There was a monarchical system and the universe was controlled by God, the church by Christ and the family by the father. The man being the master of the house and the guardian of morals was responsible for his wife's behaviour together with all family members (123). As it will be discussed soon, historical data show that the fidelity of a wife is of utmost importance for the good reputation of a household both in Spanish and English societies.

Belonging to close geographies and written in the same decade, uxoricide, thus, forms the skeleton of both *Justice Without Revenge* and *Love's Sacrifice* because of the violation of the social rules by the infidel women. Reflecting on the social conditions of their time, in this context, Lope de Vega's and John Ford's plays recount the stories of the adulterous wives and the avenger husbands triggered by the aforementioned themes.

Thence, in this thesis, the relationship between jealousy, honour, revenge and love will be assessed to demonstrate the nature of the plays while the influences of Greco-Roman theatre will be displayed simultaneously.

### **1.1 John Ford and Renaissance Drama**

English Renaissance drama or early modern drama refers to the drama of England largely taking place in London when it was the centre of court, commerce, law and intellectual activities. It covers the period of seventy-five years starting with the erection of first purpose-built theatre The Red Lion in 1567 and ends in 1642 when all the theatres were closed down due to Puritan uprisings (Orlin xxv). The Renaissance drama is generally categorized under three headings: Elizabethan drama corresponding to the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603); Jacobean drama named after King James I (1603-1625) and Caroline drama coinciding with the regency of King Charles I (1625-1642).

Among all, it would not be wrong to say that it was during the reign of Elizabeth I that English drama bloomed. The Elizabethan stage hosted the plays of Marlowe (1564-1593), Kyd (1558-1594), Shakespeare (1564-1616) and many other playwrights till the closure of theatres. The period raised important poets and playwrights such as Ben Jonson (1572-1637). “The sudden rise of the English commercial theat[re]- a phenomenon made possible only in 1574- [occurred] by the crown’s decision to allow public, weekday performances in London” (Soergel 403) and by the time James I ascended to the throne, London’s commercial theatres were well-established and the theatre activity was going on vigorously. At this time, the performances were acted in daylight since the theatres were open-air and there were only men and young boys as actors; it was forbidden for women to act. After the public theatres, a number of private theatres, which were more expensive and comfortable than the public ones, were constructed. As they were smaller, they enabled closer seating and as they had candlelit, it was then possible to perform the plays at night (Soergel 403).



During the first years of James I's rule, the art of William Shakespeare excelled. While in 1590s he treated the comic and historical themes, he later extended his scope to successful tragedies and romances (Soergel 404). Ben Jonson was following him and he was equally successful in creating witty city comedies. Shakespeare and Jonson were the two geniuses of the century, but there were many other playwrights who contributed tremendously to the stage as well (Soergel 407). Of the parade of playwrights, Thomas Middleton (1580-1627), Thomas Heywood (1573-1641), Thomas Dekker (1570-1632), Francis Beaumont (1584-1616), John Fletcher (1579-1625) and John Ford (1586-1639) were holding substantive place. "Fletcher rank[ed] high as an entertainer. The one constant principle underlying his work [was] the desire to amuse" (Wilson 13) and together with him,

Middleton achieved dubious notoriety for one of [his] productions, *A Game at Chess* (1624), a biting satire that mocked the attempt by James I's son, Charles, to conclude a marital alliance with Spain. . . . In performing the work, Middleton and his actors played on popular anti-Spanish sentiment that had seethed below the surface of English society since late sixteenth century. (Soergel 407)

Since the system of authorship was different in the seventeenth-century world, Heywood and Dekker produced their works collaboratively: "Heywood claimed to have written or have participated in the writing of more than 200 plays" (Soergel 407). Beaumont and Fletcher, just like Heywood and Dekker, united their geniuses and produced theatrical works which "focused on the values of the nobility and gentry" (Soergel 407).

The domestic tragedies flourished at the end of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth centuries and they reflected the adulterous wives, the murderous husbands and the unhappy consequences following the disappearance of the loyalty in the household (Smith and Sullivan 18). As Renaissance dramatists were familiar with the rules of Aristotelian tradition which holds that "the violence of tragedy should ideally take place between people who know and are close to each other- friends or family- so that their suffering will evoke maximum pity,"

(Smith and Sullivan 62-63) they created domestic tragedies to attract the attention of the audience and to illustrate the social structure of the Renaissance times. The anonymous plays *Arden of Feversham* (1592) and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1608), Thomas Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1607) and Dekker-Rowley-Ford production *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621) were the domestic tragedies of the English Renaissance. In the final quarter of the sixteenth century, although the commercial theatre of England gained popularity and sudden rise, the Puritans were opposed to the theatre for a couple of reasons. Since they knew that the origins of the stage performance went back to the mystery plays performed in the church festivals of the Middle Ages, they thought that the theatre was connected with Catholicism. They also hated the comedies since these plays were against the rules of Christian living: they were of the opinion that the theatre was leading man to vice and sin (Soergel 402). The other reason of the Puritan rejection could be counted as the places where the theatres were established. The first public playhouses were built in the outskirts of London known as Liberties where the municipal government had no authority. Thus, these places were notorious for prostitution, dubious trade, and other morally-defect acts (Soergel 403).

While the popularity of theatre was great in the first quarter of the seventeenth century, the scene began to change in 1630s with the increasing demand of the Puritans for the eradication of stage performances. When the Puritans gained force in 1640s in the Parliament, they outlawed the theatres. Their first measures forced London theatres to close down although some performances went on secretly. This led to a stricter measure in 1647 which stated that those who participated in or watched any performance would be punished severely. As a result of these events, between 1642 and 1660, the theatres almost ceased to exist. Only the return of Charles II's return to the throne restored the theatre activities again (Soergel 408-09).

The plays written between 1570 and 1640 have been generally divided into three generations of playwrights; the first of which was Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593) and Thomas Kyd's (1558-1594). While the second

generation was William Shakespeare's (baptized 1564-1616) and his contemporaries- namely Ben Jonson (1572-1637), Thomas Dekker (1572-1632), John Marston (1576-1634), Thomas Heywood (early 1570s-1641) and George Chapman (1559-1634), later begins the third generation with John Fletcher (1579-1625), Francis Beaumont (1584-1616), John Webster (1580-1634), Philip Massinger (1583-1640) and John Ford (Harrison vii-viii). As Oliver quotes from Algernon Charles Swinburne (1837-1909) to illustrate Ford's talent:

No poet is less forgettable than Ford; none fastens (as it were) the fangs of genius and his will more deeply in your memory . . . if he touch[es] you once he takes you, and what he takes he keeps hold of; his work becomes part of your thought and parcel of your spiritual furniture for ever; he signs himself upon you as with a seal of deliberate and decisive power. (130)

John Ford, who may be deservedly called one of the late great Renaissance tragedians according to the quotation above, was a dramatist who lived during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I, King James I and King Charles I. Although very little is known about his life, it is sure that he was born in Ilsington, Devon and was baptized on 17 April 1586 (Harrison viii). Ford's mother was the niece of Lord Chief Justice Sir John Popham. Ford studied in Exeter College between 1601 and 1602; he also attended Middle Temple between the years of 1602-1605 and 1608-1617 (Harrison xi). However, he probably did not practise law. He died in 1639 or 1640.

Literary scholars divide his works into three phases; therefore John Ford's output can be studied in three groups: his non-dramatic works from 1606 to 1620, his collaborative dramatic works from 1621 to 1625, and his unaided dramatic works from 1628 to at least 1639 (Oliver 7).

Ford's *Fames Memorial* (1606) was an elegy on the first Earl of Devonshire, Charles Blount and in *Christ's Bloody Sweat* (1613) he emphasized that salvation "is for 'the chosen and elect' and is possible only through sincere repentance" (Oliver 12). *Honour Triumphant* (1606), *The Golden Mean* (1613) and *A Line of Life* (1620) were his prose pamphlets (Bowman 17). Although they do not have great literary merit,

it is noteworthy to remark that Ford develops the themes he uses in these works later in his plays.

Glancing now at these non-dramatic works together, one sees that the rapid improvement in the versification gives some promise of the poetry of, say, *'Tis Pitty*; and the interest in questions of conscience and psychology can be seen in retrospect as a preliminary to the analytical skill of the plays. (Oliver 20)

Ford's dramatic career began with *The Witch of Edmonton*, a domestic tragedy based on the real events of the time about the accusations of witchcraft, written collectively with Rowley and Dekker in 1621. He also again collaborated with Dekker for *The Welsh Ambassador*, *The Sun's Darling*; *A Moral Masque*, *The Fairy Knight* and for *The Bristow Merchant*, the last two of which are not extant (Leech, *John Ford* 11).

As he matured, Ford started writing plays by himself. *The Lover's Melancholy* was the first play written in 1628 by him (Leech, *John Ford* 13). When writing his first independent play, Ford was thoroughly influenced by Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). Between the years of 1627 and 1631 he wrote *The Broken Heart* in which obstructed love leads to revenge and chain of victims. He produced the history play *Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth* which tells "the story of one of the pretenders to Henry VII's crown" (Keenan 100) sometime between 1622 and 1632. In addition, he penned *Love's Sacrifice* and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (1633) a "decadent treatment of passion" (Bowers 206), which deals with an incestuous love affair between a brother and a sister. *The Lady's Trial* together with *The Fancies Chaste and Noble* and *The Queen, or The Excellency of Her Sex* were published in 1638 and 1639 respectively, and *The Queen* was only printed in 1653 anonymously now generally attributed to him. What was distinctive in Ford was that although he was inspired by many playwrights -especially Shakespeare, he revitalized revenge tragedy genre with his bold treatment of subjects like adultery and incest.

Ford's plays are commonly studies of passion which is inclusive and destructive. . . . His lovers may talk of passion in ideal terms, but there is always in them a full drive towards coition: it is this which commonly destroys them. (Leech 10)

Ford wrote the quintet of *Perkin Warbeck*, *Love's Sacrifice*, *The Fancies Chaste and Noble*, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, and *The Lady's Trial* to be performed by Queen Henrietta's Men, yet *The Lover's Melancholy*, *The Broken Heart* and a lost play *Beauty in Trance* were acted by The King's Men at the Blackfriars (Ure xxix).

It is worth noting that of Ford's eight independent plays, all eight are prefaced by dedicatory epistles to friends or noble acquaintances. . . . [It] indicate[s] that the Caroline theatre is indeed a 'coterie' environment, and also an environment in which the dramatist wishes to assume the role of literary virtuoso. (Huebert 12)

Although Ford dedicated his works to the aristocrats and notable people of his age, his interest was not in the society but in the human heart. Ford conjoined the themes of love, jealousy, sex, desire and death quite often in his plays. "The grief which comes of wounded affection [was] a common theme in Ford, but as his affections [were] of this softened kind, so the grief [was] dignified and generalised" (Bradbrook 254). In his plays, he covered extramarital love and marital jealousy forbidden by the society making Richard Crashaw reproach through his couplet:

Thou cheat'st us, Ford: mak'st one seem two by art;  
What is *Love's Sacrifice* but *The Broken Heart*? (Anderson 731)

Ford sometimes idealizes women and sometimes reflects them as the cause of men's destruction, but he is always sympathetic with the love between a man and a woman. As Donald Anderson states, he "subordinates revenge to love by making the second more ceremonial" (142). He intentionally chooses his principal characters as men and women whose emotions are vogue and cannot be understood at first glance (Oliver 125). However, his characters do not conceal their feelings and they remark what they feel unhesitatingly with directness and sincerity. His style has lack of imagery and less poetic language; thus, it is closer to the common speech. This is exactly what Charles Lamb praises in his *Specimens of the English Dramatic Poets* (1818):

Ford was of the first order of poets. He sought for sublimity, not by parcels in metaphors or visible images, but directly where she has her full residence in the heart of man; in the actions and sufferings of the greatest minds. There is a grandeur of the soul above mountains, seas and the elements. (Sturgess 12)

Similarly, Havelock Ellis (1859-1939) in his introduction to Mermaid Edition of Ford's five plays in 1888 celebrates Ford's power of observance, particularly of women and he thinks that Ford is able to create sympathy for the women while he can also feel on behalf of them. T.S Eliot evaluated Ford in structural terms and noted that

Ford, as a dramatic poet, as writer of dramatic blank verse, has one quality which assures him of a higher place than even Beaumont and Fletcher; and that is a quality which any poet may envy him. The varieties of cadence and tone in blank verse are too none too many, in the history of English verse; and Ford, though intermittently, was able to manipulate sequences of words in blank verse in a manner which is quite is his own. (204)

His bold treatment of taboo subjects, his understanding of the human nature and his obsessive interest in love when creating his characters are the features which place Ford among the well-known Renaissance playwrights of the later period. John Ford acquires his concepts and ideas through varied sources and he is inspired by other playwrights' works; he is accused of being decadent and repetitive but it is also a fact that he creates his own style in his works. Although he does not start writing plays at an early age, thanks to his distinctive manner and striking subjects, he achieves to be memorable in the gallery of the British dramatists.

## **1.2 Lope de Vega and Spanish Golden Age Drama**

The Spanish Golden Age-*el Siglo de Oro* was the Century of Gold of the Habsburg dynasty considered to have begun when Ferdinand of Aragón and Isabella of Castile defeated the Moors and captured the city of Granada in 1492 ending the *Reconquista* that had begun in 711. The

same year also witnessed the discovery of the Indies by Columbus whose voyages were financially supported by Ferdinand and Isabella. The discovery led to the conquest and exploration of the New World and expansion of Spain, thus the sixteenth century was the time when Spain had strong political dominion and cultural influence over Europe. Queen Isabella died in 1504 when the Spanish dynasty was at its zenith to be followed by Charles I who was crowned thirteen years later to hold the throne till 1556 (Edwards vii).

A bridge-piece between Medieval and Renaissance Spain, *Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea* (1499) by Fernando de Rojas prepares Spanish literature for its Golden Era and, in literary terms, the beginning of the Spanish Golden Age falls between 1554, the date of an anonymous novella –the first picaresque work- *The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes and of His Fortunes and Adversities- La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades* and 1616, the year of Cervantes' death. It extends until either 1650 when Pedro Calderón de la Barca abandoned active writing or till his death in 1681 (Parker 4). Under the reigns of Charles I (1517-1556) and Philip IV (1621-1665), the Golden Age *comedia* flourishes with Lope, his school and Calderón. It should be noted that “[w]hile the roots of the word *comedia* are similar to the English ‘comedy,’ the Spanish used the term to refer to any drama –serious, tragic, or comic- that was performed in verse” (Soergel 412).

Félix Arturo Lope de Vega y Carpio's lifespan coincides with the reigns of Philip II (1556-1598), Philip III (1598-1621) and Philip IV (1621-1665) (Hayes 50). He was born on 25 November 1562 in Madrid during the regency of Philip II (Edwards ix) and Lope became the king of theatre in this period. It was during his childhood that certain religious brotherhoods began to sublet open courtyards in the city to players with the aim of sharing their profit with the poor and the elderly (Hayes 42). The typical Spanish theatre of the time was known as *corral*, a word used for walled-in courtyards. The *corrales* were open-air theatres having a raised stage for the performances. For some years, most of the performances took place in those places (Soergel 411). As theatregoing became a widespread activity, the *corrales* were roofed to acquire a sense

of permanence (Soergel 412). The brotherhoods commenced to purchase certain areas to construct their own theatres, the first of which was the Corral of the Cross- *Corral de la Cruz* in 1579. Later many theatres were built, but *Corral de la Cruz* and *La Pacheca* eventually becoming the *Teatro Español* were the most long-lasting ones remaining open till 1743 and 1745 respectively (Hayes 42-43). First of all, to put into frame:

In dealing with the Spanish theatre of the Golden Age we are dealing with a truly national theatre, that is, one in which the public influenced writers to such an extent that the theatre as a whole is the expression of the ideas, the ideals, the likes and dislikes of the people considered collectively rather than the artistic production of individual authors. (Jones 142)

However, as in England, as many as its supporters, the theatre had many enemies calling it the ally of Satan in Spain. In 1597, when Philip II closed the theatres due to his daughter's death, some members of the church tried to take advantage of it and attempted to close them permanently. The closure lasted till 1599 when Philip III reopened the theatres again with strict regulations which were disregarded soon. The final threat to the theatre finished when Philip IV ascended to the throne in 1621 (Hayes 45). Writing some plays himself, he was the supporter of the theatre. As Hayes notes, despite hindrances:

Spanish drama showed a great burst of energy, for the time, the place, and the man had coincided: the time, the Golden Age of Spanish political power and culture; the place, Madrid, capital of world empire, magnet of the world's gold and its people; the man, Lope de Vega "the prodigy of nature" ("el monstruo de la naturaleza"), the creator of the national Spanish drama, the most prolific playwright of all time. (46)

Circa the contemporary of the Elizabethan theatre, Lope de Vega became the national hero of Spanish Golden Age and "*es de Lope*"- it is Lopean were used to be a synonym for "it is excellent" in his age (Ingber 229). Lope got his education in Jesuit *Colegio de los Teatinos* and it is likely that he attended the University of Alcalá later (Edwards ix). He joined the army in 1583 and took part in the Spanish Armada. Upon the defeat of Spain, he returned home with financial troubles and settled in Valencia where he started writing seriously. He started working as a secretary in



1590 for the Duke of Alba and served him for six years. He also entered the service of the Duke of Sessa in 1605 (Ingber 230). His fame as a dramatist was established by the turn of the century but, unfortunately because the theatres were closed down by Philip II (Gerstinger 25), his career stopped for some time. In 1614, at the age of fifty two, Lope entered the priesthood and the Spanish Inquisition made him one of its officers. Pope Urban VIII made him a member of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem in 1627 and he was given the title of Doctor of Theology (Hayes 21). He wrote many of his comedies during his priesthood. He died in Madrid on August 27, 1635 (Ingber 230).

Lope de Vega became a priest but taking into consideration his private life, one can claim that he did not fit in the ideals of the priesthood. A priest should be aloof from sexual pleasures but Lope de Vega used to have a lot of women in his life. Hayes in his book summarizes his loose lifestyle with the title *Lope and Women: Two Wives, Several Mistresses, Numerous Children, No Descendants* (22). In late 1570s, Lope and his friends indulged in pleasure and they followed women regardless of their fathers or brothers. "They followed one rule with women: make love with haste and forget with dispatch" (22).

So harmoniously did his mind and his hand function together that whatever happened to him might become "instant literature." One finds Lope's mistresses, his friends, his enemies, his times, all recorded in his writings. (Hayes 24)

Indeed, thanks to his works, Lope immortalized the women he loved. In his poetry, Belisa –an anagram of Isabel- found her place, or Micela de Luján changed into Lucinda or Camila Lucinda. Elena Osorio as Dorotea became the title of his *La Dorotea* and Amarilis was the pseudonym for Marta de Navares. Lope's affairs with various women gave him an insight into the woman psychology and this was the reason why he could reflect the female feelings successively in his plays. He learnt to sympathize with the women. He gave them an opportunity to voice their desires and ideas freely which the oppressive Spanish society did not.

Lope was a pioneer; it was he who made the pattern Calderón and his followers were to employ. He worked on the formula of the *comedia*.

Although he himself did not invent it, his name became the true establisher of *comedia* as a national genre in Spain and he gained a place in the pantheon of world dramatists. In his prologue to *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos*, Cervantes defined him as the “prodigy of nature” (Edwards x).

Lope had become synonymous with the spirit of the Spanish nation, the *pueblo*. The public success of his plays proved that [he] had indeed a very good grasp of contemporary taste, the popular *gusto* that he provocatively appealed to in the *Arte Nuevo*. (Kluge 314)

Lope’s *Arte nuevo de hacer comedias en este tiempo* translated as *The New Art of Writing Plays in This Age* was a 389-line didactic work written in blank verse in which he explained the principles of his art and playwriting when he was at the peak of his popularity. Although it is clear from the text that Lope recognizes the Aristotelian rules, he does not favour them. He thinks that classical rules totally separate tragedy and comedy, thereby restricting the freedom of the playwright. He does not either follow the strict observance of three unities prescribing that there should be a single plot; this single action should occur in one place, and in a single day. He knows the rules well, but he does not apply them and remarks that “[w]hen I have to write a comedy I lock in the precepts with six keys, I banish Terence and Plautus from my study” (Brewster 21).

In this sense, Lope’s works welcome artistic freedom. His theatre is the fusion of the comic with the tragic; that is, he includes humour in his tragedies and seriousness in his comedies. He thinks that this variety is present in nature and it gives delight, so it is not improper to imitate nature:

Tragedy mixed with comedy and Terence with Seneca, tho it be like another minotaur of Pasiphae, will render one part grave, the other ridiculous, for this variety causes much delight. Nature gives us good example, for through such variety it is beautiful. (Brewster 30)

He supports that the subject should contain only one action, because the inclusion of other things may not serve to the main context and may

shatter the unity of the play. While Lope advocates the unity of action, he disregards the unity of time and place because he is of the opinion that the Spaniards would like to see the whole panorama of the world on stage from Genesis to the Judgment Day. “The concept of *naturaleza* thus [is] converged with the concept of *gusto*, that is, the question of the audience and its moral instruction through delight” (Kluge 313). He emphasizes that he is writing what the public wants “since the crowd pays for the comedies, it is fitting to talk foolishly to it to satisfy its taste” (Brewster 25). Although his references imply that he is familiar with the ancients, Lope confesses that he writes according to the taste of the audience to gain financial benefits. Indeed, there were people called *mosqueteros* standing in the pit to decide the quality of a play. They were equipped with whistles, bells and even cucumbers which they threw on stage to show their displeasure (Gerstinger 29).

In the same vein, Lope divides the play into three acts; he advises to set the subject matter in the first act, to complicate the events in the second one and to resolve it in the third act. He keeps suspense till the last act so that the audience cannot guess the outcome and cannot leave before the play ends. In this sense, he advises to “trick expectancy” (Brewster 34). It should be mentioned that because of the close cultural, economic and linguistic relations, Spain was influenced greatly by the Italians in the sixteenth century and in accordance with the Renaissance spirit, the Italian dramatists adopted the five-act-drama of the ancients performed in courts. However, the open-air *corrales* were not suitable for long performances as in five-act plays and therefore, the Spanish dramatists developed the shorter, three-act *comedias*, because they were presented in the afternoon and had to end before sunset (Soergel 412).

Lope also explains the way he constructs his plays with several forms in *Arte nuevo*. He allocates certain forms for each theme. While he uses *décima*, ten-line stanza with a rhyme arrangement of *abbaaccddc*, for emotional soliloquies and lovers’ complaints, he employs octosyllabic lines of romances “for exposition and non-amorous subject matter” (Hayes 136). Similarly, for significant events, *octavas* “eight lines of eleven syllables with the rhyme scheme of *abababcc*” (Hayes 137) served

to the intentions of Lope. He also utilized *redondilla* “eight-syllable quatrain with rhyme *abba* or *abab*; especially used for dialogue” (Hayes 136) for happy or ill-fated romantic relations. Lope expresses that:

*Décimas* are good for complainings; the sonnet is good for those who are waiting in expectation; recitals of events ask for romances, though they shine brilliantly in *octavas*. *Tercets* are for grave affairs and *redondillas* for affairs of love. (Brewster 34-35)

Lope arranges language according to his characters. He thinks that the language of the drama should suit the speaker and be natural. It can only be elaborate when the situation requires it. For the family scenes, thus, he prefers simple language. Only when a person tries to persuade, dissuade or counsel, he puts wit and gravity in his mouth because he supposes that a man talks differently when he tries to change somebody else’s mind. In his *Arte nuevo*, he notes that the kings should speak with the majesty of a king; the wise men with modesty and the lovers should talk passionately to move the crowd as much as possible. He cautions that the stage should not be remained without someone speaking, otherwise the audience become restless. Empathizing with the public, he chooses as his subject the theme of honour since it stirs everybody. He adds that along with honour, virtue fits best because it is loved everywhere. His *Punishment Without Revenge- El castigo sin venganza* (1631), *Fuenteovejuna* (1618), *The Knight of Olmedo- El caballero de Olmedo* (1620), *Peribañez and the Knight Commander of Ocaña- Peribañez y el comendador de Ocaña* (1610), *Los comendadores de Córdoba* (1598) and *El rey don Pedro en Madrid* (1618) deal with the theme of honour in this fashion.

Lope put the stage every kind of character he met. The whores, pimps, parasites, astrologers, beggars, gangsters, and friars were the members of his theatre (Hayes 19). On the contrary, he portrayed kings, queens, counts, and dukes. He was the keen observer of Spanish classes, its religious institutions, its psychology, and its corruption and he could reflect them in his plays. Lope was nourished by many sources. He made use of national sagas, heroic legends, contemporary literature of his own and other countries, pastoral tales, mythology, folk tales, proverbs,

ballads, epic poems, the lives of saints and kings to compose his plays (Hayes 63). His theatre was a living one in which contemporary reflections of political events could be observed. Besides, history offered him a lot for his plays. While ancient history was acted with *Against Bravery There is No Misfortune- Contra valor no hay desdicha* (1625-1630) which is about the rise of the Persian king Cyrus the Great, in *The Duke of Viseo- El duque de Viseo* (1608-1609) he made use of recent Spanish history and recounted the story of an innocent Duke victimized by a suspicious king. As Dixon notes:

Lope's knowledge of Spain and everything Spanish was immense, as is evidenced for instance by at least a hundred *comedias* based on its history and legends from Roman times to his own. (25)

As well as his history plays, Lope was famous for his *comedias de capa y espada* which hold an important place in Lope's *comedia*. He was able to portray the Spanish legends and national history in his plays of history while the daily life of the Spaniards was reflected in *comedias de capa y espada*. As Schelling defines these comedies of love and jealousy:

Two ladies, a gallant and his friend, their lovers, a jealous brother or a difficult father with the attendant servants of all parties; mistake, accident, intrigue and involvement, honour touched and honour righted- such is the universal recipe of the comedy of cloak and sword. (122)

Translated as the cape/cloak-and-sword/dagger plays, the cloak of these plays was an impressive theatrical costume. It was also the outdoor garment of the cavalier and it stands for the superior social rank of the person who wears it. Similarly, the sword was the possession of every cavalier in that period when duelling was on fashion. Thus, it was an indispensable stage property for the duels on stage (Gerstinger 39). In Lope's cloak-and-sword plays, two pairs of lovers and their attendants, together with other characters, create a geometrical plot structure (Gerstinger 42). The young men of these plays are gentlemanly, noble, handsome and courageous paying compliments to the ladies. Both males and females live according to the code of honour. It is noteworthy that the figure of mother is absent from the stage. In these plays, the *gracioso*,

generally in the character of a servant, keeps a distinct place in that he attracts laughter easily, thus serving to the financial aims of Lope. The *gracioso* functions as a foil and companion to the protagonist, he is more concerned with earthly matters in contrast to the protagonist's struggle to attain sublime ideas. He does not like danger. He can openly express what his masters try to hide behind their idealistic conventions; he can also read his master's mind. While the *gracioso* uses straight language, the protagonist benefits from metaphors to express his thoughts. He explains the actions in simple language to the people (Gerstinger 53). In this respect, the *gracioso* sometimes serves as a mediator between the protagonist and the audience. For the *gracioso* figure, material world and body have more importance than spirituality; he thinks about food and drink; he is avaricious. "Their view of life is extremely earthy. Money means more to them than hono[u]r, food than morals, safety more than any act of heroism" (Gerstinger 53). The *gracioso* is neither an individual nor a hero; he merely lives for his master. *The Gardener's Dog- El perro del hortelano* (1618), a famous reworking of "the dog in the manger" story, *La dama boba* (1613), *La discreta enamorada* (1604) and *El acero de Madrid* were among Lope's plays written in cloak-and-sword fashion.

Lope de Vega also produced numerous successful sacramental plays. Like in England, the feasts of Corpus Christi and similar ecclesiastic celebrations were important events in which there were religious performances in Spain. These productions paved the way for a new genre called the sacramental plays –*autos sacramentales* that aim at teaching the Spanish tenets of Catholicism and Counter-Reformation (Soergel 411). They were one-act plays in verse to celebrate the genuine faith. They were approved by church and performed on platforms on wheels. The Bible, the lives of saints and allegorical characters were included in these plays such as *San Diego de Alcalá* (1613), *La hermosa Ester* (1610) and *El divino africano* (1610).

Lope de Vega's theatre dramatizes the seventeenth century Golden Age spirit of honour. "Its pivotal tenet was that the esteem of society was indispensable. The loss of one's good name was equivalent to the loss of life itself. Its defence and recovery, therefore, justified even the taking of

life” (Fitcher 29-30). Lope does not consider honour as a concept merely belonging to the aristocracy. For him, the proper people from peasantry or aristocracy can have human dignity. Through the end of his plays, the personality of the characters is put to test and while the good ones are rewarded, the malicious people are punished as in the morality play tradition. For instance, his *Fuenteovejuna*, a national history play published in 1619, was written in this manner. Among Lope’s one of the most prominent plays, *Fuenteovejuna* is set in the fifteenth century during the reign of Isabella and Ferdinand, and it focuses on the abuses of the tyrannical commander Fernán Gómez de Gúzman upon the inhabitants of the village. The play is remembered for its legendary answer “Fuenteovejuna did it!- Fuenteovejuna lo hizo!” (III.III.483) when the king investigates for the actual murderer. It both reflects the national spirit of camaraderie and displays that true honour is not gained with title but it is innate.

Honour is also crucial in domestic matters. To summarize from Fitcher, the conjugal honour plays of Vega focus on the preservation of the reputation of the husband and his ultimate revenge to regain his impaired honour. Generally, the woman initializes the process of retaliation, because the main conflict of the play occurs due to her infidelity or to the extreme obsession of the husband in relation to his wife’s loyalty. Once the husband is sure of the wife’s guilt, he immediately takes action to punish her. Even if the intrigue of the wife does not become public, it should be punished by the man since it might cause dishonour when made open. The wronged husband must avenge secretly and he must both kill his wife and her lover to restore his reputation (31-45). He must keep his silence despite his pain and must wait patiently for the proper moment. Killing in the name of honour is one of the elements of the honour code itself and he should always obey the rule. Veinticuatro of *The Knights Commander of Córdoba- Los comendadores de Córdoba* puts forth that honour dwells in others: “honra es aquella que consiste en otro” (Jornada Tercera.11.20). Thus, the golden rule of the honour prescribes a man to protect his reputation by any means necessary.

As Hayes notes, due to his immense productivity, today it is not possible to know the exact number of plays Lope wrote. Dr. Pérez de Montalbán, a friend and disciple of him in 1636 asserted that Lope wrote 1800 plays, more than 400 sacramental plays and numerous books and papers. One of the best known Lope scholars, Emilio Cotarelo y Mori agrees with Montalbán and accepts that this large amount is undeniable (75). Contemporary Lope scholar Ingber sums the total plays attributed to Lope:

In 1604 Lope published in *El peregrino en su patria* a list (219 titles) of plays he had written by that date (claiming, at the same time, to have written 230 plays). He would periodically update the count, which in 1609 stood at 483, in 1618 at 800, in 1620 at 900, in 1625 at 1.070, and in 1632 at 1.500. Juan Pérez de Montalbán, writing in 1636, tops off the count at 1.800. Today we are aware of 726 titles and actually have the texts to 470 of these. (232)

One cannot help but agree with Cervantes who labels Lope de Vega the prodigy of nature. Throughout his life, it seems that Lope always made use of various materials. As stated above, he consulted the Spanish history, contemporary life, folklore, legends and the classical stories and the result is not surprising that he could create such a huge body of dramatic and non-dramatic works. The number of his literary pieces is the concrete evidence of his genius, his ability to create, his enthusiasm to produce and his thrill to impress the audience.

Lope worked for the popular drama and in fact, his theatre was the epitome of the spirit of the Spanish *comedia* as Flores summarizes:

[In the comedy] there were no restrictions, no rules, no unities –the Spanish ‘comedia’ mixed up the tragic with the comic, the real with the imaginary; it emphasized action rather than psychological analysis, and rarely delivered disturbing political messages. It was, in short, sheer entertainment, extremely fluid, at times almost like the musical comedy of today, with its dancing and singing, and as full of improvisation as the *commedia dell’ arte*. (xi)

Lope’s literary output was not limited only to the theatre. He created a body of non-dramatic works too. His works of poetry include *Drake the Pirate- La dragontea* (1598) which recounts the final expedition and death



of English pirate Sir Francis Drake; *Isidro- El Isidro* (1599) which glorifies the life of Madrid's patron saint Isidore; *Angelica's Beauty- La hermasura de Angélica* (1602) written with the hopes of competing with the epics of Lodovico Ariosto and Luis Barahona de Soto; and *Jerusalem Regained- La Jerusalén conquistada* (1609) based upon Torquato Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered- La Gerusalemme liberata* and dedicated to Philip III (Ingber 232). "[Lope] resented the Italian Tasso's having left Spaniards out of [his work] and rectified this slight by supplying [them] for *Jerusalem Regained* out of his fancy" (Hayes 117). Human Poems- *Rimas humanas* (1602), Sacred Poems- *Rimas sacras* (1614), *La Filomena* (1621), *Circe- La Circe* (1624), *The Tragic Crown- La corona trágica* (1624) in which he reflects his own and Spain's affection for Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, *The Laurel of Apollo- El laurel de Apolo* (1630), *Human and Divine Poems by Tomé de Burguillos- Rimas humanas y divinas del licenciado Tomé de Burguillos* (1634) and *The War of the Cats- La Gatomaquia* (1634) constitute Lope de Vega's other poetic works of art (Ingber 232).

Lope's earliest prose work was *La Arcadia* written in 1598. Among his other prose fiction *The Pilgrim in his Own Country- El peregrino en su patria* (1604) a lengthy novel made up of "stories of love and adventure, travel, hardships, shipwrecks, violence, jealousy, thieves, chance encounters" (Hayes 108) and *Shepherds of Bethlehem- Los pastores de Belén* 1612 "in which a pastoral structure is used to treat a religious theme" (Ingber 232) were written in 1604 and 1612, respectively. He penned his *Stories for Marcia Leonarda- Novelas a Marcia Leonarda* (1621 and 1624) upon the force of his last love Marta de Nevares because she hoped that she could inspire him to become a novelist. In *La Dorotea* (1632) he uses the structure of Fernando de Rojas's *La Celestina* and recounts the story of his relationship with Elena Osorio. It is a novel written in dialogue form in five acts. The work is:

a report on the sex life of male and female of both the hidalgo and the mass man of Lope's time. Its basic hypothesis, Freudian three hundred years before Freud, is found in these words from Act 1, scene 5: "The tap root of all human emotions is sex: out of it come sadness, joy, ecstasy, exhilaration, and desperation. (Hayes 112)

Because of his deep understanding of human nature and due to his enormous literary productivity, Lope de Vega deserves to be called as the king of the Spanish Golden Age drama. He could reflect the *zeitgeist* of his time through his art and that is why his funeral ceremonies lasted for nine days with numerous funeral orations. Lope de Vega was commensible to be a national hero (Hayes 21).

## CHAPTER II

### THE TRIPARTITE RELATIONSHIP: JEALOUSY, HONOUR, REVENGE

The ideas of jealousy, honour and revenge are so deeply inscribed upon the human psyche that no wonder one may come across with a body of literature dealing with these themes considering the fact that literature is the creation of human imagination. *Love's Sacrifice* (1633) and *Punishment Without Revenge* (1631) hinge on the abovementioned themes thus, it will be useful to explain the concepts of jealousy, honour and revenge based on a historical context within the framework of this thesis.

#### 2.1.1 Jealousy

Ubiquitous in every kind of human relationship, jealousy is born out of the feelings of the fear of losing someone, and of excessive love. In *Oxford English Dictionary*, jealousy is defined as the “solicitude or anxiety for the preservation or well-being of something; vigilance in guarding a possession from loss or damage.” It includes anger and bitterness which someone has when s/he thinks that another person is trying to take the person beloved or a possession away from them. The emotion of jealousy is one of the most important domains of intersexual conflicts. Professor Albert Mairer in his 1908 study *La jalousie* gives a definition of jealousy and according to his statement;

the sense of loss [does] not refer only to the person or object; it involve[s] a loss of love and associated sentiments, loss of a physical relationship possibly, and certainly loss of ease and peace of mind and of pride or prestige. (Mowat 21)

Jealousy is the anxiety of losing what someone possesses. Husbands and wives are jealous because they consider their partners as their possessions. In this sense, being old doubles the effect because it is the

reminder of death. The old husbands are more jealous and paranoid since they hold that their wives will be someone else's and these young women will love another person when they pass away. To quote from Barthes, their stance reflects the definition of jealousy by Littré in *dictionnaire de la langue française*: “[a] sentiment which is born in love and which is produced by the fear that the loved person prefers someone else” (144).

Jealousy may be a destructive passion when it is uncontrolled and it may lead to unpleasant results. It is triggered by a chain of events and it begets sequence of incidents. In both plays, it is represented as a kind of obsession and causes people not to use their reason. Jealousy makes them obsessed with what they believe to be true even if they are wrong and the people disregard all possible alternatives. The jealous husbands can create an *idée fixe* that their wives cheat on them, a delusion with catastrophic results. Nicholas Breton in the “Pasquil’s Mistressse” gives another definition of jealousy and represents it like a creature actively taking part in romantic affairs:

It workes, and watches, pries, and peeres about,  
Takes counsell, staies; yet goes on with intent,  
Bringes in one humour, puts another out,  
And findes out nothing but all discontent,  
And keeps the spirit still so passion-rent,  
That in the world, if there be a hell,  
Aske, but in love, what jealousy can tell. (Breitenberg 379)

Breton personifies jealousy and -like Capellanus- he states that where there is love, there is jealousy. He represents jealousy in a negative way commenting that if one is deeply absorbed in jealousy, life turns into hell and he cannot be in high spirits since he will think nothing else but the object of his jealousy. When jealousy works and watches, then it will consult revenge. Jealousy is almost synonymous with revenge since jealous feelings may lead one to take a vow of revenge. According to the anonymous author of *Fancies Aque-fittes, or Beauties Nettle-bed*, a treatise from 1599 “jealousie [...] is as irksome to beare in a man as a woman, and so much more in a man, because thereby he looseth his honour” (Foyster 134). Similarly, some Christian moralists thought that

the husbands' thirst for revenge was fuelled by jealousy. They considered it as the cauldron of hatred, suspicion, death and evil:

Antonio de Guevera advised that husbands should not be too jealous or suspicious of their wives. Too much jealousy is bad for both husbands and wives, warned Luis de la Puente, but a husband's jealousy is worse because he has so much power to afflict his wife, enclosing her and showing her little confidence in her, which can lead to greater evils. (Taylor 198)

The sixteenth century Spanish philosopher Juan Luis Vives (1493-1540) in his *The Passions of the Soul- De anima et Vita* (1538) called jealousy a tyrant and related that jealousy is not limited only to the men's feelings towards their wives but anyone can feel jealous towards the others. He "classifies jealousy as a morally objectionable emotion with the capacity to transform humans into most ferocious beasts" (Wagschal 7). It is also possible to mention the 20<sup>th</sup> century definitions of jealousy:

Romantic jealousy is defined here as a *complex of thoughts, feelings, and actions which follow threats to self-esteem and/or threats to the existence or quality of the relationship, when those threats are generated by the perception of a real or potential attraction between one's partner and a (perhaps imaginary) rival.* (White 24)

As it is understood from the quotation above, the feeling of jealousy occurs when the relationship of a man and a woman is threatened by a third person. The rival generates jealousy because s/he is perceived as a threat to the romantic affair. The potential loss of self-esteem, honour, the beloved are the key terms when explaining what jealousy means. The below definition also supports the thesis that the threat to the personal happiness caused by failing to keep the possession of these elements is the core of jealousy: "Jealousy is triggered by the threat of separation from, or loss of, a romantic partner, when that threat is attributed to the possibility of the partner's romantic interest in another person" (Sharpteen and Kirkpatrick 628). Jealousy is the initiator of unwelcome events in *Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge*. Both plays represent the husbands who turn mad when they lose their beloved wives to a rival. As the plays will show, the loss of the beloved or even the

supposed one provokes jealousy and anger and it causes violence and bloodshed. Thus, the feeling of jealousy can direct one from the peak of happiness to the darkest bedlam of human nature. Indeed, “jealousy is a painful passion” (Hume 195).

### **2.1.2 Honour**

For the Spanish and English societies, honour and reputation were interdependent concepts. The dominance of the society over individual, the strict social regulations, and the importance of mundane order made appearances and honour indispensable notions. The honour code prescribed how one should behave or what the result might have been when one does not behave properly: the irrevocable loss of status. Honour was a priceless possession and it was almost impossible to repair once it was tarnished. For such important themes, Spanish vocabulary contained two nouns to depict the relationship between honour and reputation:

One, *honor*, correspond[ed] to one’s social status, borne in the blood as part of the heritage of nobility. The other, *honra*, measured the worth of the individual: it was understood to derive from integrity and proper behavior, but ultimately it was measured in terms of regard and respect, and thus could be supported or threatened by the actions and beliefs of others. (Campbell 66)

For the early modern Spanish people, honour- *honor* meant the purity of blood- *limpieza de sangre* for the men and the preservation of chastity and silence for the women. The purity of blood was indirectly important for the permanence of honour. Since the Middle Ages, although the Christians dominated Spain there were Jews and Muslims dwelling in the country and the *conversos*- Jews converted to Christianity were considered to be a threat for the Christians. The prevalent idea was that “Jews were separate people and could never truly convert to Christianity because of the impurity of their blood” (Taylor 3) which explains the reason why the men’s honour was so much depended on the women chastity: a woman by secretly betraying her husband might have

introduced impure blood into the family; she may have given birth to another's child which carried the potential to harm the pure Spanish blood. The honour of a person comes from its genealogy and a spotted woman pollutes the lineage.

The Golden Age drama had an obsession with honour; how it was threatened, lost and avenged were the subject matter of the dramatists. The stage of the Golden Age Spain hosted numerous plays whose plots were concerned with the theme of honour and within this genre, wife-murder plays formed a subset in which the adulterous (real or imaginary) wives were punished by being murdered in the name of restoring honour.

In the hands of Golden Age playwrights, hono[u]r was something possessed by gentlemen that could be taken away by any affront or misdeed. The hono[u]r code was a method of safeguarding one's hono[u]r, an inalterable law, with each affront sparking an inexorable march toward violence. (Taylor 62)

Women and men had to protect their sexual purity because it was strictly connected with honour and reputation. Together with *limpieza de sangre*, the public opinion, what the other people will say –*el qué dirán* was quite significant. The rumour of infidelity was as dangerous as the real one itself. Adultery was the most serious threat to the wedlock and even the suspicion of it may have led to the wrath of a husband. For the women, the only thing that defined their being honourable was chastity. One of their most important duties was to manifest honour to their husbands if they were married or to their fathers and brothers if they were not. They could only achieve honour by being sexually pure since/and the honour of the patriarchy was dependent on the woman comportment.

Spanish women were thought to be weak creatures devoid of strong moral principle so that strict espionage and snooping on any and all of the affairs of a wife or unmarried sister were expected of the men. (Hayes 90)

The increase in the number of conduct literature and wife-murder *comedias* coincided in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries' Spain. While the conduct manuals prescribed women how to behave properly, the plays on stage implied what would happen when they do not comply with

the rules of the woman demeanour. Because the thoughts of marital infidelity were enough to evoke homicidal fantasies in men, female sexual desire should be controlled and eliminated regardless of the consequences and it could only be purified with blood. As it would cause the loss of honour and the male honour was based on woman's sexual conduct, controlling woman behaviour was crucial. There was a belief that when left unrestrained the women would commit adultery and it was virtually certain that it would lead to disaster because the only response to it was violence; revenge was the sole key to solve the problem of adultery and it was bloody. It is important to note that in the case of adultery, the man was also equally guilty since he involved in a sinful act with another man's wife.

In accordance with the rules of the Ten Commandments preaching that "thou shalt not kill," (Exodus 20.13) hence, the Christian moralists did not favour revenge because killing someone would be an inexcusable sin. For them, private vengeance was unacceptable and should be left to the officials. Wardropper clearly analyses the connexion between religion and being Spanish:

*Honor* was based on appearances rather than on eternal realities, on man's judgment rather than on God's. It implied an obligation, not to forgive, but to avenge. Christian doctrine, on the other hand, required forgiveness of personal injury up to the seventy times seventh time. And in the particular sphere of *honor*- conjugal relations Christ had asked his followers not to judge the woman taken in adultery, but to forgive her. . . . As a man the Spaniard had to avenge his dishono[u]r; as a Christian he had to forgive his dishono[u]rer. It was impossible to be both a man of hono[u]r and a Christian. (82)

Actually, "[t]he sentiment of hono[u]r portrayed in the Golden Age theat[re], far from being an exclusively Hispanic phenomenon, [was] simply part of a general Renaissance code familiar in every royal court of Europe" (McGrady 33). Just as it was in Spain, adultery was in conflict with the accepted way of life in England. The Renaissance society was patriarchal and the man was the head of the household and he was responsible for the wife, the children and the servants in the house. The man was the husband, the father and the master.



In theory, all household relationships were binary ones and these binaries were unequal: husbands and wives, with husbands over wives; parents and children, with parents over children; and masters and servants, with masters over servants. (Orlin 67-68)

The institution of matrimony was very important for the welfare of the society and the fidelity of the couple was the touchstone for proper relations. In the introduction to her sermon, that is how Queen Elizabeth I emphasized the importance of marriage in “An Homily of the State of Matrimony” in 1563 in the second volume of sermons edited by her following the twelve sermons of Edward I:

The word of Almighty God doth testify and declare whence the original beginning of matrimony cometh and why it is ordained. It is instituted of God, to be intent that man and woman should live lawfully in a perpetual friendly fellowship, to bring forth fruit, and to avoid fornication. By which means, a good conscience might be preserved on both parties in bridling the corrupt inclinations of the flesh within the limits of honesty. (qtd. in Orlin 71)

It is clear that the Queen considered marriage as an institution to keep away from adultery. It is the corrupt inclination which harms the well-being of the family and in turn the society. By stating that matrimony is the word of God, she seems to prohibit the extramarital relationships or illegitimate children. Queen Elizabeth I assumed marriage a friendly fellowship but the condition of the women was inferior to the men in England as it was in the Spanish society:

In the eyes of the law, the vast majority of women were *femmes couvertes*, with their own identities, for legal purposes, entirely subsumed in those of their husbands or fathers. Effectively, they were considered incapable of independent action and not fully responsible for any actions which they might in effect take. And since every woman was legally considered as either married or marriageable, all were theoretically subject to this disabling classification. (Hopkins 87)

In England, the female sexuality and male honour were interdependent too. Just as St. Paul remarked in Ephesians 5.23 that the husband is the head of the wife, John Calvin preached that the woman and man were

inseparable from each other; while the woman stood for the body, the man was associated with the head. Compatible with the societal rules, the man was the head of the house and the woman representing body was responsible for the honour and domestic reputation of it. Likewise, John Cleaver stated in 1598 in *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government* that “there is no honour within the house, longer than a man’s wife is honourable” (qtd. in Smith and Sullivan 20). The women had to take care of their reputation because the people were concerned with the lives of the others and they had to be careful so as not to stain their honour in a society where

[i]n every parish in town and country, churchwardens and their assistants or sidemen had a duty to make presentments to the church courts . . . for faults such as failing to attend church . . . fathering a bastard, or committing adultery, or even for conniving at the sins of others by ‘harbo[u]ring’ unmarried pregnant women or allowing an unwed couple to fornicate under the household’s roof. (Kinney 95-96)

In the Renaissance England, the men were unquestionably superior to their wives and the women still had the burden of the Original Sin. As can be inferred from the literary works of the period, there was a male paranoia about the possible infidelity of a wife. Later to be known as the Othello Syndrome coined by John Todd in his article (1955) with Kenneth Dewhurst “The Othello Syndrome: A Study in the Psychopathology of Sexual Jealousy,” the men of the period were obsessed with the delusions of the infidelity of their wives. The women were the weaker vessel and they were thought to be lusty, irrational, and not to be trusted especially in sexual matters. “[T]he only way that men could be sure that they were passing on wealth to their own children was if their wives were sexually faithful” (Keenan 20-21). The woman’s sexual purity used to define her social status and value. The female promiscuity was dishonourable. The outlook on the woman was the same as it was in Spain and there were also manuals in England instructing them how to behave properly. In these manuals, the ideal woman was represented as chaste, silent, obedient, nurturing and serving.

Even though the ideal women were qualified with the afore-mentioned adjectives and they were overwhelmed by the male authority, the Renaissance period was not devoid of powerful and assertive women who contradicted with the general patterns of behaviour expected of the females. For instance, Isabella d'Este, Veronica Franco, Gaspara Stampa, Elisabetta Gonzaga, Vittoria Colonna, and Catherine de Medici were the prominent noblewomen of the Renaissance who have not been remembered with their domestic attributes but with their bright personalities. Belonging to the aristocracy, they had a chance to have education, they were equipped with artistic and political skills, they actively took part in politics and they patronized the artists who contributed to the flourish of Renaissance arts. Some of them such as Veronica Franco, Gaspara Stampa, and Vittoria Colonna were poets themselves. Likewise, Colonna was remembered with her spiritual sonnets and also with the love sonnets Michelangelo wrote and dedicated to her. Isabella d'Este was the patron of arts and she used to be a powerful figure in politics. To mention Elisabetta Gonzaga, without doubt she was an extremely strong woman and her dominance was even commemorated by Baldassare Castiglione in his *The Book of the Courtier* in which the conversations are mediated by Elisabetta Gonzaga in her court.

### **2.1.3 Revenge**

And euery one cries, let the tyrant die.  
The Sunne by day shines hotely for reuenge.  
The Moone by night eclipseth for reuenge.  
The Stars are turnd to Comets for reuenge.  
The Planets chaunge their courses for reuenge.  
The birds sing not, but sorrow for reuenge.  
The silly lambes sits bleating for reuenge.  
The screeking Rauen sits croking for reuenge.  
Whole heads of beasts comes bellowing for reuenge.  
And all, yea all the world I thinke,  
Cries for reuenge, and nothing but reuenge. (Simpson 6)

The quotation above is from one of the precursors of the Shakespearean tragedies: It is from an anonymous play *The True Tragedy of Richard the Third* in which King Richard hyperbolically outbursts and epitomizes the nature of revenge. Similarly, Susan Jacoby in *Wild Justice: The Evolution of Revenge* considers love, the acquisition of worldly goods, and revenge as the three grand themes of the western literature (14). In the catalogue of the world drama, there are numerous characters remembered for their thirst for revenge. In many plays, revenge was an important and common device to motivate the traffic of the events. Revenge is a reaction to an event which occurred earlier and indeed “[t]he prefix ‘re’ for the word ‘revenge’ evokes a sense of repetition [and] reaction” (Lo 160). One feels ambitious to take revenge when s/he is faced with personal affront, humiliation, or offence. Synonymous with the nouns reprisal, requital, retaliation, retribution, payback, and vengeance, revenge is the desire to harm a person who hurts the avenger earlier. As Albert Camus (1913-1960) puts forth in his “Reflections on the Guillotine,” (1957) “whoever has done me harm must suffer harm; whoever has put out my eye must lose an eye; and whoever has killed must die. This is an emotion and a particularly violent one (150).

The theme of revenge has been closely linked with the idea of honour since the ancient times. Kerrigan explains that the ancient Greeks did not have a word for “revenger,” instead they used to use the words “poinē” (to pay back, to recompense) for revenge and “timōros” (restorer of honour, status or respect) for the avenger (21). In this vein, repayment and restoration of honour form the roots of revenge. Although the thought of revenge existed both in Spain and England, the perspective on it was different in the two countries. In Spain, it was legal to avenge disgrace. “That one’s wife was publicly committing adultery was an acceptable defen[c]e for killing her and her lover” (Wetmore 6). Unlike Spain,

England ha[d] no legitimized code of revenge. It was an open system, not a closed one. And despite the English gentleman’s inclination to sustain his hono[u]r through revenge, there was a strong conviction in England, stressed by the clerics, that vengeance belonged only to God. (Pronko 41)

It seems that the sermon “[a]venge not yourselves, but *rather* give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord” (Romans 12.19) was deeply embedded in the Christian English mind.

Revenge is a serious act and there are some elements which prompt it. Anger, ambition, pride, and jealousy are the provokers of revenge. Francis Bacon said that “opinion of the touch of a man’s reputation doth multiply and sharpen anger.” Indeed, these components are intricate and closely knitted. That is to say, jealousy arises out of the fear of losing pride and prestige and the loss of them together with jealousy of someone/thing drives one to take revenge. In the reciprocal relationship between anger and revenge, jealousy is the mediator: it breeds anger, anger stirs up revenge.

## **2.2 Jealousy, Honour, Revenge in *Love’s Sacrifice***

There be none of the affections, which have been noted to fascinate or bewitch, but love and envy. They both have vehement wishes; they frame themselves readily into imaginations and suggestions. (Bacon 22)

The quotation above demonstrates how Francis Bacon, at the dawn of the seventeenth century, epitomizes the feelings of love and jealousy, both of which have been so inextricably knitted in the human soul ever since the fall of man. From Cain to Medea, jealousy and love have always been the subject matter of literature and the Renaissance stage hosts plenty of plays based on these themes. For instance, Shakespeare, who is among the most prominent playwrights of the period, employs jealousy “the green-ey’d Monster” (III.III.166) as the fundamental device to establish his plot in *Othello, The Moor of Venice* (1603).

Influenced by him, John Ford models his *Love’s Sacrifice* on Shakespeare’s tragedy and he reflects the destructive results of marital jealousy through it. Hence, because of their similar plot lines and characters, *Love’s Sacrifice* has often been thought to be a rewriting of *Othello*: while Roderico D’Avolos, who is the villain of *Love’s Sacrifice* as

the nourisher of suspicions in Philippo Caraffa's mind, substitutes *Othello's* Iago, Bianca becomes the victim of her jealous husband like Desdemona though with a slight difference that she is really in love with the Cassio figure Fernando (Hopkins, *'Tis Pity* 1).

Apart from *Othello*, John Ford benefits from several other sources to build up his play. As A. T. Moore lists in his introduction to *Love's Sacrifice*, while Ford makes use of Massinger's *The Duke of Milan* (1623) to create his principal characters, it is observable that he follows the similar structural pattern of *Romeo and Juliet* in the play (28-29). Besides, as the name of the characters suggests, when choosing his topic, most probably the Italian prince Carlo Gesualdo, who kills his wife Maria D'Avolos because of her forbidden love affair with Fabrizio Carafa, inspires Ford (30). Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, published a decade earlier before *Love's Sacrifice*, also has a considerable influence on Ford; Burton's repercussions are traceable in *The Lover's Melancholy* and *Love's Sacrifice*.

Considering the variety of sources Ford benefited from, it is possible to conclude that he used to have cultural awareness. Ford did not isolate himself from the happenings of his age; contrarily, he was a man of society. He was concerned with the intercultural events of his time and was intelligent enough to employ them in his plays. Expected of a playwright, he was the keen observer of the culture he was part of as well as the societies of his continent.

Like a Senecan play, *Love's Sacrifice* is made up of five acts. The first and the fourth acts include two scenes; the second and the fifth acts include three scenes and the third act is composed of four scenes. The play takes place at Pavy, the modern day Pavia which is the province of Lombardy region of the northern Italy, twenty miles south of Milan (Moore 116). Ford categorizes his characters under two headings: men and women. While Philippo Caraffa as the Duke of Pavy, Paolo Baglione as the uncle to the Duchess and the Abbot of Monaco, Fernando as the favourite to the Duke, Ferentes as the wanton courtier, Roseilli as the young nobleman, Petruccio and Nibrassa as the two counsellors of state, Roderico D'Avolos as the secretary to the Duke, Mauruccio as the old

antic and Giacopo as the servant to Mauruccio form the male characters of the tragedy, Bianca as the Duchess, Fiormonda as the Duke's sister, Colona as Petruccio's daughter, Julia as Nibrassa's daughter and Morona as the old lady constitutes the female part. If Fernando and Bianca are taken as the protagonists, the Duke, Fiormonda and D'Avolos can be considered the antagonists. D'Avolos can also be labelled as the Machiavellian figure of the play since he uses deceitful ways to obtain information from people and he manipulates the Duke for revenge. His ruthlessness towards other characters is emphasized by Ford. For the subplot, Ferentes creates the antagonism towards Julia, Morona, Colona, Petruccio and Nibrassa. Roseilli acts as the confidante of Fernando and Paolo Baglione enacts the role of an admonisher in the end.

John Ford's tragedy recounts the story of the jealous, old-aged husband Filippo Caraffa and the young, beautiful wife Bianca whose extramarital love affair with her husband's best friend Fernando arouses the feelings of jealousy and revenge in the husband who, in return, murders the lovers both to clean his honour before he commits suicide because of repentance. In the chain of events, the Duke's widow sister Fiormonda and her manipulative disciple D'Avolos quicken these characters' doom because of their malevolent machinations.

Italy became a conventional setting for Elizabethan revenge tragedians since the country, together with Spain, was accepted to be the place of uncontrolled appetites such as revenge and sexual drives. Within this framework, the court of Pavy, which is the imaginary setting of *Love's Sacrifice*, lodges plenty of characters who are driven by their instincts of jealousy and revenge. Fiormonda is jealous of Bianca and Fernando, thus she takes a vow of revenge to destruct them. The Duke, triggered by the manipulations of his sister and D'Avolos, is consumed by jealousy and decides to avenge the infidelity of his wife and Fernando. The lustful Ferentes deceives three women and the female solidarity begets three murderers who try to cleanse their reputation. In this context, the present chapter is allotted to the analysis of the drives of jealousy, the idea of honour and its devastating results as well as the motive of

revenge and its fatal consequences based on references to the aforementioned characters.

Fiormonda, the villainous widow of *Love's Sacrifice*, can be considered as the initiator of the bloodshed because it is her jealousy for Bianca, which hinges on a number of reasons, gives rise to all tragic events.

The first reason of her jealousy seems to depend on the fact that she does not want to share her brother with anybody else. It is presumable that the old-aged Duke has always been the father to Fiormonda ever since their father's death and that Fiormonda has established a close relationship with him. In this respect, Bianca threatens their relationship like an intruder. Jealousy has been defined as the fear of losing possession or as the anxiety when someone feels that s/he might lose the person s/he loves because of a rival. In this vein, when the brother-sister bond based on mutual affection and love has encountered with a rival, it is not surprising that Fiormonda develops jealousy. She, thinking that her brother might not love her as much as before, treats Bianca offensively because she is her only rival. Jealousy is also defined as the fear of losing prestige: Fiormonda, who has been the only woman of the court for years, might fear that she will be secondary to Bianca whose beauty attracts both the Duke's and everybody's attention.

The second reason why Fiormonda is jealous of Bianca might be due to the fear of losing possession. Being the only heiress to the Duke's property, Fiormonda knows that she has to share the estate with Bianca in case the Duke dies before them. However, this is exactly what she does not want to, because she thinks that Bianca does not deserve what she will inherit because of her social rank- just being the daughter of a gentleman in Milan (I.I.110-11). In this respect, Fiormonda thinks that Bianca merits neither the Duke nor his estate. For her, "many a woman's wit have thought themselves much better, was much worse" (II.I.46). Fiormonda is well aware that Bianca's charming beauty has advanced her to Filippo's marriage bed despite the negative opinion and "severe dispute" (I.I.180) of his senate.

As well as these reasons, when D'Avolos tells Fernando that "the great and gracious lady Fiormonda loves [him], infinitely loves [him]" (I.I.223-



24), the principal reason of her jealousy is made public: the recently-widowed Fiormonda loves Fernando even if the latter neglects her because he is in love with Bianca. Indeed, D'Avolos's secret illustrates the manipulative character of Fiormonda. Even though she is mourning deeply for her dead husband in public, it is Fiormonda herself who instructs D'Avolos to tell about her love. Her cunning attitude ranks her as a woman to be afraid of and foreshadows the upcoming events which will be shaped by her machinations. Fiormonda holds the features of an extremely passionate person which Burton defines as follows:

what they desire, they do most furiously seek: anxious ever and very solicitous, distrustful . . . envious, malicious . . . but most part covetous, muttering, repining, discontent, and still complaining, grudging, peevisish . . . prone to revenge, soon troubled, and most violent in all their imaginations. (321-22)

Fernando rejects Fiormonda because of his hopeless love for Bianca. The shrewd D'Avolos realizes Fernando's strange situation and decides to learn the reason behind it. He is sure that Fernando is in love but to find who the lady is, D'Avolos shows him the portraits of Fiormonda and Bianca. When Fernando constantly dwells upon Bianca's picture, D'Avolos understands that he loves Bianca and he does not fail to inform Fiormonda about it as soon as possible on which Fiormonda signals "brave revenge" (II.II.221). When she learns that Fernando and Bianca might upset her brother and reckons that he prefers Bianca to her, Fiormonda gets angrier. The fact that the man she loves is in love with the woman she hates inflames her motives of jealousy and revenge.

To be able to carry on with her vengeful intentions, Fiormonda orders D'Avolos to observe Bianca and Fernando carefully. D'Avolos witnesses a crucial scene during which Fernando tries to persuade Bianca to accept his love. D'Avolos cannot hear their conversation but seeing that Fernando is kneeling before Bianca, he deliberately misinterprets the sight and thinks that they are courting each other:

Not kissing yet? Still on your knees? O for a plump bed and clean sheets to comfort the aching of his shins! We shall have 'em clip anon, and lisp kisses. Here's a ceremony with a vengeance. (II.III.64-67)

However, he misunderstands the scene because the truth is different from what he thinks. During their conversation, Bianca severely rejects Fernando and his love because she considers it as a betrayal to her marriage vows and to the Duke's sincere friendship with Fernando. As soon as Fernando and Bianca leave, Fiormonda enters and D'Avolos relates what he has seen: "I saw him kneel, make pitiful faces, kiss hands and forefingers, rise, and by this time he is up, up, madam" (II.III.117-19). Fernando and Bianca kiss in a room and if the room is suggestive of privacy, D'Avolos is to blame for his behaviour. However, he implies to accuse the couple for their betrayal and informs Fiormonda about it soon. The forbidden love exasperates Fiormonda and she resolves

To stir up tragedies as black as brave,  
And send the lecher panting to his grave. (II.III.127-28)

It is notable that Fiormonda does not focus on Bianca and Fernando's forbidden love and when she decides to take revenge, what she thinks is not Filippo's honour but personal vengeance due to her unrequited love. Fernando does not accept her love. Instead, he chases after Bianca triggering Fiormonda for retaliation.

After the Duke returns from the hunting trip, D'Avolos does not wait any longer and decides to share the secret truth with him because he cannot conceal what he knows of the Duke's dishonour (III.III.29). He relates the situation as a matter of (dis)honour, which proves the fact that a husband's honour is closely linked with his wife's fidelity: if the wife is disloyal to her husband, it either indicates his impotence or suggests that he is not appealing enough to attract his wife. Arranged marriage also contributes to the lack of harmony between couples because the wives are generally much younger and beautiful than the husbands who are old and suspicious about the fidelity of their wives. Indeed, Filippo and Bianca exemplify the above-mentioned condition: Filippo is an old man while Bianca is young and beautiful. Bearing these ideas in mind, D'Avolos does not hesitate to label the Duke as the cuckold since he believes that Bianca is attracted by a younger man:

D'AVOLOS: In short, my lord, and plain discovery, you are a cuckold.

DUKE: Keep in a word- a cuckold?

D'AVOLOS: Fernando is your rival, has stolen your Duchess' heart, murdered friendship, horns your head, and laughs at your horns. (III.III.38-43)

With his remark, D'Avolos not only highlights a historical situation because in the Renaissance England, it was common to mock the cuckolds: "horns or antlers were hung up on their houses, or neighbours grimaced or made horn signs at them with their fingers" (Ingram, *Church* 163), he epitomizes the situation the Duke faces with as well.

Fernando conquers Bianca's heart and D'Avolos's assumption turns out to be true that Fernando does not respect friendship nor Bianca remains loyal to her husband. Love cannot tolerate a rival and when the Duke encounters with one, his jealousy increases and it leads him to pursue vengeance. The Duke reminds the reader of *Volpone's* ill-tempered and jealous husband Corvino who treats his wife Celia violently. If the Duke had obeyed Burton's advice, he would not have found himself in such an ill-fated position:

The principle cause of jealousy is incompatibility: an old man should not marry a young woman: old and young cattle do not plough well together; persons unequal in fortunes and birth should not marry; and a sick, impotent person should not marry one who is sound, for the nuptial hopes are frustrated. (Ewing 19)

When Burton's statement is taken for granted, the Duke's reactions, based on his suspicion that he is being cheated on, can be accepted as the natural consequences of his situation because the Duke and Bianca both have considerable age gap and they belong to different social classes. Besides, it is probable that he is unable to satisfy Bianca's sexual needs due to his old age. If it is taken into consideration that the couple does not have children nor the Duke has any child beforehand, the assumption that he is impotent is reinforced as well.

Philippo's intention of revenge may arise from various reasons. The wives were thought to be the property of their husbands in the Renaissance England and in fact, D'Avolos's comment that Fernando has stolen his

Duchess unquestionably renders Bianca the Duke's possession. Besides, Fernando has been his best friend and his treason cannot remain unpunished. Indeed, Fernando's endeavour to win his friend's heart is also a dishonourable act. It is because of Fernando's insistence that Bianca finally surrenders to love and betrays her husband. Thus, cuckoldry, being a source of shame and gossip, leaves him no choice but reprisal. As Ingram observes in the "Family and Household,"

Contemporaries saw cuckoldry, a man's loss of control of his wife's body, as causing possible doubts about his ability to satisfy her sexually, his capacity to govern his household, and even perhaps his fitness for any kind of public office- in brief, about his manhood. Accusations or underhand aspersions of cuckoldry . . . touched man's honour to the quick. To be an unwitting cuckold was bad; to know oneself such was worse; to be exposed was a disaster, especially as a failure to respond would condemn the man to the utterly ignominious status of "wittol" or complaisant cuckold. (104-05)

Being a cuckold shatters one's identity as a whole. If the Duke is really a cuckold, he will lose his authority and prestige over his subjects as well as his honour. Besides these, that his cuckoldry is made public doubles his rage. This is why he prefers to have lost all his inheritance as long as his wife preserves her fidelity (III.III.60-63). The public shame that he has been cuckolded combined with the obsession that he has lost his honour affects Filippo's health as well. According to Burton, such kind of people feel desperate and they are unable to decide what to do:

whether he run, go, rest with the heard, or alone, this grief remains: irresolution, inconstancy, vanity of mind, their fear, torture, care, jealousy, suspicion continues, and they cannot be relieved. (320)

Later on, to find out the truth, Filippo instructs D'Avolos to observe Bianca and Fernando. The Duke does not instantly believe in the adulterous relationship of his best friend and his wife but Fiormonda is too quick to pursue revenge. With this purpose in mind, to encourage his brother, Fiormonda reminds him of their great ancestors, of the Italian blood they are connected to and of the "harlot's lust" (IV.I.12) he is victimized by. D'Avolos backs her up and the two villains envenom the

Duke against Bianca and Fernando. They accuse Bianca of seducing the Duke's friend. They even visualize a bastard who will inherit the throne:

FIORMONDA: Be a prince?  
Th'adst better, Duke, thou hadst been born a peasant.  
Now boys will sing thy scandal in the streets,  
Tune ballads to thy infamy, get money  
By making pageants of thee, and invent  
Some strangely shaped man-beast that may for horns  
Resemble thee, and call it Pavy's duke. (IV.I.32-38)

D'Avolos and Fiormonda do not prefer to take law into their hands since they are not directly influenced from the adultery. Contrariwise, it is a direct attack to the Duke's manhood and his prestige. In the Senecan tradition, once a hero is faced with personal affront, humiliation, insult or resentment, he is supposed to take revenge himself. With their intrigues, the two villains encourage the Duke to retaliate.

D'Avolos also repeats that the Duke has been "most shamefully, most sinfully, most scornfully cornuted" (IV.I.93-94). Their inciting speech renders Philippo a man who resolves to be "matchless in revenge" (IV.I.56). The Duke decides to seek a royal vengeance until he satisfies the wrong because honour is a precious jewel (IV.I.130) for him. At the beginning of the play, Philippo addresses Bianca and Fernando "a pair of jewels" (I.I.133) and in this context, his comparison becomes meaningful foreshadowing that his honour depends on and will be tarnished by them.

Meanwhile, the old antic Mauruccio and Morona decide to get married. As it will be discussed soon, Morona cannot be an ideal woman for marriage since another man has already taken her chastity and impregnated her. For this reason, the Duke considers the marriage a "public shame" (IV.I.157) and he cannot understand how Mauruccio is willing to marry an unchaste woman. When Bianca and Fernando join hands during their marriage ceremony, the already suspicious Duke cannot suppress his feelings of jealousy anymore. As Iago states,

Trifles light as air,  
Are to the jealous, confirmations strong,  
As proof of holy writ." (III.III.325-27)

The Duke, who cannot reflect his fury on Bianca and Fernando, banishes Morona and Mauruccio because of their unchaste and unsanctified marriage.

Robert Burton relates that melancholy and jealousy cause “absurd and interrupt dreams, and many phantastical visions” (315). The one, who is in a melancholy situation, “suspects everything he hears or sees to be a devil, or enchanted, and imagineth a thousand chimeras and visions” (318); those people are tormented by baseless fears and suspicions. The Duke too falls within this group of people whose vision is the result of their melancholy. His jealousy discomforts him and “the nightly anguish of [his] dull unrest” (IV.II.31) begets an opinion that he is being cheated on. The Duke has had a dream in which Bianca and Fernando betray him with their lustful actions. Upon their treason, he does not remain silent and draws his sword. The dream vision is suggestive in that it both foreshadows the future tragedy of the court and reflects the Philippo’s distorted mind. Even though his is just a dream, the Duke almost threatens Bianca to kill her as if she was indulged in adultery. Although his jealousy is not based on ocular proof but it is based merely on D’Avolos’s treacherous belief, the Duke cannot stay calm. After severely accusing and threatening Bianca, he all of a sudden subsides and asks forgiveness because of his delusions. Jealousy creates a monstrous man with an inconsistent behaviour. The Duke bears the characteristics of a jealous man of Burton’s explanation:

Inconstant they are in all their action; vertiginous, restless, unapt to resolve of any business, they will and will not, persuaded to and fro upon every small occasion, or word spoken. (321)

The fifth chapter opens with Fernando and Bianca’s dialogue in which Bianca questions the iron laws of matrimony. Their conversation proves that Bianca is not content with her marriage and that she is determined to change her status for the sake of love. She confesses that she is jealous of the waiting-woman; she prefers to be one of them to purchase one night’s rest with Fernando than to be Philippo’s spouse for thousand years (V.I.10-15).

In the meantime, the Duke feigns an absence for Lucca to leave Bianca and Fernando alone so that he can peep at them. Before the Duke catches the couple, Fiormonda watches them holding their hands. The sight enrages the rejected woman and she repeats her vow of revenge:

Now fly, revenge, and wound the lower earth,  
That I, ensphered above, may cross the race  
Of love despised, and triumph o'er their graves  
Who scorn the low-bent thralldom of my heart. (V.I.1-4)

It is the first time Fiormonda witnesses Bianca and Fernando's forbidden love and it takes away her hopes of union with him. The feeling that she is insulted induces vengeful intentions. She tries to destroy the man whom she cannot possess. She does not set him free nor respects his feelings but struggles to capture him dead or alive.

The scene above reminds the reader of the balcony scene of *Romeo and Juliet*. Different from theirs, in *Love's Sacrifice*, Fiormonda watches the lovers from the balcony while they are united. Bianca is seen in her night attire proving that they meet during the night when they are distinct from the outside world. Besides, night and darkness are the allusions to the forbidden nature of their love. During the day, they are forced to part because somebody can catch them. Fernando and Bianca create a world of their own but Fiormonda belonging to the outside world and representing the society this time, intrudes and resolves to destroy their love. Stage direction states that a curtain is drawn and it metaphorically separates the lovers from the world of oppression. Romeo and Juliet, who are on the balcony, decide to marry and their decision brings about their doom. Similarly, Fiormonda, standing on the balcony, catches them and she is fuelled with anger and jealousy to devastate them.

Just as Bianca and Fernando exchange kisses unaware of being watched, the Duke enters with his sword in his hand. He is too quick to believe that they are being adulterous when he sees them because D'Avolos has already fuelled him with suspicions. He does not hesitate to label Bianca a "strumpet" (V.I.54) or a "shameless harlot" (V.I.60) but his accusations do not intimidate Bianca who "[holds] Fernando much the properer man" (V.I.70). Bianca does not keep her silence nor does she

feel sorry about their forbidden affair. She does not cry for mercy or forgiveness either. On the contrary, she lists the Duke's defects and concludes why she cannot love him. She unhesitatingly tells how she is deeply in love Fernando. The Duke cannot react but only insults her: he stamps her as "a devil worser than the worst in hell" (V.I.111), "a miserable creature" (V.I.131), "a black angel, fair devil" (V.I.138-39). Bianca only wishes to be dead because she knows that the patriarchal code does not let her unite with Fernando.

All societies have rules of conduct, indeed the terms 'society' and 'social regulations' are coterminous. All societies sanction their rules of conduct, rewarding those who conform and punishing those who disobey. Honour and shame are social evaluations and thus participate of the nature of social sanctions. (Peristiany 9)

The idea of honour demands a rubric of social conduct. The Renaissance society was a patriarchal one in which the sexual freedom of the women were excessively restricted. The patriarchal system prevalent in the society embarked particular roles on women whose manners defined the masculine honour. The women were socially accepted to be the weaker sex and there were certain rules they should obey. Hence, while those who conformed to the social code by being silent, submissive and chaste avoided punishment; the ones who disobeyed it with their unchaste manners were subjected to punishment. In such a case, a married woman used to have just one option- to be loyal to her husband because both her and her husband's honour depended on her sexual propriety. Apart from the social rules, Christianity demanded the chastity of wives as well. In this context, defying the husband's authority through adultery was definitely frowned upon because

[e]xtramarital sexual activity of whatever kind was in social theory abhorred as hateful to God and a threat to the well-being of the commonwealth . . . sexual 'honesty' and the status of married householder were important touchstones of respectability and stability. (Ingram, *Church* 125)

Thus, violence turns out to be the only remedy for the Duke; "the jealous madman" (V.II.9) has had no chance but to kill his wife to restore his



honour. If honour is “conferred as a mark or token of esteem or distinction; a title of rank” (Barber 61), duty will call him to clean his honour because a person would prefer to “give myriads of crowns, lose his life, than suffer the least defamation of honour, or blot in his good name” (Burton 226). Jealousy and honour serve as the central psychological motives for his retribution. In accordance with what the social code prescribes as well as his jealousy, the Duke considers Bianca’s lustful act unforgivable and thinks that she deserves to be sacrificed for her adultery. A Senecan hero experiences a momentary hesitation before murder but he does not hesitate to stab Bianca to death claiming “here is a blood for lust and sacrifice for wrong” (V.I.173).

The Duke intends to kill Fernando too but he does not reflect it as a personal vengeance. Contrarily, he states that it is the command of heavens that the adulterous people should be punished. He does not propound jealousy or revenge but he only seems to be obeying what God and the society preach him to do:

Look here, ‘tis written on my poniard’s point,  
The bloody evidence of thy untruth,  
Wherein thy conscience and the wrathful rod  
Of heaven’s scourge for lust at once give up  
The verdict of thy crying villainies. (V.II.29-33)

Even though revenge has been condemned by the clergymen because God states that vengeance belongs to him, the Duke soothes his desire under religious code through which he claims himself sufficient to act. He might be afraid that Bianca would shatter his authority which would make him impotent. To show that he is still powerful, the Duke exerts power over Bianca and the poniard functions as the indicator of his omnipotence. Through the murder, he tries to show that he can control his wife since

[f]or the husband, not only did he have to act virtuously in a social context, but his hono[u]r was also dependent on his wife’s obedience to completely internal and personal norms because she was considered to be the repository of her husband’s good name. (Stroud 98)

Killing Bianca does not alleviate his anger because the Duke is also determined to punish the guilty Fernando who has injured his honour. Even though Bianca and Fernando's love affair is far from being sexual, the Duke thinks that it is purely physical and accordingly, he resolves to mix their souls together in their deaths just as they have done their bodies in life (V.II.44-45). They just kiss each other as a token of their love, but the Duke accuses them of being lustful. In this sense, his intention of revenge can be linked to double reasons: he wants to kill them both because they have tarnished his honour and because he is jealous of his wife who has betrayed him. He desires to punish the ones who have done wrong to him.

Now that Bianca is dead, Fernando cannot find an objective to live. "[S]ince she is dead / I'll hold all life a hell" (V.II.80-81) he sighs. He cannot endure the pain caused by her absence and thereby he does not hesitate to encourage the Duke to kill him. However, before drinking a vial of poison to unite with Bianca, Fernando admits that he has never "unshrined the altar of her purity" (V.II.57-58) and claims that Bianca is an innocent wife free from lust.

Their love cannot be considered chaste since Bianca exchanges kisses with Fernando and confesses her love despite being bounded by marriage contract. However, the Duke is thunderstruck when he learns that Bianca is chaste and he easily believes in the innocence and chastity of his wife whom he has recently "butchered" (V.II.53). The Duke, who kills her for the sake of honour because she brings shame, now accounts for her virtues. Similarly, the burial of Bianca looks like a religious ceremony. All of the court members enter her tomb with torches in their hands and kneel in front of it. The Duke, who claims to have killed Bianca because of her dishonourable act, now worships her "sacred tomb" (V.III.40) and the people are gathered to honour her corpse.

Throughout the play, Bianca is attributed with several characteristics. While at the beginning of the play, she is the innocent wife of Philipppo, she is soon seduced by Fernando's love and changes into a devout lover who transgresses the boundaries allowed to her. Upon her declaration of love, she is labelled a shameless adulteress, a lustful harlot by the voice

of patriarchy. Finally, when Fernando confesses that they have never had sexual intercourse, Bianca becomes the Duke's blameless victim fatally wounded by his jealousy. The Duke, who has thought that he has gained triumph over Bianca, ends up with destruction like the Icarus of the Greek mythology. In this process of change, the name *Bianca* becomes quite meaningful and ironic. The play takes place in Italy and Bianca means *white* in Italian. Whiteness suggests purity, innocence and spotlessness. In this respect, the name and its bearer juxtapose since the Duchess Bianca does not deserve her name. Although she is chaste and spotless at the beginning, because of her adulterous affair with Fernando, she loses her purity and whiteness through the end. Even though she is as white as the handkerchief she has initially, her forbidden affair with Fernando stains her just as the bloody handkerchief has been stained due to his bloody lip. Bianca has been killed because of her dishonour. In the end, however, the Duke thinks that he has murdered his wife without consideration and reckons that she is guiltless. He claims that he has killed a spotless wife. Bianca's death renders her spotless and restores her whiteness and thanks to her death she deserves her name again.

The moment he is convinced of the guiltlessness of Bianca, the Duke realizes how the hellish rage has blinded his reason. He, who reflects his jealousy on Morona and Mauruccio, now directs his anger towards D'Avolos whom he calls "a devil in the shape of man, an arch-arch-devil" (V.II.105-06). Just as he has punished the newly-married couple to hide his jealousy, the Duke puts the blame on D'Avolos to lessen his sense of guilt. No wonder it is clear that D'Avolos has put the seeds of jealousy and revenge in his mind but it is actually the Duke who kills his wife without consideration and further research. He is too quick to believe in the erroneous information related by D'Avolos. That Bianca has cheated on her husband is undeniable but whether her punishment should be death is debatable. Even though Bianca does not remain loyal to her husband, her sin does not necessitate her death. The Duke realizes his mistake soon but it is too late to bring Bianca back. Thence, he changes into a grieving and a regretful man:

I am Caraffa, he, that wretched man,  
That butcher who in my enraged spleen  
Slaughtered the life of innocence and beauty.  
Now come I to pay tribute to those wounds  
Which I digged up, and reconcile the wrongs  
My fury wrought and my contrition mourns. (V.III.46-51)

Not only the Duke blames himself for Bianca's unjust death, Fernando as well accuses him of being an "inhuman tyrant" (V.III.61) who has shattered all hopes of his happiness. While Fernando condemns the Duke because of stealing his future joys and Bianca, the Duke thinks that Fernando has robbed his resolution of a good name (V.III.73).

Nonetheless, his deep affection for them overcomes his obsession with honour and he believes in the innocence of his wife and friend. Since he knows that he has lost them eternally, the Duke decides upon a self-inflicted revenge and stabs himself "in revenge of wrongs to her" (V.III.115) and Fernando. His final remarks prove the desperate condition of his uncontrolled actions and before he dies, the Duke gives a moral lesson on how jealousy might lead to devastating results:

O that these thick streams  
Could gather head and make a standing pool,  
That jealous husbands here might bathe in blood. (V.III.121-23)

Probably influenced by the Roman tradition, John Ford employs violence on stage. The Duke first stabs Bianca and later he stabs himself. Similarly, Fernando drinks a vial of poison and kills himself in the presence of the other characters. Both men commit murder before the eyes of the audience. Ford does not use chorus like his Greek counterparts to report the news. Instead, he believes in the power of spectacle, imitates Seneca and displays torture on stage.

The Duke commits suicide due to his penitence of what he has done to an innocent wife and in fact punishes himself because of his blind jealousy. Bacon warns out that jealousy is "the vilest affection, and the most depraved; for which cause it is the proper attribute of the devil, who is called, the envious man, that soweth tares amongst the wheat by night" (26). The Duke realizes his sin too late and pays it back with a

greater one by killing himself. His condition is remindful of a proverb by Confucius: “when you go out to seek revenge, dig two graves” (Barash and Lipton 148-49). The Duke’s jealousy costs to his life. However, it stands out even in his final breath when he requests that a monument be erected in honour of them. He wants to be the part of the memorial. Fernando and Bianca cannot unite even after their deaths because the Duke follows them.

Indeed, in *Love’s Sacrifice*, slander causes three deaths. Fernando, Bianca and the Duke become the victims of it because of D’Avolos and Fiormonda’s false accusations. Through manipulative machinations of these black characters, the play brings about the most unfortunate results. Although it is true that Bianca and Fernando are in love with each other, they never consummate it. However, D’Avolos’s calumnious intrigues and Fiormonda’s insistence on revenge serve as incentives to lead the frustrated husband Philippo to kill his wife. In the play, suspicion, jealousy, and honour, all of which are caused by calumny, create fatal consequences. The Duke “fulfils the direst but most expected prognostication of this most violent form of jealousy by murdering his wife and causing the death of his friend” (Ewing 70). *Love’s Sacrifice* displays revenge with its evil results which befall when it is not conceived on just grounds (Bowers 214).

Pursuing the footsteps of Aristotle, Greco-Roman plays follow unity of action without digressions and they do not contain sub-plots. In *Love’s Sacrifice*, however, Ford benefits from a sub-plot both to enhance his content and to give his women freedom to express themselves.

While the triangular love tragedy constitutes the main plot of *Love’s Sacrifice*, the play also hosts a secondary plot similar to that of Bianca and Fernando’s. The subplot concerns the love quadrangle of Ferentes, Julia, Colona and Morona whose relations lead to bloodshed. Ferentes has been introduced as the wanton courtier of the dukedom who takes delight in seducing women. While he is a man enslaved by his voluptuousness, Julia, Colona and Morona, who are victimized by his false promises of marriage, become the murderers who have avenged his treachery by taking his life.

At the beginning of the play, Ferentes is depicted as the “one whose pride takes pride in nothing more than to delight his lust” (I.I.97-98). Accordingly, when he courts three women with the same discourse of love, it is certain that none of his affairs will end up with marriage since he does not believe in genuine love but considers it a trade (I.II.41). Ferentes deceives three women and the third act begins when Julia and Colona inform their fathers that they are pregnant by Ferentes. Nibrassa and Petruccio, who are Julia’s and Colona’s fathers respectively, when they first hear the out-of-wedlock pregnancies, accuse their daughters of being a “strumpet” (III.I.1), an “infamous whore” (III.I.1). Before marriage, the fathers were supposed to be the guardians of their daughters according to the social customs of England and therefore, Nibrassa, unable to do so, “disclaim[s] the legitimation of [Julia’s] birth, and curse the hour of [her] nativity” (III.I.5-6). He considers the situation as a shame to his grave. He thinks that the adulterous relationship is up to no possibilities of reformation for the girl and for him which means that once a woman has been labelled a whore, she is left with no promises of sanctified marriage. Petruccio and Colona suffer from the same situation since Ferentes also cheats her with his vow of marriage. The two fathers are excessively angry with their daughters for indulging in extramarital affair: “One cock hath trod both our hens: Ferentes, Ferentes, who else? How dost take it? Methinks thou art wondrous patient. Why, I am mad, stark mad” (III.I.49-51) bursts out Nibrassa. He encourages the women to plot revenge which Petruccio approves of:

There, there, sit ye down together. Never rise, as you hope to inherit our blessings, till you have plotted some brave revenge. Think upon it to purpose, and you shall want no seconds to further it. Be secret, one to another. Come, Petruccio, let ‘em alone, the wenches will demur on’t, and for the process, we’ll give ‘em courage. (III.I.61-67)

Due to the social rules, it is expected from the fathers to kill their daughters as they have brought shame on their name but contrariwise, they encourage their daughters to avenge the dishonour. Since Petruccio and Nibrassa are the two counsellors of state, they might not want to lose their position because of committing murder or John Ford intentionally

gives the women freedom to act as they wish. The patriarchy allows them to do so but with their *own* decisions, they take a vow of revenge to kill the trickster Ferentes. In *Love's Sacrifice*, the three women subvert the conventions of honour code because they kill the wrongdoer themselves.

Just as Colona and Julia have asserted themselves to take revenge, another victim of Ferentes's lechery appears. Morona has also been taken in by his false promises and now suffers from it because she thinks that Ferentes has robbed her of her good name. To make the matters worse, Ferentes humiliates the women: while he insults Morona because of her age which is not young enough to be married, he belittles Julia due to her scurvy face. Similarly, he refuses to marry Colona since she has been so easily seduced. Ferentes neither feels upset because he has cheated them all nor he is willing to marry any of them so that he can save one from being labelled as a whore. On the contrary, he mocks at and rejects all of them upon which the females join their forces to destroy him.

COLONA: Unmatched villain.

Julia: Madam, though strangers, yet we understand  
Your wrongs do equal ours, which to revenge,  
Please but to join with us, and we'll redeem  
Our loss of honour by a brave exploit. (III.II. 150-54)

The important point is that the three women take a vow of revenge neither because of their great love for Ferentes nor because of jealousy towards each other. Their sole reason to take revenge is their honour. In this respect, their stance is different from the Duke's since he decides to avenge the wrong because his jealous feelings stemming from his love lead him to. The women are supposed to be jealous of each other since they all expect to marry Ferentes but they establish camaraderie to kill him. The three victims, who are easily taken in by his charming love discourse, turn out to be the cunning schemers to pay his wrong back. They subvert the general belief of the seventeenth century which considers women to be weak and fragile creatures as they show their capability to plot, their strength to retaliate.

The women react against his wrongdoings and during the dance show prepared in honour of the Abbot of Monaco, they suddenly fall upon

Ferentes and stab him. They do not repent since they think that he deserves what he has done. The women argue that Ferentes has abused their simplicity and therefore he should be punished with death because he has blamed Colona for being “too quickly won” (III.IV.39), Morona for being “too old” (III.IV.40) and Julia for being “not fair enough” (III.IV.42). In his last breath, Ferentes too accepts his fault: “My forfeit was in my blood, and my life hath answered it” (III.IV.51-52). His remark echoes what Vittoria in *The White Devil* (1612) of Webster sighs:

My greatest sin lay in my blood!  
Now my blood pays for 't. (V.VI.240-41)

Eventually, Ferentes dies and the rest of the men react differently to their crime. While Petruccio and Nibrassa congratulate their daughters for their courageous action- “O well done, girls!” (III.IV.58), the Duke decides to prison “those monstrous strumpets” (III.IV.56) since in his view they have lost their chastity without getting married. At this stage, D’Avolos has already sown the seeds of suspicion in his mind, which is why he is angrier than the other men. The Abbot, being a religious man, keeps his refined manner and presents the moral lesson of the play:

Here’s fatal sad presages, but ‘tis just:  
He dies by murder that hath lived in lust. (III.IV.62-63)

With his final remarks about Ferentes’s and Fernando’s situation, the Abbot represents the chorus of a Greek tragedy. As a whole, he remains aloof from the events; he observes them and finally speaking as the voice of wisdom interprets the unfortunate situation they find themselves in.

The Duke puts the women in prison but through Bianca’s intercessions, they are set free. Later Morona marries Mauruccio and although the women have killed a person, none of them is punished. It seems that “[Ford] represents women with great sympathy, consistently allotting to them what his culture as a whole did not” (Hopkins 107).

Except for Ferentes’s victims, in *Love’s Sacrifice*, the people who have done wrong to each other do not remain unpunished: Fernando and Bianca because of their treachery and forbidden love affair, Filippo Caraffa because of his hasty decision to kill his wife, Ferentes because of



being a philanderer, and Fiormonda-D'Avolos couple because of their evil intentions are all punished. While Filippo, Bianca, Fernando and Ferentes's sins cost them to their lives, D'Avolos is sent to dungeons for good and Fiormonda is banished from the pleasures of marriage bed. Similarly, the ones who have been driven by their motives of honour and jealousy bring about their own ends. Fiormonda because of her excessive jealousy and vengeful intentions turns out to be an unhappy woman just as the Duke due to his jealous feelings and obsession with honour prepares his own doom.

### **2.3 Jealousy, Honour, Revenge in *Punishment Without Revenge***

Lope de Vega's masterpiece *El castigo sin venganza*, written four years before his death, was the dramatization of a tragic event that took place during the fifteenth century Ferrara. Lope called the play a tragedy when he signed the manuscript of the play on 1 August 1631. Probably inspired by Matteo Bandello's novella about Ugo and Parisiana, Lope's play was based on the adulterous relationship of 1425 between Parisiana Malatesta and Ugo d'Este, the second wife and the illegitimate son of Niccolò III d'Este, the Duke of Ferrara who, learning the betrayal, beheaded them both.

Besides benefiting from the Spanish history, Lope mirrored the contemporary situation of the court in *El castigo*. Historical data suggest the similarity between Philip IV who sought the company of promiscuous women just as the Duke of Ferrara of the play. As Greer observes:

*Castigo* may have been too telling a mirror, politically, given the similarity between the libertine Duke and the womanizing for which Philip IV was criticised; it was performed just one day on the *corral* stage, Lope reported in the preface of the 1634 *princeps*. (363).

*Uxor* means wife in Latin and uxoricide is defined as "the murder of one's wife" in *Oxford English Dictionary*. *El castigo sin venganza* is a typical uxoricide play in which the old-aged husband murders his wife to restore his honour due to his delusion of infidelity. Stroud lists some structural

characteristics of these plays as the use of letters, portraits and mirrors, eavesdropping- an incriminating conversation overheard by the husband, and the false accusation of the wife (27). Lope's contemporary Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *The Painter of His Dishonour- El pintor de su deshonra* and *The Surgeon of his Honour- El médico de su honra* were the best examples to the genre in Spain while Shakespeare dealt with uxoricide in his *Cymbeline* and *Othello*. Similarly, Lope's play follows a plot line in which the Duke of Ferrara, after learning the adulterous affair of his wife Casandra with his illegitimate son Federico, resolves to kill them in the name of honour without making the reasons public. Within this context, the chapter covers the motives and functions of jealousy, the idea of honour and its aftermath together with the reasons and consequences of revenge in relation to certain characters.

*El castigo sin venganza* is a *comedia* made up of three acts. While the Duke of Ferrara, the Count Federico, the Marquis of Gonzaga, Batín, Febo and Ricardo are Lope's male characters, Casandra, Aurora, Lucrecia and Cintia constitute the female figures of the tragedy. Batín and Lucrecia appear as the servants of Federico and Casandra respectively and they are the two *graciosos* of the play. They can directly voice the feelings of their masters and they create a bridge between the audience and the characters. Lope does not specify the setting but it is understood that the play takes place in Ferrara, Italy. Lope chooses Italy as his setting probably because he was aware that the country was infamous for its obsession with revenge as well as its association with excessive sexual appetites. Although the events take place in Italy, the play does not contain a Machiavellian figure.

As he has argued in *Arte nuevo*, Lope follows neither the unity of time nor the place. From the dialogues of the characters, it is learnt that the play covers a time span of five months. Besides, the events do not occur in one place. While the play starts at the street, the scene shifts to the Duke's palace or Federico and Casandra first meet on the road next to a riverbank. Lope follows only the unity of action since from the beginning to the end; the plot is mainly concerned with Federico and Casandra's relationship. If Federico and Casandra are accepted as the protagonists,

the Duke of Ferrara, Aurora and the Marquis of Gonzaga become their antagonists. Batín and Lucrecia enact as the confidantes of the protagonists. The couples of *Federico-Casandra* and *Aurora-the Marquis* create a geometrical structure and their relationships are contrasted.

*El castigo* begins with the Duke and his two servants Febo and Ricardo when the three are on the street busy with womanizing. The figure of a jealous husband first appears when Ricardo says that the jealous husbands “are by their nature hard of heart” (I.38). According to him, a jealous husband is mean because he only keeps his wife to himself. The Duke agrees and accuses men of lacking generosity. It is ironic that he will contradict himself and he will be the representative of the jealous husband of the uxoricide play at the end of the piece even though he never openly expresses his jealousy.

The Duke appears in disguise because he desires to indulge in a lascivious occasion without being discovered. He is precautious so as not to be recognised suggesting that he does not want to stain his reputation as a respectful man. After all he is the duke- the head of the state and he is supposed to be a model for his subjects. The *disguised* Duke also hints that *el qué dirán*, the thoughts of the others is critical to his status. He seems to arrange his attitude in respect to the reputation he enjoys in the society. As Reichenberger notes *la honra es opinion*- it was based on an unquestioned code of socially approved behaviour; it was man-made (308).

The Duke is an old-aged, libertine, lustful man but since he does not have a legitimate heir, he is on the verge of marriage. However, he does not yield to change his attitude and still keeps chasing women. That he is a loose man is a well-known fact by the women of the Ferrara:

CINTIA: I mean, the whole world knows  
His reputation: he thinks he is  
God's gift to women and so has lived  
His life devoted to that passion.  
To live so freely meant, of course,  
He never thought of getting married. (I.115-20)

The Duke accepts that he has lived indulgently, he is a free-spirited man but he is forced to get married by his subjects because he has just one heir who is not legally proper to inherit his wealth: his illegitimate son Federico.

As the Duke, Febo and Ricardo leave the scene, the young and handsome Count Federico enters dressed in travelling clothes accompanied by his servant Batin. He is charged to bring his stepmother Casandra from Mantua by his father, but he is unwilling to go since he thinks that he will have to bear the consequences of the deed. Bastard as he is, he knows that he will be his father's heir. However, he considers "everything lost" (I.296) due to the forthcoming union and regards his stepmother as the "fatal poison" (I.300). "The sorrow in jealousy may be associated with anger, discontent, humiliation . . . grief, as well as feelings of insecurity, helplessness, and of being unlucky" (Ben-Ze'ev 43). These elements take part in Federico's sadness and jealousy.

In tripartite relationships, the rivals do not necessarily belong to the same sex. Federico feels threatened by Casandra and thinks that he will lose everything because he envisages that the woman will both take his father and his wealth away from him. Besides the beloved person, he does not want to be separated from the future welfare. The fear that he will lose prestige, the idea that will end up in a worse financial and spiritual condition than he has now and that he will be loved less by his father creates anxiety and jealousy. For Federico marriage will be a remedy to the Duke's lechery since he assumes that "a woman can control the proudest and the fiercest man" (I.341-43). He is also jealous of the couple's unborn siblings who can have the power to transform a man totally and who may cause his being alienated from the society as an out-of-wedlock child. Presumably, he has already been aware of his illegitimate status.

Being the closest one to his father, Federico does not want to share him with anyone else. His jealousy is double: he does not want to lose the person he loves and the prosperity he is committed to. To him,

[A woman] is a lioness before whose gaze he seems  
A lamb, his wildness at the very sight  
Of his first-born transformed to such extremes

Of tenderness as will allow that man  
To hold his babbling, gurgling child  
And let it pull and tug his beard. (I.344-49)

While he is talking about his sorrow, the wheel of fortune intervenes and he accidentally meets “Casandra, daughter of the Duke of Mantua, and soon to be the Duchess of Ferrara” (I.421-23).

Casandra is properly enclosed by Federico’s arms when the audience first meets her, not only because women are trapped by men in Ferrara, but also Federico and Casandra are equal victims, locked together in degradation, destined for an identical catastrophe. (Evans 332)

Accident and chance may be mitigating factors for the adultery of Casandra and Federico because he arrives at the precise moment when she needs him. He rescues her, but the apparent blessing turns into an omen for the would-be lovers. Seeing such a beautiful and a young woman, both Federico and Batín are astonished. Drawing attention to the mutual attraction of Federico and Casandra, Batín thinks that she would be a better suit for his master rather than the Duke owing to the natural correspondence of the youth. Federico feels the same but cannot express his emotions; his jealousy changes direction and now he becomes jealous of his father because he will “be the only stepson / To have claimed a stepmother as beautiful / As this” (I.714-16). At the end of the Act I, he confesses that he is jealous of his father. He forgets about the richness he may lose since his mind is obsessed with Casandra. He feels envious because his father possesses the beautiful lady. His feelings of jealousy turn into envy:

My father is  
The happiest of men.  
BATÍN: Say that again.  
FEDERICO: I envy him. He has what is  
For me impossible.  
BATÍN: That’s true.  
And her more suitable by far  
For you. You do require right to envy him.  
FEDERICO: Then shall I die of love that is  
Impossible and at the same  
Time prove that for a son to be

So jealous of his father is  
Quite possible. (I.1079-91)

It is useful to note that there is a slight difference between the concepts of jealousy and envy. “Envy has to do with lack of possession, jealousy with anxiety of losing possession” (Lo 15). Federico’s jealousy of losing his father turns into the envy of not having his stepmother at this stage.

Casandra’s sentiments are not so different from Federico’s, either. Being a servant to her, Lucrecia echoes Batin’s ideas and comments that it would be better if Federico were the husband to Casandra, to which she readily agrees. It is implied that Casandra likes Federico too but she knows that she cannot go back because of the matter of reputation. She reaches Ferrara with her father’s carriage. Like the carriage, she also belongs to her father and she marries to become the possession of another man. Casandra’s destiny is settled for her by her father since in the Spanish society, “marriages were arranged by parents, with or without the consent of the young people” (Jones 154) and thus she is unable to change it. She considers deceiving her father with a false story but she is aware that she will “soon become a topic for the idle tongues of Italy” (I.657-58). She wants to go back but she is aware that her father will not accept her and this explains the reason why she decides to make up a story. Owing to the fear of rumours, she is forced to live in Ferrara; she is sure that her turning back to Mantua will be a source of dishonour both for her and her father just as the moralists asserted: “a girl’s sexual purity determined the fate of her parents’ hono[u]r” (Taylor 162). Casandra does not have free will because

[r]eputation was a cultural touchstone in early modern Spain, vital to the maintenance of the social order: everyone had a position and was expected to conduct him or herself according to the expectations and obligations of that position. (Campbell 65)

Good reputation was as important as the life itself. The individual had to submit to the rules of the society, to the roles imposed by that society and should behave accordingly. This is the reason why the Duke has married Casandra; it is not because of love but because of the affairs of

state as his folk is ready to devastate his land unless he is married. He does not stop his womanizing and he abandons his bride as soon as they are married. Arranged marriage contributes to the conflict between Casandra and the Duke because she is much younger and beautiful than him. Casandra is possibly an exchange for economic and political reasons and has to sacrifice herself to the outside interests. They have to live up to the expectations of the society and because they fail to do so, the tragic outcome is inevitable. The Duke cannot be a loyal husband as expected of him, so Casandra and Federico do not respect the bonds of marriage.

In line with the formula prescribing that it does not have to be unity of time in a play, between Act I and II one month passes. Now the unhappy Casandra wishes to be a peasant girl rather than belonging to the nobility. She pours out that the Duke has held her in his arms only once in an entire month, the detail which suggests that their marriage has been consummated and any sexual relationship of Casandra will be adulterous. She prefers to be a girl of low birth but loved by an honourable man and she becomes jealous of those couples whose hearts burn with the eternal fire of love.

She complains that the Duke sees her as a property. What she opposes is the privilege given only to men to indulge in an extra-marital relationship. For her, the Duke is of the school that thinks

A wife is something to adorn  
His house: an ornament, a piece  
Of furniture to call his own,  
An item he's gone out and bought  
To decorate his drawing-room.  
I will not willingly accept  
Such terms, nor easily believe  
That any man who loves his wife  
Will use such methods to destroy  
Her life and happiness; for if  
She's genuine, a woman wants  
To be a wife and mother, not  
Another stick of furniture. (II.56-69)

Casandra condones her husband's libertinism but challenges that she will not accept being treated like an ornament considering such a

husband “a total fool who’ll soon / Regret the day that he was born” (II.54-55). She implies that if she is not treated as valuable as she deserves, she will recompense it. She seems to be determined to hurt the one who hurts her. Her pain and ambition to take revenge double when the Duke keeps ignoring her and she takes a vow of revenge:

Unless I am mistaken, I  
Shall see to it that one day he  
Shall pay for everything he’s done to me. (II.153-55)

Contrary to the common belief of the Golden Age that the women are weak creatures, Casandra is strong enough to pay back the threat to her happiness. The idea of reaction to a personal affront or humiliation available in the nature of revenge is observable through her characterization.

For the Golden Age women, honour was a burdensome issue since it used to limit their behaviour. “Literal enclosure inside houses and convents, as well as metaphorical enclosure in terms of passivity and obedience to men, defined the public image of women” (Taylor 104). The role of self-discipline was an important issue for the Christian moralists and they reflected that the perfect women were the most silent and the most obedient ones. In this vein, numerous books were published about the spiritual guidance of the women. Antonio de Guevara in *To the Recently Married- Á los recién casados* (1539), Juan de la Cerda in *Principles of Life for All Estates of Women- Vida política de todos los estados de mugeres* (1599), and Gaspar Astete in *Treatise on the Government of the Family, and on the Estate of Widows and Maidens- Tratado del gobierno de la familia, y estado de las viudas y donzellas* (1603) stated that women should protect their sexual purity. For Astete a girl who loses her virginity was also guilty of adultery now that her body belongs to her father. He also remarked that the girls should stay indoors and both windows of the houses and the mouths of the women should be shut. Likewise, Juan Luis Vives argued that “married women should leave the house even less than maidens, for they had already found what they were looking for outside the house: a husband” (Taylor 163). Based on the historical evidence, it is possible to claim that the Duke is the



implementer/embodiment of the honour code since he is of the opinion that the women should be kept inside:

If men  
Were constantly concerned about  
The women in their lives, they'd have  
To lock them up to keep them safe  
From prying eyes. Think of a mirror as  
You breathe on it; the image disappears.  
But take a cloth to clean the glass,  
The surface that was soiled appears clear. (II.202-09)

The Duke first possesses Casandra at a social level by marriage and then at a physical level by almost imprisoning her in his palace. He wants to keep Casandra in cage but he himself carries on his libertine lifestyle. She is aware that the Duke has married her to satisfy the will of his people. What she complains is the disrespectful attitude of the Duke towards marriage and her. He is an uncaring, neglectful husband; he is supposed to have sexual intercourse with his wife, but he “seeks immoral women idly spending his days and nights in pleasure with them” (II.398-99). For Casandra, the Duke is a tyrant more than a husband and the palace is a prison (II.405-07). Casandra is concerned with the honour code as well and she thinks that the Duke’s lechery will “tarnish her own good name” (II.394-95). She reasons that good reputation is important because

Honour is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of his society. It is his estimation of his own worth, his claim to pride, but it is also the acknowledgement of that claim, his excellence recognized by society, his *right* to pride. (Pitt-Rivers 21)

It is also affirmable that jealousy has an effect on Casandra’s behaviour. Although she is not in love with her husband, being a wife, she is right to be jealous of the promiscuous women outside. Most probably, the couple has promised to be loyal to each other during the marriage ceremony and now the husband does not keep it. Marriage is an institution that gives the possession of the husband to his wife just as the wife is supposed to belong to her husband. However, “[a]fter marriage, the husband [i]s definitely the head of the house” (Jones 154) and he has a privileged

position which enables him to behave as he wishes. Thus, despite Casandra's opinion that her reputation will be stained, it is doubtful that the Duke's activities will bring shame on her.

On the other hand, Casandra feels restricted due to the impositions of marriage. As the Christian moralists put forth, she has to be submissive and faithful even if her husband is not. The Duke is an indifferent man and does not cherish his wife and matrimony but Casandra is unable to react so as to change the situation. She cannot behave according to her will because she knows that she is under his authority. Even though she does not love him, she has to be loyal to the vow of marriage because "[even though] male honour for the most part was based on social considerations, female honour revolved around sexual virtue" (Barahona 121). Thus, her being married is like a burden:

. . . I  
Am married now, and therefore must,  
For good or ill, accept my marriage vow. (II.578-80)

She has two options: either to be a good wife or a bad one. She can be good by obeying to the rules of marriage- being silent, constant, submissive, chaste- or she can be bad by transgressing the marital bonds and dishonouring herself and her husband owing to the fact that male honour depends on female sexuality. Casandra chooses the second alternative. She knows that she is under the hegemony of her husband but she does not surrender. She is both a victim and a predator and having such a husband drives her towards revenge. Through it, she wants to prove that she can act without his permission thereby establishing her identity. She considers that taking revenge is quite dangerous and that the Duke will avenge what she has done because it is the way to restore the tarnished honour. Nonetheless, motivated by jealousy and the fact that the Duke is a profligate husband makes Casandra's intention of revenge rightful.

The relationship between honour and revenge is a vicious circle: Casandra thinks that her husband stains her reputation so she wants to

take revenge. At the same time she knows that the Duke will retaliate if Casandra harms his honour and reputation.

The eye-for-an-eye rule of revenge works in Casandra's action. She is after "sweet revenge" (II.590) and it is probable that she will respond to the Duke's adulterous affairs in which he has been involved since their marriage with her own adultery. As said earlier, revenge is a reaction, a repetition.

Aurora and Casandra make use of jealousy with similar intentions. Aurora loves Federico for years and it is most probable that they would get married unless Casandra arrived. In fact, she and Federico have similar traits: they are both motherless, the Duke is the surrogate father of Aurora and they call him father. Aurora realizes the change in Federico ever since he has left to bring Casandra and she calculates that he may be attracted to her. However, Casandra denies it and uses jealousy as an instrument to divert Aurora's thoughts. She says Federico is in a melancholy mood because he is jealous of the Marquis of Gonzaga. She tries to make Aurora believe that Federico considers the Marquis a rival to himself and the anxiety to lose her disturbs him. Jealousy serves as a cover to Federico's love for Casandra.

In turn, Casandra decides to use jealousy as a vehicle to get him back. She also uses jealousy in reprisal for her hurt feelings. By pretending that she loves the Marquis, she struggles to evoke a sense of jealousy in Federico. The motive towards her action is the fact that jealousy arises out of the fear of losing possession or the beloved person.

While Casandra, Federico, and Aurora are obsessed with revenge and jealousy, the Duke is summoned to war by the Pope to Rome to "be the commander of the great and mighty army of the Church" (II.725-27). This is a crucial moment in the course of the play because his absence creates a chance for Casandra to carry out her plans. It will be a total madness but she is attracted by the idea of revenge. She describes revenge wickedness but it gives pleasure too. She wants to hurt the Duke and the best way is to use his son, the one most precious to him:

Because of what the Duke has done  
To me, I feel a wickedness

Within my soul that seeks both pleasure and  
Revenge in what undoubtedly  
Is utter madness. The Count, apart  
From being sweet and handsome, is  
My dear husband's only son,  
And thus the very one through whom  
I could be best avenged upon  
That cruel, most ungrateful man. (II.878-87)

It is an incestuous relationship and Casandra has been given the role of a temptress. She encourages herself and no matter what the consequences will be, she resolves to take revenge. She establishes herself as an ambitious, intelligent, and a powerful woman who can do whatever she wants casting aside doubt and fear. While the Duke is away, Casandra persuades Federico to confess his love and the two are indulged in a romantic relationship. She gains authority over Federico only to brutally lose it as soon as the Duke finds out the betrayal. While Casandra asserts her identity through an incestuous relationship, she is also the subject at the hands of male power. She is a medium by which exchange of male authority and power can be conducted because “[i]n Lope’s hono[u]r plays, male traffic in women is carried out first through marriage and then through the mechanism of cuckoldry in the erotic triangle” (Yarbro-Bejarano 7). Casandra first honours the Duke as his beautiful and young Duchess and later gives pleasure to Federico who will simultaneously think that he has overcome his father’s dominion. Since both Casandra and Federico are under the authority of the Duke, their relationship creates a chance to overcome his hegemony.

Federico is a bastard, an offspring out of wedlock; he was born as a consequence of an unnatural relationship. Therefore, it is possible that his relationship with Casandra is natural for him. The Duke committed adultery and nature has revenged itself on the committer of a vicious act. Adultery begets its own punishment and Federico- the child of an adulterous relationship and the pawn of nature- is indulged in adultery with his stepmother. As Middleton’s Spurio in *The Revenger’s Tragedy* (1607) expresses:

For indeed a bastard by nature should make cuckolds  
Because he is the son of a cuckold-maker. (I.II.201-02)

Between Act II and III, four months pass. Aurora, since she is despised by Federico and “driven by [her] lynx-eyed jealousy, [starts] to watch him carefully” (III.36-37). Her pursuit turns out fruitful and she catches the fornicators on the spot. Lope employs one of the features of a typical uxoricide play and Aurora relates the Marquis how she saw the two kissing each other through a mirror. As her name suggests, she is the bearer of dawn, of light and she unearths the scandal. Unable to know what to do, she asks for the Marquis’s hand. That is how she tells her experience:

In quietly, I looked into a mirror  
And saw Federico slip as silently  
Into the opposite recess,  
And straight away begin to pick  
The blood-red roses of Casandra’s lips. (III.43-47)

The blood-red colour of her lips foreshadows the catastrophe. The Marquis of Gonzaga is in favour of the rubric of honour and evaluates that Casandra’s infidelity deserves bloodshed. Like the Spanish Golden Age men, he considers the act unforgivable. It is a stain on the man’s honour and it can only be cleansed through blood:

What will Ferrara’s new Achilles do  
In order to avenge his name  
And tarnished honour? Who can believe  
That such stain as this can now  
Be cleansed unless it be by spilling blood. (III.94-98)

After Federico learns that the Duke is victoriously on the way home, he meets Aurora and asks why she has been together with the Marquis so frequently. He is afraid that the Duke will be informed about the relationship that is why he pretends to be jealous and accuses Aurora of being infidel.

Just as it is for Casandra, for the Count, jealousy is a shield to mask his doings and he tries to change the traffic of the events. However, Aurora is intelligent enough not to succumb to his lies and she is pretty resolved to avenge the pain Federico has caused:

I'll not forget the pain that you  
Cause me. Do not, then, be surprised  
If I inflict the same on you. (III.171-73)

Considering the fact that Aurora does not submit to Federico, it is predictable that Casandra and Aurora –the only female characters of the play- share identical personalities. Both women reject the male authority and they are equally intelligent. It is also owing to these women, a number of events occur. If Casandra had not seduced Federico, Aurora would not have been able to see them kissing and there would be no bloodshed. In this respect, it is likely to conclude that in *El castigo sin venganza* Lope sympathizes with women. It is useful to remember that Lope used to write his plays in accordance with the pleasure of the public and he had a number of romantic affairs with various women, in this respect that he would like to appeal to the women audience may be natural.

Now that the Duke has returned, Federico and Casandra estimate that they will be in trouble. Federico suggests that he can marry Aurora so that they will be clear of suspicions and gossips which may harm their reputation. He at length realizes that their forbidden love will dishonour them. However, Casandra turns mad and instantly rejects the proposal. The idea of sharing Federico with Aurora evokes her jealousy. Aurora is her eternal rival and the union is unacceptable for her:

I swear that if you contemplate  
Such treachery when you are most  
To blame for this, the world shall hear  
Me voice aloud both my own guilt  
And your infamy. (III.270-74)

As José María Díez Borque elucidates, “Lope presents us with the triumph of jealousy over hono[u]r . . . and [it] overcomes the virtue and honesty of the lady” (qtd. in Wagschal 24). Casandra’s extreme jealousy overcomes the boundaries of the society and she screams that even at the expense of losing honour, she will not let them marry. She cannot think reasonably because of jealousy. She is a sexual outlaw; hot-tempered, unhesitant to express her desire and ready to defend it at all

costs. “[Her] jealousy rejects Federico’s ploy to marry Aurora to cover himself” (Wetmore 47). She refuses to be a passive woman and threatens masculine power. Casandra’s sin is partially mitigated by the Duke’s absence, his own adultery and neglectful attitude. The unhappy marriage makes Casandra a vindictive woman who will lead to a marital disaster.

The Duke returns from the war as a reformed man. He talks about the victory of the battle and how he is welcomed by the city and by the Holy Father. On that account, he decides to abandon his former lifestyle and chooses to follow a virtuous, honourable one.

Hono[u]r was conceived as the reputation which a man had among his peers. The nobility were endowed with hono[u]r per se. Hono[u]r, however, could also be acquired by doing deeds generally approved of, such as performing brave deeds in the army. (Jones 152)

Ricardo confirms and states that the Duke does not chase women anymore and he does not spend his time in idle pleasure. The Duke is now resolved to dedicate himself only to Casandra and Federico. He becomes “a real saint” (III.378).

Roads and journeys are important in the course of the play. The Duke is first seen on the road to find women to have sex in Ferrara, and then he sets off to lead the Papal forces in Rome. Federico encounters Casandra on the way to Mantua. They meet during a journey which changes their destiny and the Duke returns a reformed man after the war. The linear structure of a way can be associated with the transformation of destiny which affects the lives of the characters.

What is past is past and the Duke is delighted that while he was away, his son and wife learnt to love each other. He considers himself triumphant in Italy and Casandra at home. The happy moment of the Duke creates a tragic irony since the reader knows that he is actually a cuckolded husband betrayed by the ones dearest to him.

To turn the play into a tragedy, another convention of the uxoricide play, the use of letters, is introduced to inform the Duke about the ignominy. Pandora’s Box is opened and an anonymous, tightly sealed letter reveals the truth:

“My lord,  
While you have been away, the Count  
And Duchess have” . . . “offended both  
Your honour and your bed by means  
Of their infamy.” . . . “You shall  
Have certain proof of it if you  
Observe them carefully.” (III.513-23)

With the letter, Aurora keeps her promise and punishes Federico as well as Casandra. She can only soothe her feelings by taking revenge. That she is jealous of Casandra because she has lost the man she loves for the sake of Casandra and that Federico has hurt her feelings are the two reasons motivating Aurora to take revenge.

Reading the letter, the Duke cannot believe “how his wife and son can deprive him of his honour” (III.529-30). Surprise, anger, and disbelief are his first reactions to the news of infidelity. He cannot accept that his own flesh is responsible for such a shame but the fact that they are a man and a woman creates suspicion and even his being suspicious is enough for him to take a vow of revenge. Out of fury, he settles to murder Federico and begs God to grant him a second life so that he can kill his son twice. “This is true disloyalty” (III.563) and although he is not sure whether the two have really committed adultery, he decides to take revenge.

The Duke also complains that God may be punishing him for his sins. He is tempted to believe that God is paying him back for what he has done. Later he will name his revenge as God’s but it is possible that he means God avenges him for his promiscuous life, for his own voluptuousness:

It is as if the wickedness  
Of my own irresponsible  
And sinful life has now been sent  
To punish me. (III.547-50)

The Duke is determined to learn the truth and to punish Federico. However, the thought that he will punish him as a father does not calm his feelings of revenge down. It is certain that the Duke wants to avenge the dishonour but he entitles it a punishment.



The deed is bad but its being made public is worse. The punishment can be known by the society but the reason behind it- the revenge should be secret because his reputation is vital for him and the disclosure of such a crime only brings disgrace:

Honour lies  
Far less in what is done in  
The dreadful things that may be spoken. (III.585-87)

In the meantime, Federico asks for his father's permission to marry Aurora so that he can hide the crime. The Duke agrees and cunningly suggests that they should also ask for Casandra's opinion. However, Federico is unwilling to accept this suggestion foreseeing Casandra's outrage therefore, he propounds that she is not his real mother. Such hideous lies make the Duke angrier and persevered to elicit the truth because he learns that Federico and Casandra have "got on extremely well together" (III.627) and that "nothing ever pleased her more than seeing [him]" (III.635).

Federico's deceitful attitude convinces the Duke of his guilt but a moment of hesitation strikes him. That somebody wants to take revenge due to his former deeds occurs to him. He judges that an enemy of his may plot against him. Nevertheless, he abandons these ideas and when talking to Casandra implies that he knows the truth. Within the strict confines of marriage, adultery only deserves desirable punishment of death since the Duke can assert the masculine power only by this means. Casandra praises Federico with discretion, nobility, wisdom and bravery while the Duke vaguely threatens him. This threat/reward will not be merely for Federico; Casandra will also pay for her sins:

You speak as if he copies me  
In everything, and you know have  
A problem in distinguishing  
Between two of us. For this  
I shall reward him as he properly  
Deserves. (III.694-99)

After the Duke leaves, Casandra and Federico meet. Her jealousy is irrepressible and it is not surprising to see Casandra in an extremely

furious mood since the man she loves betrays her and decides to marry another woman. The exposure of such a shame is so dangerous and it is the reason why Federico decides to get married but Casandra's anger cannot be compared with their promiscuity made public. Federico is concerned with their reputation. He is aware that the Duke will act to mend his honour and reputation. Casandra, in return, accuses Federico of stealing her honour. She assumes herself the helpless prisoner of Federico. Their dialogue clearly displays their anxiety:

CASANDRA: There is  
 No danger that can now compare  
 With all the anger I feel  
 For you.  
 FEDERICO: Casandra, please! Speak quietly,  
 Or everyone will hear.  
 .....  
 Casandra, listen. What matters now  
 Is your reputation.  
 .....  
 My main concern  
 Was that suspicion should not fall  
 On us. . . . The Duke is not so base a man  
 He will not, once he understands  
 What we have done, take every step  
 To mend his name and reputation. (III.751-775)

While they breathlessly quarrel, the Duke spies on their conversation and ascertains that they have really committed adultery. He needs to hear no more and decides to destroy them since it is the only way by which he can cleanse his honour and as he is both the head of the state and the household, he is the keeper of justice and honour. The Duke goes on with his debauchery after marriage but he cannot tolerate his wife's. In addition, the Council of Trent "established the indissolubility of marriage and the prohibition of remarriage during the lifetime of an adulterous spouse, [thus] the hono[u]r play's prescription of murder in the case of adultery might be seen as a way around this" (Wetmore 228). These reasons make it inevitable that the Duke should execute them both

But it  
 Must be in such a way that [his]  
 Good name remains unsoiled, and cannot be  
 By public gossip then destroyed.  
 No living soul shall ever know

[He is] dishonoured.

.....

For it is enough for any man  
To cleanse his honour, when others are  
Prepared to speak of it forever. (III.797-806)

The honour code states that he should kill the people who have destroyed his honour but it is painful for the Duke since he dearly loves his son. Adultery is a disease, disobedience and he puts the husband in dis-ease. He is caught in a dilemma of love and duty and almost curses the cruel rule prescribing that adultery can only be purified through blood. Lope condemns the pain-giving honour code which justifies revenge:

DUKE: How true that we are always bound  
By honour's harsh and cruel rule!  
What man was it that brought this law  
Into the world to prove himself  
The most misguided of fools? (III.863-67)

Honour is the savage enemy and he is entrapped by the duty of honour. Being the member of the Spanish society and even if he does not sincerely want to, he has to obey the rules and has to kill his dishonourers. *Honor/buena fama/reputación* compels him to spill blood.

[I]f honour depends on the ability to impress one's will on others, it is clear that nothing could be so dishonouring as a man's not being able to exert authority over those whom he is most obliged to control. (Larson 10)

Killing in the name of persevering honour is an obligation no matter how inhumane the act is. Having the title of the duke, he has no alternative; he is the representative of the lawmakers and he should follow the rules. Besides, reputation is crucial for the endurance of royal power. "Diego de Saavedra Fajardo, one of the most widely-read political theorists of the seventeenth century, warned that reputation was like a column held upright by its own weight, but when tilted would easily topple" (Campbell 66).

The Duke has been cuckolded and hurt but he denies it and seeks justice not as a wronged husband but as a father. For him, it is not his

but God's revenge. He decides to punish them in the name of God to avenge an unfortunate sin because he relates that it is the Scripture that orders "it is God's command that sons must be obedient to their fathers in the things they do, and not dishonour them" (III.934-37):

It is in any case what each  
Of us by honour's law is clearly told:  
Avenge the insult secretly,  
Or else dishonour is twofold.  
The man is doubly shamed who gives  
The punishment publicity;  
For having lost his honour once,  
The world then knows his infamy. (III.903-10)

When the Duke decides to punish his *own* son, he reflects it to the audience as a punishment by God. Indeed, he does not want to kill Federico but to save his conscience, he uses the will of God. Lope uses the technique of *deus ex machina* for the punishment. *Deus ex machina* was frequently employed by the Greek tragedians as a device to solve their plots when the events became rather complicated. Horace in his *Ars Poetica* (191) introduces the term and warns a playwright that he should avoid using the interference of gods since it connotes his insufficient creativity. In *El castigo*, Lope uses a similar technique not to solve his plot but to save the Duke from his discomfort. The Duke of Ferrara does not know how to handle the situation and finally he reflects it as God's command: God interferes, solves his problem and saves his conscience simultaneously. Different from a Greek or Latin tragedy, God never appears but his absent presence is deeply felt by the Duke.

He does not feel pity when he ties Casandra but his pain aggrandizes when he remembers Federico. He does not want to kill him but cannot escape it. He sacrifices his son for the sake of redeeming his honour which overwhelms his mind. The rubric of honour omits the element of choice, it is "an inalterable code that demanded murderous vengeance for dishono[u]r" (Taylor 224). To kill his son and to mitigate the pain, there remains only one alternative for him: he cannot disobey God's rule:

No, I must punish anyone  
Who breaks God's law and brings such shame  
Upon a father. (III.938-40)

Actually the Duke hides behind God's will and uses it as a means to fulfil his revenge. He does not use the language of revenge, though. At this point, the title of the play is problematized. Is it really a punishment without revenge or does it include personal vengeance? On the one hand, considered that the Duke is betrayed by his closest and the most trustful relatives, it seems impossible to disregard the intention of personal revenge. On the other hand, Casandra and Federico have apparently involved in sin. God commands that "thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exodus 20.14) and in compliance with it, the Duke punishes them. He appears to secure the justice that is why he denominates his action as punishment. However, which character is the guiltiest one is problematic in that the Duke punishes them because of adultery but he also violates the vow of matrimony being indulged in adulterous affairs.

The Duke pretends to act not as a cuckolded husband but as a wronged father but being a husband, it is impossible that he can bear cuckoldry. As Taylor notes to accuse someone in sexual terms was a serious accusation in the seventeenth century Spain. *Cornudo* meant cuckold and it was used to attack men's reputation (40). In this vein, his punishment as a father is implausible but he intelligently uses it to conceal the infamy which causes dishonour. He is successful in hiding his intention of revenge. He designates his plan in the name of divine punishment but his angry sentences are not devoid of revengeful overtones. He does not contemplate to consult the legal system to avenge the dishonour because

[t]he *Nueva recopilación*, the 1567 law code, stated that a man had right to kill both his wife and her lover, but not just one of them. Legal commentators agreed. For example, Hugh de Celso and Francisco de Pradilla Barnuevo both concurred that a cuckold held his wife and her lover in his power and could either kill or pardon them, whichever he chose. (Taylor 197)

On this basis, the Duke chooses to kill his wife and son. Moreover, "[i]t was in the time of Alfonso the Wise (1416-1458) that the law passed permitting a husband who [would surprise] his wife and a lover *in flagrante delicto* to kill them both on the spot" (Gerstinger 9) but the

Duke does not hurry since secret vengeance, prudent circumspection and to wait patiently for the right moment to retaliate are the fundamentals of the honour code.

In a Machiavellian way, the Duke deceives Federico by saying that a nobleman has planned to bring about his overthrow and has sent a conspirator. He encourages Federico to kill the person in sack who is Casandra indeed. After a moment of hesitation, Federico draws his sword and kills her and it washes away the stain on the Duke's honour:

The man  
Who by his actions stained by honour thus  
Restores it. (III.1025-27)

The sword stands out as a phallic metaphor or male authority by means of which the Duke regains his honour and authority over his son and wife. The sword separates their union and the Duke asserts his dominance again.

He employs jealousy to cover his thirst for retaliation. He resolutely applies the rules of marital fidelity. Since honour is a man's most valued possession, it surpasses the feelings of love. He partially restores his honour with the blood of Casandra but it can only be completed with the death of Federico. The Duke feigns that Federico, "the victim of honour's tyranny," (Edwards xxx) has killed Casandra out of jealousy when he learns that she is pregnant. Federico's jealousy has been due to his possible loss of inheritance at the beginning of the play and the Duke invents that the same reason has caused Casandra's death. He behaves prudently because an untoward behaviour may cause his disgrace.

The eye-for-an-eye rule works and the time comes for the Marquis of Gonzaga to move in reprisal for the Duchess's murder. He kills Federico because of his treachery. The Marquis also says that it is a punishment, not revenge.

Both for the Duke and the Marquis, revenge is inevitable but they choose to name it punishment. The Duke insists that Federico has been punished for his avarice:

For pity's sake!  
My poor heart begins to break!

He thought he could inherit all  
My property; his punishment  
This lifeless body. (III.1075-79)

Federico fails to perform his role of a son; he creates a desire for his stepmother which evokes vengeance of the father and he is victimized by an unexpected death. Casandra really turns out to be “a fatal poison” (I.300) as he has naively foreshadowed. In this context, the name *Casandra* becomes quite meaningful. Lope draws it from the classics and gives his main female character a name from the Greek mythology. Cassandra, the daughter of the King Priam and Queen Hecuba of Troy in Greek and Latin sources by Homer, Virgil and Aeschylus, has always been known by her gift of prophecy bestowed upon her by Apollo. However, when Cassandra refuses his advances, out of fury, Apollo curses her stating that her prophecies would never be believed by the others (Quinn 250). From then on, her warnings were ignored and the people never believed in her. In *El castigo*, the Duchess-to-be bears the name *Casandra* which prophesies that she might lead to unfortunate events. She has a prophetic name but neither the Duke nor Federico can conceive it and Casandra really turns out to be a poison for them. Her name preaches that she should be avoided as she has been cursed by Apollo but the men cannot realize it. Just as the god of sun Apollo curses the mythological Cassandra, Aurora as the bearer of dawn causes Casandra’s tragic downfall.

The tragedy ends with the broken-hearted Duke and with a message that it should be a lesson for all Spain. The Duke enacts both a betrayed husband and a wronged father, because of his final message, he also represents the chorus of the ancient tragedies as well. Two bodies are put side by side to use the power of the spectacle which can serve as morale for the other women since “[t]he murder of the transgressive wife and the display of her corpse provide an ‘exercise in terror,’ making women aware of the unlimited power of men” (Bejarano 8). Besides serving as a warning for the women, the corpses on stage also remind the audience of the Senecan tragedies. In Greek ones before Roman influence, murders

and deaths are reported by the chorus or by messengers. In *El castigo*, however, the violence is displayed on stage.

Marriage is supposed to bring (re)birth and rejuvenation but it breeds destruction in *El castigo*. It is supposed to be fruitful but the play ends with an unsatisfactory result because the illegitimate son is killed and there is no other character left to replace Casandra. Matrimony is the source of dishonour for the Duke, a prison for Casandra and a disaster for Federico. Marriage with Casandra and non-marriage with Federico's mother thus making him a bastard prepares all characters' downfall. In this vein,

A. A. Parker sees the Duke as the tragic figure: he it is who brings his own disaster, and yet ironically he has reformed by the time he is punished and is left without the hope of an heir and without the son that he loved. (Thacker 53)

In *Arte nuevo*, Lope is of the opinion that the play should be divided into three acts. Just as he has prescribed before, in *El castigo sin venganza*, he introduces his characters, their defects and their main concerns in the first act; he complicates their situation by adding the love affair between Casandra and Federico, the absence of the Duke leading to their affair and the *in flagrante* position of the lovers caught by Aurora in the second act and in the final act, all the events reach a conclusion. The Duke resolves the problems and saves his honour by destroying the object of his dishonour. Lope succeeds in creating tensions through which he appeals to the taste of the audience and thus they can never leave before the play ends- just as he wishes.

The Duke never mentions that he is jealous but the fear that the others will learn that his reputation has been stained makes him anxious and obsessed with his honour. Given that the fear of losing someone or something precious and the anxiety to lose prestige are the reasons of jealousy, one can claim that the Duke is jealous because he is afraid of being dishonourable. His jealousy is not towards a person or an object, but on an abstraction. He cannot bear that his honour will be the topic for the other tongues. His fixation with honour accompanied with personal affront and injury as a result of it leaves him no alternative but



to take revenge now that he is a man conditioned by the rules of the Spanish society. The threat to his self-esteem and his perception of Federico as a usurper/rival add his will to reassert his honour. In his war of *honor* versus *amor*, the former one succeeds. Casandra both does not want to submit the societal rules and she is jealous of a happy marriage, the motives paving the way for her sweet revenge. To attain her goal, jealousy sometimes works as a cover, sometimes as an instrument. Modelled by her, Aurora employs jealousy with the same functions in order to get Federico back. The Marquis of Gonzaga is a reflection of the Duke, he is bounded by the honour code and he seeks revenge in exchange for Casandra's life. *El castigo sin venganza* illustrates that all of the characters are under the effect of jealousy: it shapes their attitude which is dominated by the idea of revenge and it results in tragedy.

## CHAPTER III

### LOVE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

#### 3.1 Love as a Historic Concept

Abelard and Heloise, Lancelot and Guinevere, Paolo and Francesca, Tristan and Iseult, Romeo and Juliet, Antony and Cleopatra, Cupid and Psyche, Orpheus and Eurydice, Pyramus and Thisbe, Layla and Majnun... Hundreds of epics, poems, mythological stories, folk tales, and plays from different parts of the world throughout the centuries have struggled to describe this strong emotion: love. Its power, how it influences the individuals, how it encourages them to overcome the restrictions, and how they have sacrificed themselves for the sake of it have become the subject of literature.

Love has always existed. It has a long history tracing back to the ancient times and that the *Symposium* of Plato (428 BC-347 AD) constitutes its origin would not be wrong to state. In his concept of love, the lover devoted himself to the physical love of one particular person but then he saw that beauty was not limited only to the person he loved and he became the lover of all beauty in general. At the next stage, he realized that the beauty of the soul was more important than the physical beauty which led him to the appreciation of the beauty of the souls even if the bodies were not beautiful at all. These souls made him realize the moral beauty which triggered him to the acquisition of knowledge which is beautiful and available in nature. The love of wisdom freed the lover from individual beauties and through them he reached the absolute beauty. Plato called this process the Ladder of Perfection. However, Plato excluded the female sex and purported that true love is possible only among men.

After Plato, St. Augustine (354-430) in the fourth century developed his own concept of love similar to that of pagan Plato but this time with Christian elements. He made a distinction between two kinds of love: *caritas* and *cupiditas*. Basically, in his view, *caritas* meant the love of God and it represented the ways thanks to which a person unites with him. According to St. Augustine, *cupiditas* was the love of the material world. Because of it, “the body [drew] man back to the material world, leaving him bent until the love of God [could] strengthen him out and allow his soul to move upward” (Singer 1: 178). Even though both *caritas* and *cupiditas* involved love, *caritas* was the true path to be able to achieve perfection.

According to the Christian tradition, love was the great link which held all of God’s creation together, with the motivation for love in the individual being his desire for beauty. The highest beauty and the greatest good were, of course, to be found in God, but the choice of the object of love rested with man. He could either through reason raise his sights, often through the worship of the Blessed Virgin, to the love of God (*caritas*) or lower them to love the material things of this world (*cupiditas*). (Stavig 37)

The Christian elements of *agape*, *eros*, and *philia*- the friendship with God and the humanity created a need to harmonize the seemingly incompatible elements of *agape* and *eros* through the Middle Ages. Thus, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas developed their concept of *caritas*-synthesis in which they tried to unite *agape* and *eros*. In the *caritas*-synthesis, God’s love dominated and love between humans was considered as a reflection of this divine love. Thereby, excessive love for a particular person was frowned upon. On the other hand, as long as it directed one towards God’s love, all kinds of love were accepted. The twentieth century Swedish theologian Anders Nygren (1890-1978) in his *Eros and Agape* (1930 and 1936) tried to reconcile these terms but concluded that it is impossible since their features are not compatible with each other: *agape* is the charitable, “the selfless love of humanity” (Secomb 65) while *eros* is “complete Desire, luminous Aspiration” (Rougemont 61) based on human love. Before the courtly love tradition, there had been only *agape*- love of humankind under the influence of

Christianity- and *eros* which was commonly associated with lust and destructive desires.

However, late eleventh to the early twelfth centuries, when the troubadour poets in France led to the emergence of the cult of *amour courtois*- courtly love, witnessed a kind of pure and unrequited love. Even though the courtly love dates back the eleventh century, *amour courtois* as a term was not coined till 1883 when Gaston Paris first used it to define the characteristics of the love that flourished in the twelfth century Europe. The doctrine of courtly love created a mode of attitude which replaced sexuality with the ennobling ideas of spirituality. It commanded personal conduct without sexual aims. Its basic motive was “the lover’s progress and growth in natural goodness, merit, and worth” (Denomy 44). It refined the manners of a man, served as a Muse for literature, and emphasized personal value. In such kind of love, the beloved lady was idolized and exalted by the lover. Although the lover suffered a lot, as he could not unite with the lady, his agonies ennobled his heart; no matter what happened, he remained devoted to her and his fidelity defined his honour. One of the distinctive features of courtly love lyrics was the poet’s fixation on a certain lady who absorbed all his thoughts and feelings. As a rule, the lady had to be married to someone else; she should be unattainable and to choose the beloved, love at first sight was a crucial element. The courtly love was in conflict with the institution of marriage because:

[t]he reasons for a marriage in the Middle Ages were routinely based on practical considerations of status and property having comparatively little to do with the feelings of the parties concerned. (Porter 15)

However, the desire for love as a basic human need was prevalent in the Middle Ages too and even though it was not widespread among the common folk, courtly love, which included the following ideas, was influential among the literature people:

[S]exual love between men and women is in itself something splendid, an ideal worth striving for . . . love pertains to courtesy and courtship but is not necessarily related to the institution of marriage, love is an intense, passionate

relationship that establishes a holy oneness between man and woman. (Singer 2: 22-23)

Even though the concept of courtly love did not totally disregard the instinctive inclinations of the humans, it is notable that it struggled for moral perfection. The Provençal term *fin' amors*- the fine love was the motto of the troubadours but their understanding of love was also different from Plato's. For the troubadour poets, the lady was the supreme example of beauty and it was the reason why they loved and glorified them through their lyrics. "And yet, they [did] not love her for the sake of [...] an absolute or abstract [beauty]. It scarcely occur[ed] to the troubadours that love might be extended beyond the lady. In their thinking, *fin' amors* [had] no direct relation to the love of God" (Singer 2: 47). Singer also puts forth that the troubadours of Southern France humanized the Platonic and Christian love through courtly love replacing their elements with ideal women and men because of their devotion to love (2: 43).

Although it is possible to follow the roots of courtly love in Ovid's (43 BC-AD 17) *Ars Amatoria- The Art of Love* (2 AD) and *Remedia Amoris- The Cure for Love* (5 AD), Andreas Capellanus, who refers himself as "the chaplain of the royal court" (104) wrote his *De Amore- About Love* circa 1185 and became the spokesperson for the cult of courtly love. In his work, he commented on the nature of love, how it can be acquired and preserved. He defined love as:

a certain inborn suffering derived from the sight of and excessive meditation upon the beauty of the opposite sex, which causes each one to wish above all things the embraces of the other. (28)

The troubadour and courtly love lyrics were not only limited to France and the Minnesängers of Germany created such kind of poetry in which love, worship of and submission to a lady, moral development, and suffering of the lover were the common themes.

Love has always been a term frequently used in literature therefore it is difficult to summarize what it has meant throughout the centuries.

Sometimes divine love has got its share in Western literature exemplified in Dante's *Divine Comedy*- written between the years 1308 and 1321- or Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), but as a whole the literary pieces concentrated on love between human beings.

The ideas of courtly love spread over Europe and influenced its literature. All in all, the romance writers and northern French trouvères in France, Dante (1265-1321), with his *La Vita Nuova* (1295), together with Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374) in the thirteenth-century Italy and the Minnesängers of Germany employed the doctrines of courtly love to create their works beginning from the twelfth century. In English literature, the features of courtly love were traceable in the medieval romance *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* from the fourteenth century onwards. With the translations of Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542) from Petrarch's sonnets and his and Henry Howard's (1517-1547) employment of the Italian scheme in writing their own poems, the sonnet and courtly love tradition were introduced into England in the Renaissance period. Later, the sonneteers Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586), Edmund Spenser (1552-1599) and William Shakespeare (1564-1616) strengthened the foundations of sonnet and ornamented it with an English spirit. The Renaissance also witnessed to the association of love with death- *eros* versus *thanatos* which was exemplified in the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet* (1597) as well as in many other plays.

The tradition of courtly love emphasized the importance of love and with the nineteenth century Romanticism, love was considered as "the highest expression of spiritual longings, the source of feelings that reach an unparalleled depth and intensity" (Quinn 246). Similarly, in French Enlightenment philosopher Destutt de Tracy's words in his *De l'Amour*: "[Love] is the supreme sentiment that focuses all our behaviour, that employs all our faculties, that satisfies all our desires, that combines all our pleasures. It is the masterpiece of our being" (Hatfield and Rapson 106). On the other hand, Wagner in his opera *Tristan und Isolde*- composed between the years 1857 and 1859- introduced *Liebestod* which told that it is impossible to attain love on earth and the consummation of love between sexes is possible only after death. It presupposed that the

union of lovers can only be possible post-mortem. As Shelly (1792-1822) stated in his *Epipsychidion* (1821):

Love's very pain is sweet,  
But its reward is in the world divine  
Which, if not here, it builds beyond the grave. (I.595)

“What is love?” (III.II.47) asks Shakespeare in *Twelfth Night* (1623). The majority of the world literature has been devoted to express the feelings of love under various cases whether be it romantic, paternal, maternal, familial, nationalistic or patriotic love. In this context, *Oxford English Dictionary* defines love as

[a] feeling or disposition of deep affection or fondness for someone, typically arising from a recognition of attractive qualities, from natural affinity, or from sympathy and manifesting itself in concern for the other's welfare and pleasure in his or her presence . . . great liking, strong emotional attachment; . . . a feeling or disposition of benevolent attachment experienced towards a group or category of people, and . . . towards one's country or another impersonal object of affection.

Love is based on human relationships. A person may devote himself to his country, to God or to the welfare of mankind; he may feel attached to a target, to an animal, to an object or he may strive for the preservation of the nature. Whatever the type is, love always carries a sense of commitment. According to the definition of Hatfield and Walster, when the bonds of love flourish between a woman and a man, it creates an “intense longing for union with another” (9) and this is called passionate love or infatuation. *Oxford English Dictionary* describes this kind of love as

[a]n intense feeling of romantic attachment based on an attraction felt by one person for another; intense liking and concern for another person, typically combined with sexual passion.

Similarly, William Stephens in *The Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (1963) listed the features of romantic love as strong attachment or attraction to a single person, possessiveness, sexual loyalty or jealousy,

extremes of depression and idealization of the love object (Wilkinson 142).

Even though love has been ubiquitous for centuries, the scientific studies started only around 1970s. In 1970, Isaac Michael Rubin defined it “as an attitude that predisposes one to think, feel, and act in particular ways toward the love object” (Fehr 226). In 1973, John Alan Lee with his *The Colours of Love* offered the taxonomy of love and he identified six love styles: *eros*, *ludus*, *storge*, *pragma*, *mania*, and *agape*. In 1980s, Clyde and Susan Hendrick reworked on his taxonomy.

In their study, *eros* is defined as a kind of passionate, physical love which includes desire whose core is a “[s]trong physical attraction, emotional intensity, a preferred physical appearance, and a sense of inevitability of the relationship” (153) and *ludus* is depicted as a type of love which looks like a game played with more than one partners in which they are more likely to cheat on themselves. The third style of love is called *storge* and it is used to define friendship which does not include the desire of *eros*. Because of its non-sexual nature, it also means the love between a parent and a child; it is familial love. This kind of love can also be associated with *philia* which is a companionate love necessitating the devotion to the friends and family. This is friendship love and like *storge*, it does not include sexual interests. In *pragma*, “love is a shopping list of desired attributes” (Hendrick and Hendrick 153) while *mania* is an obsessive love which results in sudden changes in mood from ecstasy to agony and which harbours jealousy in itself. The sixth type of love, *agape* is generally associated with the divine and may be referred as true love. This kind of love is defined to be sacrificial and selfless “placing the loved person’s welfare above one’s own” (153).

Even though centuries have passed, the basics of love have not changed and love still affects human beings. Whether it is a selfless, self-sacrificial love towards God, towards nature, or towards one’s nation; whether it is friendship love between school friends; whether it is familial love between the members of the family; whether it is a romantic love based on desires, physical attraction and submission of sexes, love keeps its place as the sovereign of all people without discrimination. People too accept



its domination and willingly sacrifice themselves to its ceaseless energy. Literary pieces never lose their freshness because the theme of love will always remain unbounded by time preserving its universal appeal.

### **3.2 Love and Its Consequences in *Love's Sacrifice***

“Che morte più dolce che morire per amore?” (IV.III.59) asks Annabella in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Ford examines the *eros* versus *thanatos* relationship in *Love's Sacrifice* too and recapitulates the same question: “which death is sweeter than dying for love?” In *Love's Sacrifice*, Ford creates the unhappy lovers Bianca and Fernando as substitutes for the Annabella-Giovanni couple of *'Tis Pity* and the Penthea-Orgilus couple of *The Broken Heart*.

*Love's Sacrifice* recounts the unfortunate consequences of the passion and love between Fernando and Bianca. Just as it is in Ford's other plays, love and death are inextricable in *Love's Sacrifice* as well. The tragedy hosts Bianca and Fernando as the hopeless lovers, Filippo Caraffa as a husband to Bianca, Filippo's sister Fiormonda as the manipulative widow and the Iago-figure Roderico D'Avolos as her disciple. In this chapter, love and its consequences between the following people will be studied respectively: the Duke and Bianca, Fiormonda and Fernando, Bianca and Fernando, Ferentes and Julia-Morona-Colona, Mauruccio and Fiormonda, and Fiormonda and Roseilli.

The Duke and Bianca are the two representatives of a mismatched couple since the husband is much older than the young and beautiful Bianca. Their marriage is not based on love, either: Bianca's “enchanted face” (I.I.108) catches Filippo's attention. Being the daughter of a gentleman in Milan, Bianca is not from blue blood but she is famous for her beauty to quickly attract the Duke's “roving eye” (I.I.108). The Duke is aware of the fact that he has married someone beneath his rank. However, it is neither her wealth nor loyalty that advances Bianca to marriage. Her physical details such as her brows, cheeks, and sweet looks (IV.II.20-26) conquer the Duke's heart. Bianca's beauty becomes her passport for the royal marriage. Petruccio, through his dialogue with

Fernando, informs that the Duke “saw her, loved her, wooed her, won her, matched her” (I.I.119). Both the quick process of their marriage and the emphasis on Bianca’s physical appearance suggest that the Duke is a sensual man driven by his appetite. He himself states that he has not listened to his senate’s advice despite their “strict opinion and severe dispute” (I.I.180).

It is possible that he is very proud of possessing a young and a beautiful woman as he addresses her “my Bianca” (I.I.127). To show how great his love is, the Duke compares Bianca’s beauty with the earthly wealth: Bianca is to him as dear as if her portion was Europe’s riches (I.I.191-92) or she is a jewel, rich and beautiful above comparison (I.I.134). He treats his friend Fernando with equal care; he is also a jewel, “a perfect friend” (I.I.134). Ironically enough, they together make the Duke “a monarch of felicity” (I.I.134) while he is unaware that their forbidden love will bring about his doom. Because he is extremely fond of his friend and wife, the Duke can neither distinguish himself from Fernando nor can he distinguish between Fernando and Bianca. Innocently, he remarks that he and Fernando will be without distinction in all respects with the exception of his being a husband to Bianca (I.I.144-46). The Duke manifests himself in his attitude that he is a sensual, strong headed, and a naïve man. Because of Bianca’s charming beauty, the Duke does not obey his senate’s advice and marries her. Upon their marriage, he paves the way for a forbidden love and naïvely enough, he praises Bianca and Fernando to each other. The Duke should have paid attention to what Ovid warned:

Friendship is but a name, faith is an empty name. Alas, it is not safe to praise to a friend the object of your love; so soon as he believes your praises, he slips into your place. (I.740-43)

Fernando is of the opinion that beauty and noble virtues are more important than parentage when choosing a marriage partner and D’Avolos repeats Fernando’s ideas while he is glorifying Fiormonda. He confides in Fernando that Fiormonda loves him and presents the occasion as a “step to fortune” (I.I.249) owing to her “singular beauty, unimitable virtues, honour, youth, and absolute goodness” (I.I.219-20).

When he meets with Fiormonda, Fernando also confirms her “superlative” (I.II.113) beauty which is “so far above all beauties else abroad” (I.II.112). Fernando, however, being a well-mannered courtier, pays his service and loyalty to Fiormonda only because she is the Duke’s sister. He is also a quick-witted man. He tries to remind Fiormonda of her dead husband so that he can stop her advances. However, Fiormonda does not hesitate to confess her love and offers her ring as a token of love. To Fernando’s surprise, Fiormonda exclaims that “her blood is not yet freezed” (I.II.154) and kisses him on the lips. Her remark and bold action suggest that Fiormonda is sexually aroused and that she is driven by her instincts. The man, however, who has already been in love with Bianca, feigns an excuse and rejects Fiormonda stating that he has had a vow of celibacy. Fernando cannot imagine another one’s embraces just like the courtly lover of the Capellanus’s formula.

The unrequited love not only hurts Fiormonda but Fernando also gets his share and suffers from the indifferent attitude of his beloved. That he harbours a great love for Bianca is evident when he sighs desperately: “The Duchess, O the Duchess! In her smiles / Are all my joys abstracted” (I.II.91-92). He is ready to sacrifice what he has for the sake of Bianca’s love as well:

O had I India’s gold, I’d give it all  
T’exchange one private word, one minute’s breath,  
With this heart-wounding beauty.” (I.II.220-22)

Fernando is in a sorrowful condition because he cannot succeed in his quest for love. In the play, Fernando acts as a courtly lover and Bianca as his cruel lady who, in accordance with the courtly love tradition, is married to the Duke. Fernando is nourished by her love and he considers his body devoid of soul without Bianca. Bianca adopts the role of a nurturer who regenerates him. She becomes his soul, his life-giver. If death is the time when the soul leaves the body, Fernando considers himself dead so long as he cannot unite with Bianca. He cannot find a purpose to live with the exception of her:

Thus bodies walk unsouled. Mine eyes but follows  
My heart entombed in yonder goodly shrine.

Life without her is but death's subtle snares,  
And I am but a coffin to my cares." (I.II.273-76)

Cupid shoots his arrows and hits Fernando. In this context, he calls himself a "castaway in love" (II.I.123) because he is rejected by Bianca and because love is like an accident caused by the blind Cupid's accidental arrows. Fernando's situation reminds the reader of Petrarca's sonnet III in which he recounts how he was defencelessly shot by Cupid's arrows on Good Friday:

It did not seem to me to be a time to guard myself  
against Love's blows:  
.....  
Love discovered me all weaponless,  
and opened the way to the heart through the eyes,  
which are made the passageways and doors of tears:

Fernando can no longer hide his love and the moment he catches Bianca alone voices his feelings to the "sweet princess" (II.I.132) of his life. The occasion makes Bianca furious. She does not want to listen to his compliments as she thinks that Fernando is treacherous towards her husband. Meanwhile, she states that even though it is the third time she rejects Fernando's advances, he keeps insisting on. Bianca, being a loyal wife, does not even think of cheating on her husband and she is afraid that Fernando will harm her honour. She threatens that she will reveal the truth if he speaks once more. On the other hand, she hides the secret from her husband for a while, which might be interpreted as an indication that she takes delight in Fernando's courting. Ovid's statement seem to reflect the situation they are in clearly: "[a]nd as stolen love is pleasant to a man, so is it also to a woman; the man dissembles badly: she conceals desire better" (I.275-76). Fernando has to endure unrequited love and Bianca, like a courtly lady, does not instantly respond to his advances. The play supports the idea that a courtly lover has to go through a process of pain until the lady surrenders to his love. Likewise, Fernando has to experience the agonies of love.

Influenced by Bianca's severe outburst and constant rejection, Fernando experiences a momentary hesitation whether to fight for the sake of love

or not. Being Filippo's dearest friend, he is sure that what he is doing is sheer betrayal. At the same time, he cannot restrain his emotions. He comes to make a choice between two important concepts- love and friendship and he is unable to decide which one to prefer: either he will sacrifice friendship for love or he will victimize himself for the sake of Bianca. He becomes entangled in a dilemma between reason and passion. In the meantime, the cunning D'Avolos realizes the weird situation Fernando is in and he benefits from it to affirm his suspicions. "He who is in love is always apprehensive" (Capellanus 184) and the moment D'Avolos shows Fernando Bianca's portrait, he startles. As they are talking about the picture, Fernando cannot remain calm and discloses himself. He fixes his eyes on the portrait of the "lustre in the court of Pavy" (II.II.78) and falls into a trance during which he remembers her hair and lips. Fernando cannot soothe his desire and he jeopardizes his life and reputation.

The Duke's two-day-absence for hunting creates another chance for Fernando to beg for compassion from the cruel Bianca. "Love means to commit oneself without a guarantee, to give oneself completely in the hope that our love will produce love in the loved person" (Buscaglia 96) and within this direction Fernando persistently strives to gain Bianca. He is a devout lover and he does not give up. He surrenders to love and becomes Bianca's "most faithful servant" (II.IV.97). He lays before Bianca's feet "in lowest vassalage" (II.III.44) and pleads:

Great lady, pity me, my youth, my wounds,  
 .....  
 I beg compassion to a love as chaste  
 As softness of desire can intimate. (II.III.46-53)

With his remarks, Fernando evinces that his love is not an erotic one and that he is not after sexual fulfilment. Just like an ideal courtly lover, Fernando is in pursuit of chaste love and he does not have any carnal intentions. His unrequited love puts him in a torture chamber from which he does not know how to escape. Nevertheless, he remains love's devoted soldier and the "heat of cruelty" (II.III.57) of the "bright angel" (II.III.56) Bianca or her "too-stony breast" (II.III.58) does not intimidate

him. On the other hand, as for Bianca, Fernando's love is "lawless" (II.III.70) because it is not blessed with marriage. She is determined not to give in to Fernando: "We had much rather prostitute our blood / To some envenomed serpent than admit / Thy bestial dalliance" (II.III.73-75). Upon Bianca's harsh rebuff, Fernando, in despair, resigns and takes an oath of silence:

Good night t'ee. If, when I am dead, you rip  
This coffin of my heart, there you shall read,  
With constant eyes, what now my tongue defines:  
Bianca's name carved out in bloody lines. (II.III.98-101)

As mentioned earlier, it is probable that Bianca likes Fernando's courting, the reason why she does not reveal it to anyone else. It is not expected from a courtly lady to be disposed to have sexual intercourse with her lover because

although in men an excess of love or of lechery is tolerated on account of the boldness of the sex, in women it is considered a damnable offense; a woman's good name is ruined by it and every wise person looks upon her as an unclean harlot and holds her in utter contempt. (Capellanus 193)

However, the chaste Bianca deviates from the rules of courtly love and in her night mantle late at night visits Fernando because she wants to taste the pleasure of sexual intercourse with him. It is the crucial instant which verifies the old saying that *amor vincit omnia*. Indeed, love conquers all and the young Bianca confesses that she is also in love with Fernando. Just like him, Bianca submits to love's tyranny. She acknowledges that ever since her eyes beheld Fernando, he has been her only king (II.IV.18-19):

Fernando, in short words, how e'er my tongue  
Did often chide thy love, each word thou spak'st  
Was music to my ear. (II.IV. 23-25)

Her behaviour can also be interpreted as a rebellion against the male authority preaching the women to be submissive all the time. For instance, the Puritan William Whately in his *A Bride-Bush* (1617), which is designed to be a conduct book for the married women, advises them to

accept their inferior status: “If thou purpose to be a good wife, and to live comfortably, set down this with thy self: *My husband is my superior, my better*” (Keeble 151).

Even though Bianca has internalized the patriarchal code, love’s power overcomes the restrictions of the social contracts and the couple welcomes all possibilities with regard to love without thinking of the consequences. Bianca admits that she has vowed to be a constant wife loyal to the Duke but at the same time she does not hide that she loves Fernando “beyond imagination” (II.IV.45).

If one has difficulty in obtaining the embraces of one’s lover . . . the lovers are bound to each other in more ardent chains of love and their souls are linked together in heavier and closer bonds of affection. (Capellanus 99)

Nonetheless, Bianca is conscience-stricken and her situation echoes the dilemma Fernando has gone through previously. While Fernando is ready “to crown joys” (II.IV.14) now, Bianca is stuck between her matrimonial responsibilities and her love at first sight. The more she wants to flee, the more she is entrapped by love. Bianca’s earlier comments that she will never surrender herself to Fernando’s carnal love stand in a stark contrast to her present condition. She craves for consummating love which is a pact of life and death: in exchange for one-night-intercourse with Fernando, Bianca is resolved to kill herself. Her decision is important since it renders two possible interpretations. On the one hand, Bianca cherishes love over all other earthly pleasures such as fame, wealth, title and even resolves to be the martyr for the sake of love’s sovereignty. As Capellanus elaborates, “a true lover would be deprived of all his money and of everything that the human mind can imagine as indispensable to life rather than be without love” (30). On the other hand, she decides to commit suicide because she knows that she cannot bear the results of their intercourse. Grown up under the shadow of strict social code that wives should be loyal to their husbands, Bianca is conscious of the consequences of adultery. In either case, death looks like the best solution.

Fernando becomes the embodiment of love by whose might Bianca is overwhelmed: and she goes after what is forbidden for her stating “I am all thine” (II.IV.60). She grants Fernando three chaste kisses much dearer than all her joys on earth. Bianca revitalizes Fernando’s broken heart with her commitment to his love, upon which he masters his passion. From then on, they do not seek sexual fulfilment and they consider themselves triumphant because they are both conquered by love. The heroic love overrules their reason. They create an intimacy free from social constraints and in their romance, love functions as the commander while the lovers are its soldiers who will become its future victims. The lovers cannot resist love which actually means death in disguise. They treasure their love and Bianca’s final remarks similar to Fernando’s earlier feelings conclude the second act:

Remember this, and think I speak thy words:  
When I am dead, rip up my heart and read  
With constant eyes what now my tongue defines:  
Fernando’s name carved out in bloody lines. (II.IV.92-95)

Fernando’s love, which is inscribed upon Bianca’s heart in bloody letters, becomes so effective that it encourages her to trespass the line allowed to her. Charmed by Fernando, Bianca displays imprudent behaviour and she attempts to wipe his bloody lip with her handkerchief in public while offering to “steal a kiss” (III.II.47). The bloody handkerchief implies that the couple is on the brink of downfall. Within this framework, while the references to the blood foreshadow the future sacrifice of the couple, the title of the play suggests that there will be bloodshed for the sake of love. Fernando confides in Roseilli that Bianca has been loyal to her husband but it is possible to associate the lips with passionate feelings. It is readily agreeable that trying to steal a kiss connotes sexual intentions. Moreover, Fernando confesses his love verbally; for example, he does not use letters nor he employs a go-between to reveal his feelings. In this sense, the bloody lips of Fernando denote the succeeding tragic events.

Bianca, who yields to kill herself out of shame, changes into a fearless woman and instead of being the slave of social conventions, chooses to



serve love and follows her emotions. Even though she initially repulses Fernando, she succumbs to his entreaties and love.

While Bianca represents the temptress woman, the Duke enacts the cuckolded husband figure. He remarks that he has a kind of dullness ever since the hunting trip. In fact, the strange psychological condition of Filippo stems from the fact that while the Duke has been away to hunt the wild animals, the couple, who is already hunted by Cupid, indulges in romantic affairs. John Ford makes use of irony to dramatize the Duke's situation since the audience already knows the reason why his "head is ever aching" (III.II.67). It is during the Duke's two-day-absence that Bianca sows the seeds of their forbidden love. She says "there is many who think themselves most wise that are most fools" (III.II.117-18) and the Duke becomes one of those fools who is cuckolded and betrayed by the people most precious to him.

Roseilli's preaching that "no toil can shun the violence of fate" (IV.II.129) epitomizes the transformation of Bianca from an obedient wife to a reckless woman. Because of the role of coincidence in her destiny, Bianca meets Fernando who happens to be Filippo's best friend. Fate also intervenes when the Duke chooses Bianca as a wife because she and Fernando might not have met otherwise. As Clifford Leech comments on, "the love-relationship of Fernando and Bianca is an inevitable consequence of their situation. She, young and dowerless, has married the elderly Duke: Fernando is his young friend, and Bianca is fair" (80). The temptation of the situation almost invites their adulterous love.

Probably, Bianca has never fallen in love with the Duke but his title and fame have attracted her. Besides, considering the social situation of the seventeenth century, it would not be surprising that their marriage is an arranged one and that nobody has asked Bianca's decision. Since the girls were considered to be the property of their fathers and the authority over women passed from the father to the husband in the sixteenth and seventeenth century England, it is possible that John Ford framed the background of his play in accordance with this code.

Based on his researches on the British society, Lawrence Stone categorizes three different family structures- namely the Open Lineage

Family, the Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family, and the Closed Domesticated Nuclear Family among which the court of the Duke fits in the second one. Stone concludes that the Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family was the dominant one between the years 1580-1640 and in this family structure “both state and church, for their own reasons, actively reinforced the pre-existent patriarchy within the family” (7). What is more, Keenan relates that with the Common Law, the secondary position of the women was legalized: “husband and wife were recognised as one person, governed by the husband (22). Besides, marriage, in which the idea of mutual romantic love was not valued at all, was an instrument to gain economic advantages through which the wealth of two families could converge during the Renaissance England. Having born into the Restricted Patriarchal Nuclear Family and being a bride to a patriarchal man, it is presumable that Bianca has never had the freedom of speech and choice when selecting her husband, which strengthens the idea that their marriage is not the outcome of their love.

The subordination of the wives was also supported by the epistles of Apostle John to Corinthians and Ephesians. Accordingly, the ideal women of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were submissive, silent, weak, fragile and modest whose duties were nurturing the children and housekeeping. The inferior status of the women was also reinforced by the religious sermons one of which was the Homily on Marriage “read in church every Sunday from 1562 onwards” (Stone 198).

As the historical data show, the husband was the guardian of the house in the English society. Enslaved by the social conduct, Bianca has had no chance but to get married to a man whom she is not attracted to. That she has fallen in love with Fernando at first sight also supports this view. If she were in love with the Duke, she would ignore Fernando and she would not fight for love at the cost of her own life. However, Bianca leaves her passive personality; she gets over the rules and even starts questioning them. Thanks to her love, the truth dawns upon her that she has always been bounded by the male authority and she stands up to it. The ideal wife of the Renaissance English society is supposed to resist

the advances of another man but Bianca thinks that societal rules hinder mutual love and she rebels against the social institutions:

Why shouldst thou not be mine? Why should the  
Laws,  
The iron laws of ceremony, bar  
Mutual embraces? (V.I.5-7)

Bianca struggles against the restrictions of the institutions of marriage and religion at the same time because in the Renaissance British society, the rules of the society and God were similar:

This cohesion was stimulated by a flood of propaganda and printing press, making the household responsible for, and the symbol of, the whole social system, which was thought to be based on the God-given principles of hierarchy, deference and obedience. (Stone 653)

Bianca not only resists the social order but also defies God's rule which sermonizes against adultery. She regards mutual embraces innocent as long as they flourish as a result of love: "What's vow? A vow? Can there be a sin in unity?" (V.I.7-8) she asks. As Robert Burton in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* states, people usually know what is good for them but they follow the opposite (150). Bianca knows that adultery is a sin notwithstanding she pursues her desire against religion and reason. She disregards the seventh commandment of God and follows the cult of Queen Henrietta Maria.

As Stavig summarizes, Charles I ascended to the throne in 1625 and he married the French princess Henrietta Maria. John Ford wrote *Love's Sacrifice* during the regency of Charles I and in his play he reflected the ideals of marriage and love which was spread by the Queen Henrietta in the English court (36). Ford, whose main theme was always love in his independent plays, employed the cult of Platonic love in *Love's Sacrifice*. Mary Susan Steele in *Plays and Masques at Court* (1926), a study on the examination of all plays and masques written between the years 1625 and 1642, listed the features of this code which are observable in *Love's Sacrifice* as well. According to the Platonic love cult which is also summarized by Sensabaugh in *The Tragic Muse of John Ford*, fate rules

all lovers; beauty and goodness are one and the same; beautiful women are saints to be worshipped; true love is of equal hearts and divine; love is all-important and all-powerful; true love is more important than marriage; true love is the sole guide to virtue and true love allows any liberty of action and thought. As studied above, these are the reasons why Fernando and Bianca cannot change the course of their destiny and why Bianca, who is the temple of purity, has incomparable beauty and perfect virtues. The love cult of Queen Henrietta Maria prescribes that true love is more important than marriage which is a barrier to the union of souls and it preaches the primacy of love over the earthly rules. Fernando and Bianca consider their love chaste and innocent because the love cult regards true love as a vehicle to achieve virtue. The same reason also allows the liberty of action and thought, according to which they shape their behaviours.

Compatible with the rules of Platonic love cult, Bianca and Fernando kiss each other to unite their souls during which the Duke catches them and furiously accuses them of committing adultery. Their being caught *in flagrante* echoes the legendary love between *Lancelot and Guinevere* whose first kiss leads to the downfall of the Round Table. The act of kissing begets the most unfortunate events in both cases. However, in *Love's Sacrifice*, Fernando and Bianca believe that love is powerful above all and even death cannot separate them. As Fernando swears:

I can wish to taste,  
By your fair eyes, that sepulchre that holds  
Your coffin shall encoffin me alive. (V.I.19-21)

Since they think that their love is chaste and more sacred than marriage vows, Fernando cries out that Bianca is innocent. Even though they kiss each other, they do not consider their love adulterous because now that theirs is genuine love, it is not sinful. In contrast to how they assume their love, however, the Duke calls Bianca the “strumpet” (V.I.54), the “shameless harlot” (V.I.60), the “shameless intolerable whore” (V.I.70) whose “lust impostumes for a birth of bastardy” (V.I.62-63). The patriarchal voice could easily label Bianca as a prostitute even though

their love is far from being lustful and they never have sexual intercourse.

Upon severe accusations, Bianca does not remain silent and she lists the reasons why she cannot love the Duke. She confesses that the moment she set her eyes on Fernando, she was infatuated with him. She thinks that having the title of the Duke is not enough to attract a lady. What is more, she shouts that the Duke should be glad to have a friend whom his wife thinks so well of (V.I.82):

What ails you?  
Can you imagine, sir, the name of Duke  
Could make a crooked leg, a scuffling foot,  
A tolerable face, a wearish hand,  
A bloodless lip, or such an untrimmed beard  
As yours fit for a lady's pleasure? No. (V.I.71-76)

Bianca humiliates Philipppo because of his old age and careless appearance. She mocks at her husband and honestly says that she does not like him because he is not as handsome as Fernando. She fearlessly rises against the patriarchal, "the most supreme authority" (I.I.38) represented by the Duke who is both her husband and the head of the dukedom.

Federico's appearance is compatible with Bianca's desires; she compares Philipppo with Fernando and regards the latter a gallant man, "a miracle composed of flesh and blood" (V.I.98-9). Through her remarks, she provokes the Duke so that he might kill her on the spot because Bianca knows that their forbidden relationship is revealed and that the iron rules of society will not let her unite with Fernando. Besides, if the Duke kills Fernando, life will be like death for her without him (V.I.164). Her deep love for Fernando without whom she considers herself dead and the social restrictions she has to face with leave Bianca only one alternative: death.

In courtly love tradition, under the influence of patriarchy, the lover is readily associated with the man while the beloved is the woman who is possessed by the opposite sex. However, Bianca reverses the convention and she becomes the agent to choose which man to love. She elevates her position from the chosen to the chooser. She, being the object of love,

becomes the subject herself and selects the man she desires in accordance with her wishes. The obedient girl-wife voices her own opinion and reasserts herself through Fernando. She concludes that “The selfsame appetite which led you on / To marry me, led me to love your friend” (V.I.95-96).

Besides, the women are never expected to reveal their sexual desires but Bianca shatters this tradition too and admits that if Fernando had accepted, she would have consummated their love without hesitation (V.I.105):

Yet be assured, my lord, if ever language  
Of cunning servile flatteries, entreaties,  
Of what n me is, could procure his love,  
I would not blush to speak it. (V.I.126-29)

She openheartedly confesses her feelings and adds that because of his loyalty to friendship, Fernando has not given in to carnal pleasure. Bianca undertakes the role of a seducer again but Fernando denies that he has stained her chastity even though he accepts that he has abused the Duke and exceeded in courtship:

If ever I unshrined  
The altar of her purity, or tasted  
More of her than what without control. (V.II.57-59)

Fernando struggles in vain because the Duke has already stabbed Bianca with his poniard while he is trying to prove her innocence. Stating that “here is a blood for lust and sacrifice for wrong” (V.I.173), the Duke kills Bianca. He kills his wife as a punishment for her wrongdoing and uxoricide also serves as a sign of his omnipotence. The poniard is a phallic metaphor which reflects his power and the Duke asserts that he is capable of behaving as he wishes now that Bianca is his wife. “It was the husband’s duty to restrain his wife’s behaviour” (Ingram, *Church* 253) and unable to control Bianca, the Duke fulfils his duty by taking her life. It is possible to define religion as “a particular interest or influence that is very important in your life” according to *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* and in this respect, love becomes Bianca and Fernando’s religion. Fernando’s use of religious imagery also reinforces this idea. In

her last breath, Bianca blames the Duke for tragedy while her heart still belongs to Fernando. Bianca dies unrepentant because she sacrifices herself for which she has worshipped. The Duke kills “a spotless wife” (V.II.72) without whom life turns into a hell for Fernando. Fernando cannot endure living without the presence of Bianca and he decides to commit suicide. To unite with Bianca, Fernando drinks a phial of poison and kills himself. The Abbot of Monaco labels his self-sacrifice the most desperate end because he acts against the rule of the Scripture. As Huebert comments, in *Love’s Sacrifice* “[w]e are never allowed to forget that human flesh and blood is being sacrificed for the cause of love [and that] [d]eath ecstasy becomes a substitute for love ecstasy” (51).

The destruction of their natural emotions exhausts the couple and the lovers ascend to the heavens as the martyrs of love. Bianca and Fernando never deny their love although it costs to their lives. Their death serves as atonement for their forbidden love. They never hesitate to sacrifice the material things for the sake of love. Love hits them at first sight and becomes the most important thing in their life like religion. However, in the struggle of *eros* versus *thanatos*, death overcomes love; Bianca and Fernando cannot unite because of the restrictions of the institution of marriage. The idea of *liebestod* best describes their situation: they can only come together in their graves. It is not the world they are living in but afterlife makes their love possible. Even though their fatal love brings about their bitter end which they welcome willingly, Bianca and Fernando manifests the supremacy of love over the social code. Their story is the victory of love over social order. They prove that love cannot be restricted by customs. Just as Bianca and Fernando, Ford in *Love’s Sacrifice* reflects that “[he] made love his religion, exalted individual whim, and worshipped a morality ‘higher’ than law and convention” (Sensabaugh 172).

*Love’s Sacrifice* hosts another love case which proves deadly to the profligate Ferentes. He is a wanton courtier of the play and stands in stark contrast to Fernando. As Oliver suggests, Ferentes is a foil to Fernando (81). While Fernando is always polite, Ferentes is the “one whose pride takes pride in nothing more than to delight his lust” (I.I.97-

98). He is a lascivious, rude man who seeks women just for his pleasure. What is more, his ideas never overlap with how he behaves.

Ferentes is a trickster figure. He manipulates, insults and deceives three women. He persuades Colona, Julia, and Morona with false promises of marriage and impregnates them all. The manner of the three women is also different than Bianca's, either. Bianca does not yield to Fernando's love instantly but Colona, Julia, and Morona are so readily taken in to Ferentes's compliments. In this sense, the love affair of the devout lovers Fernando and Bianca is just the opposite of the playful affair of Ferentes and the three women. Bianca and Fernando fit in and represent the ideals of courtly love. However, Ferentes's love adventure is anti-courtly love. Like what the courtly lover does, Ferentes takes a vow of loyalty and servitude and makes himself Colona's servant but with totally different intentions in mind:

Madam, by this light, I vow myself your servant: only yours, inespacially yours. Time, like a turn-coat, may order and disorder the outward fashions of our bodies, but shall never enforce a change on the constancy of my mind. (I.II.1-5)

Ferentes does not merit the outward appearance of Colona but praises her honour and virtues. He considers himself unworthy of her embraces and at the same time he promises that he will always be her true servant. The courtly lovers exalt their ladies above everything and consider them as the emblem of virtue. However, as Colona leaves, Ferentes makes a misogynistic remark that it is not easy to find an honest woman: "He that is not a cuckold or a bastard, is a strangely happy man, for a chaste wife or a mother that never slept awry are wonders, wonders in Italy" (I.II.36-9). Thinking that the women are not chaste, Ferentes pursues his passion and seduces them by using the discourse of courtly love. For Fernando, love has been a religion yet for Ferentes it is a trade, a sweet sin (I.II.41). To serve for his trade, Ferentes finds another alternative: Julia. Because of the rumours, Julia is suspicious of his loyalty but Ferentes manages to deceive her. He coaxingly persuades her that Julia is his one and only love: "Well, if thou shouldst die, farewell all love with me forever" (I.II.63-64). He swears that he will reserve his heart only for Julia. When he is alone, he repeats that the women are not chaste:



“Chastity? I am an eunuch if I think there be any such thing” (I.II.75-76). Similarly, Ferentes deceives the old woman Morona with the false promise of marriage. When Ferentes impregnates and rejects all of them, the women decide to take revenge and kill him to cleanse their tarnished honour as discussed in the second chapter. Indeed, the Duke’s remark that “here is a blood for lust and sacrifice for wrong” (V.I.173) best describes Ferentes’s situation.

Another love case occurs between Mauruccio and Fiormonda. Mauruccio is the old antic of the play and his love affair with Fiormonda is like a parody of the courtly love tradition because he cannot be an ideal courtly lover since he is too old to be one according to Capellanus: “[a]ge is a bar, because after the sixtieth year in a man . . . his passion cannot develop into love” (32).

Mauruccio first appears while he is getting prepared to court Fiormonda. He asks his servant Giacomo’s opinion about his countenance, his voice, his breath; he rehearses how he will kiss Fiormonda’s hand. He “makes ridiculous the whole machinery of Platonic love by his effeminate toilet and dainty practice of worship of beauty” (Sensabaugh 154). He is an old man but it is not a barrier for him to be Fiormonda’s servant. His idea of love is shallow as evinced by the superficial details he pays attention to but he compares himself with the great poets Petrarch, Dante, Ariosto and Sannazar. He challenges Francesco Petrarca and Dante Alighieri who rendered themselves unforgettable thanks to their legendary commitment to their ladies Laura and Beatrice. Together with them, Mauruccio mentions Ludovico Ariosto and Jacopo Sannazaro, two Italian poets, who immortalized themselves through their lyrics. Because of his gigantic love for Fiormonda, Mauruccio also seems to believe that he can immortalize himself as well as his lady and to serve this purpose, he decides to prepare a mirror for Fiormonda on which he will draw his portrait. He selects the mirror as a token of love so that she can see her beauty and Mauruccio’s love at the same time whenever she looks at. Besides, the mirror serves as Mauruccio’s heart on which Fiormonda is carved. However, no wonder that Fiormonda rejects him and the old Mauruccio ends up marrying Morona. His apparently great love fades away soon and

he is forced to abandon the city to “live like pigeons” (IV.I.197) with Morona.

Mauruccio is not the only man whom Fiormonda rejects. A young nobleman Roseilli, who is banished by her from the city because of an unknown reason, is also in love with “that glorious widow” (I.I.23). Despite being forced into exile, Roseilli does not leave the court in disguise. Bianca relates that he is a noble gentleman loyal to the court and that he always offers his special service and obsequious care to win respect from Fiormonda (I.II.175-80), but she does not reciprocate his love since she aims for Fernando. To repeat Petruccio, indeed she is the only one who nurses an enmity to him. Roseilli grieves because of an unrequited love till the end of the play. Fortunately, through the end of the play Fiormonda repents of what she has done and asks for forgiveness:

Roseilli, I must honour thee. Thy truth,  
Like a transparent mirror, represents  
My reason with my errors. Noble lord,  
That better dost deserve a better fate,  
Forgive me. (V.III.9-13)

When the Duke stabs himself because of remorse, Roseilli unexpectedly turns out to be the head of the dukedom and gains authority over all. The already repentant Fiormonda marries Roseilli but he does not submit to love at once and he keeps her back from himself through which she can purge her sins. Roseilli, who is banished by Fiormonda, now banishes her from their nuptials. As Stavig concludes, “[e]ven the reasonable Roseilli is a victim of love, but he differs from the others in that he finally sees the folly of passionate idolatry of women and asserts his natural sovereignty over Fiormonda at the end of the play” (124). While love dominates him at the beginning of the play, the patriarchy is restored when he claims his superiority over Fiormonda in the end.

In *Love’s Sacrifice*, only Fiormonda and Roseilli establish a socially acceptable marriage bond even though their marriage does not evolve from mutual love. As a whole, in the imaginary setting of the play, which is actually the reflection of the sixteenth/seventeenth century England,

the people do not cherish love. Ferentes does not believe in the sanctity of marriage or love and his lust brings about his doom. The ceremony of marriage between the Duke of Pavy and Bianca cannot hinder Bianca's love to Fernando. Similarly, the fact that Bianca is a married woman does not prevent Fernando falling in love with her. Since theirs is a forbidden love, the greatness of their love cannot overcome the social orders. John Ford recounts the story of people who either sacrifice themselves or their love because of the social pressures.

### **3.3 Love and Its Consequences in *Punishment Without Revenge***

Honour and love are the concurrent themes of Lope de Vega's plays and he prolongs his convention in *El castigo* too. According to Vega, honour, as examined in the previous chapter, is the obsessive interest of the Golden Age man and the woman sexuality constitutes the fundamental share of his honour. Therefore, love might be considered as a threat to the rules of matrimony because the beloved person sometimes does not hesitate to violate them. In this respect, honour and love are interdependent in *Punishment Without Revenge* and love triggers a chain of events because were it not for the love of the young Federico and Casandra, the feelings of jealousy, the desire to commit adultery and the need to take revenge to restore honour might not have emerged. Under these circumstances, it would not be wrong to associate love with death since, in the play, the only union which leads to a fruitful end is the one between Aurora and the Marquis of Gonzaga.

In this chapter, love and its consequences between the following people will be studied consecutively: the Duke and Federico, the Duke and Casandra, Federico and Aurora, the Marquis of Gonzaga and Aurora, and Federico and Casandra.

Even the first pages of *El castigo sin venganza* imply that the Duke of Ferrara will not be an ideal husband but his libertinism does not cloud him as a favourable father. Casandra is the turning point in their peaceful life but when even before she arrives, the harmony of the palace where the Duke lives with his son has already been disturbed by the

Duke's subjects because the old-aged Duke still does not have a legitimate heir. As mentioned elsewhere, his people force him to get married to produce a legitimate child. The Duke heartily loves Federico but no doubt the marriage is an obligation. For this reason, he is sorry since he thinks that his son might misinterpret his action as betrayal. He is a caring father and does not want to make Federico upset. He is also sad because he does not want to offend his son and he is forced to abandon his former lifestyle. Even though the reader does not approve of the way he treats his wife, since he insists on keeping his profligacy, his sincere outburst having hurt Federico turns him into a sympathetic-father-figure:

But now I am  
Embarked upon this marriage, he  
Believes I do it of my own accord  
And thinks it is some treachery  
That I deliberately do  
To him, when, if the truth be known,  
My subjects are the ones to blame  
For forcing me to marry and,  
In consequence, offending him. (I.735-43)

The Duke's great love for his son is once more emphasized when he returns from the war. Because he has been away due to the war of Papacy for four months, the Duke misses his son greatly and he cannot wait until his people welcome him. He rides ahead the rest to rejoin his son as early as possible. His servant Batin relates how zealous the Duke has been to see Federico again. It is pointed that the Duke also wants to see Casandra but Federico's love is far greater than hers. The servant tells Federico about the Duke's love:

[T]here is nothing else  
Can match his love for you. For him  
You are the sun itself, and four  
Months absence like the moon's eclipse. (III.120-23)

The Duke considers himself the world and the moon, which corresponds to his journey, separates him from his son. The servant associates Federico with the sun. It is the originator of life and without it life is impossible on earth. Similarly, Federico is the biggest star of the Duke's

world. Being his main source of happiness, when Federico betrays the Duke later, he leaves him in despair at the end of the play.

When the father and the son meet, again the Duke emphasizes that his love for Federico is eternal and that his marriage with Casandra cannot hinder their affinity. He underlines that “[a] father’s love can never cease to love his flesh and blood” (III.294-95). He is even repentant that he decided to get married because he has put his son in such an unbearable sorrow:

But loyalty  
Like this deserves at least that I  
Should say to you that I regret  
The day I chose to marry. (II.176-79)

Federico equally loves his father, but his youth and Casandra’s love overcomes paternal love and causes agony and bloodshed. However, Federico should not be the scapegoat since

[the Duke] was wrong not to accept Federico’s offer to accompany him into battle; much grief might have been avoided had he done so. Just as clearly, he was wrong to treat Casandra after their wedding night with indifference and disrespect. (Larson 147)

*El castigo* leads to a fatal end because the Duke is not a suitable husband for a conventional, desired marriage bond in which the couples love and care for each other. Love should be a prelude to marriage for the proper conduct of domestic relations but it is already known that the Duke is a womanizer and he cannot commit himself to the love of a certain lady and besides he has married Casandra owing to outside forces. Far from being based on love, their marriage does not serve as a solution to the Duke’s problem. Despite his oration that he loves Federico and Casandra equally, it turns out to be untrue when he unhesitatingly decides to kill the latter without feeling agony. The duke does not fit in the ideal courtly lover of Andreas Capellanus because in reality he neither loves Casandra nor is capable of loving someone. Capellanus comments that “an excess of passion is a bar to love” (33) and the Duke lusts after every woman he sees. To him, the Duke is “a shameless dog”

(33), “a counterfeiter of love and a pretender” (149) or “an impetuous ass” (149). Similarly, Casandra does not love the Duke because theirs is an arranged marriage and the Duke is too old to be able to attract the lady and to arouse her sexual desires. Instead, in his absence, Casandra directs her love towards Federico. It is even what Castiglione advises in *the Book of the Courtier*: “If the court lady is married to a husband who does not love her, she is advised to reciprocate of someone who does, although a fear of scandal or dishonour requires her to avoid sexual consummation” (qtd. in Singer 2: 187). Unfortunately, the couple consummates their love and when the Duke returns from the war, Casandra pretends that she loves him only to keep their love safe from being made public. Federico joins Casandra in their deception and urges her to employ deceitful love to clear away the rumours:

FEDERICO: What matters most is that the Duke  
Should be convinced of your love.  
He must believe that, when he lies  
With you, you are his gentle, cooing dove.  
CASANDRA: I shall convince him I am still  
His treasure, though love, when it is feigned,  
Does not contain the slightest pleasure. (III.820-26)

Love does not give pleasure when it is false and it appears that Federico’s love for Aurora is not deep because it fades away once he comes across with Casandra. Aurora is the daughter of the duke’s brother and her parents have already been dead at the beginning of the play. The Duke is a father both to Federico and Aurora. The two cousins have deep emotional bonds since their childhood because they have grown up in the same house, they have shared the same family atmosphere and they have called the same man father. Federico has been like a brother to Aurora. However, it is evident that their relationship is more than being a brother and a sister. Aurora has a deep affection for Federico and she takes care of him dearly.

When the Duke decides to marry Casandra, which causes Federico’s sadness, Aurora thinks that she can soothe his anxiety of losing fortune because hers is enough for the two. She is fond of Federico’s well-being and is ready to share with him what she has:

Moreover, if  
I marry him, why should some future heir  
Cause him anxiety? My fortune is  
Enough to free him from such cares. (I.806-09)

Aurora's love does not include sexual desire and it is based on friendship and mutual benefit. Her deep attachment is also the result of their common past. Familial bonds tie them; they are the offspring of the same blood. Within this context, Aurora mentions that Federico also loves her and she thinks that their marriage will render their happiness eternal. Since she does not know the real cause of Federico's sorrow, she considers that after their nuptials only death can break them up:

I loved him just as truly and  
As honestly as he loved me,  
Our life together one: one law,  
One love, one will that joined us both  
In such true harmony as now  
Our marriage would make permanent. (I.789-94)

Number XXIV of Capellanus's rules of love states that every act of a lover ends in the thoughts of the beloved. Aurora reasons that Federico's sadness stems from the fact that he will be devoid of the Duke's estate and to solve the problem, she asks for the Duke's advice to marry him. She uses the monetary issue as an excuse for marriage. The Duke, thinking on behalf of his son and unaware of his real situation, readily accepts the proposal and titles their union "perfect marriage" (I.823). Actually, the Duke's opinion and Aurora's intentions of marriage are not baseless since later her dialogue with Casandra evinces that she and Federico indulged in a romantic relationship and their love used to be mutual. She remarks that Federico used to call her his own:

There was a time  
When each new dawn saw Federico come  
In search of that still brighter dawn  
He'd learned to call his own. Was there  
A garden or a fountain then  
That did not hear sweet words of love?  
.....  
And when he said goodbye to one  
Another, was there a moment he  
Enjoyed away from me, an instant he'd  
Describe as moderately happy? (II.295-306)

However, although Federico seems to have been in love with Aurora, the moment he sets eyes on Casandra, he tastes love at first sight. Their harmony is shattered and their romantic love is not glorified with marriage. Their break up suggests that Federico has not been a devout lover for Aurora which makes him an inappropriate lover of Andreas Capellanus. "He should not be a lover of several women at the same time, but for the sake of one should be devoted servant of all" (Capellanus 60). Likewise, Aurora's love for Federico is not long-lived. Capellanus says that jealousy incites love but when Aurora witnesses how Federico "pick[s] the blood-red roses of Casandra's lips" (III.46-47), it conquers love and she starts pursuing revenge. Red in literature is the colour of fire, of love, of roses and "it is the colo[u]r of faces when they show anger or passion" (Ferber 76) as well as being the colour of blood. Besides, for the 12<sup>th</sup> century German Minnesänger Wolfram von Eschenbach, "red lips and radiance are the quintessence of courtly love beauty" (Schultz 35). In this context, the blood-red lips of Casandra represent her beauty, the love between her and Federico, Aurora's fury at them and the final bloodshed.

Aurora cannot manage to unite with Federico but her beauty strikes the Marquis of Gonzaga the moment he encounters her. The Marquis is a man from Mantua, accompanying Casandra during her journey to Ferrara. The wheel of fortune does not only work for Casandra and Federico but the Marquis gets his share too. His is not a love-at-first-sight case, though. As his speech shows, the Marquis arrives at Ferrara particularly to see Aurora because of her famous beauty:

MARQUIS: Most beautiful  
Aurora. Everything that I  
Had heard of you inspired me  
To want to see you for myself.  
It falls on to my good fortune now  
To find myself in such proximity,  
And since my deepest wishes have  
Come true, I swear that beauty such  
As you possess obliges me  
To put my life at your service. (I.970-79)



Like the courtly lover of Capellanus, the Marquis puts himself at Aurora's service to win her heart. Just as a knight should comply with the will of his master and pay service to him, a courtly lover should obey the wishes of his lady. The Marquis bears the features of an ideal courtly lover in that he both takes a vow of loyalty and he is also a gallant warrior like a medieval knight. He is "a man whose name throughout the whole of Italy is commonly associated with his fame upon the battlefield" (I.982-85). Capellanus, explaining the etymology of the word love seems to highlight the condition of the Marquis who is affected by its power and who is equally willing to win the heart of his lady:

Love gets its name (*amor*) from the word hook (*amus*), which means 'to be captured,' for he who is in love is captured in the chains of desire and wishes to capture someone else with his hook. . . . [T]he man who is a captive of love tries to attract another person by his allurements and exerts all his efforts to unite two different hearts with an intangible bond. (31)

However, theirs will be different from a courtly love union because there are no obstacles to their nuptials Aurora being an unmarried lady. The only hindrance soon to be eliminated is her unwilling attitude –typical of a courtly lady- to accept the Marquis's love. Furthermore, when the two meet for the first time, Aurora is still in love with Federico. Even though he has already forgotten her, she keeps her loyalty and rejects the Marquis's advances. Unaware of Aurora's situation, the Marquis devotes himself to her love and promises: "your wish is my command" (I.995):

Since I arrived from Mantua,  
My only wish has been to have  
You welcome me as your suitor, sworn  
To serve you well and sacrifice  
Myself as you desire. (II.660-64)

As examined earlier, formerly Aurora pretends that she loves the Marquis but it is only to make Federico jealous and to reanimate his love. In Beauvoir's words, "[i]f the man's love wanes the desperate woman lover pretends to reassert her independence by flirting with another. She hopes thereby to arouse jealousy and inflame passion" (qtd. in Secomb 50).

Later the Marquis learns that Aurora's heart belongs to someone else but having bestowed upon so much value on her, he does not give up his

love. Similar to the troubadours who “elevate women in the sense that they choose one woman as the exemplar of all significant virtues and use that as the reason for loving her” (Singer 2: 49), the Marquis selects Aurora as the queen. He cannot abandon the fair Aurora which he calls the sun itself. Love means rebirth for him and just as Federico is the sun for the Duke and the initiator of life, Aurora means the same for the Marquis. Aurora shines upon him and her splendour terminates the darkness in the Marquis. As Singer concludes “[t]he person who has fallen in love may feel that a new reality has been revealed to him” (3: 383). Aurora and her love rejuvenate the Marquis of Gonzaga:

Aurora, lovely as the dawn;  
No sooner do I set these eyes  
On you than I am born again.  
Aurora, province of the sun,  
No sooner do you come than this  
Dark burden of my night is banished by  
The loveliness of your vision. (II.653-59)

Unfortunately, much as he tries, the Marquis cannot evoke the feelings of love in Aurora and he deviates from the rules of the courtly love and decides to abandon Ferrara. He expects that Aurora’s love will be a remedy for his darkness but she does not cure his illness and does not brighten his soul. The Marquis reproaches:

I know how much I have deceived  
Myself when that same soul that in  
Your worship always proves so bold,  
Has in the end awakened not  
The warmth of love but only cold  
Disdain; discovered not the brightness of  
Your day but only this my endless night. (II.665-71)

Upon his decision, Aurora does not let him go and she associates love with sorrow. To her, one who does not love enough cannot talk of suffering and if the Marquis really loved her, he would not go away. She is of the opinion that if the lover cannot withstand the first rebuff, he does not feel true love. Aurora seems to believe that the lady can make her lover wait and suffer from her cruelty. The Marquis accepts to stay to win her soul just as the Greeks waited ten years to capture Troy. To strengthen her argument, Aurora gives the example of the Trojan War

and the shepherd Jacob who served seven years to be able to marry Rachel until her father's permission according to Genesis 29.18. The Marquis eagerly assents to achieve Aurora's love and he resembles himself to Zeus's son Tantalus who, suffering from eternal punishment, can never taste the fruit above his head nor drink water despite being placed in water up to his chin. He promises to

Wait for centuries,  
And be like wretched Tantalus,  
Devoured constantly by doubt  
And certainty. (II.706-09)

The Marquis wishes for Aurora's love and his hope soothes him. If he does not abandon Aurora under any circumstance, then she will be convinced that he is worthy of her love and it is a process of maturation: "[u]ntil a man achieves his goal, suffering improves his soul" (II.712-13).

The Marquis turns out to be the only lucky male of the play at length. His endurance ends fruitful and he and Aurora decide to get married. Their love is glorified with a happy-ever-after union. Almost through the end of the play, when Federico and Casandra hurriedly prepare their doom, the Marquis and Aurora start preparations for their wedding ceremony and to leave for Mantua. The couples are contrasted and Lope seems to give a message that no matter what the reason is, the ones who violate the limitations of marriage deserve punishment while the ones who obey the societal rules are rewarded. Lope, writing for the public, concludes his play in compliance with their rules. Even though love between Casandra and Federico is deeper and more devout as they sacrifice themselves for the sake of it, love between Aurora and the Marquis leads to felicity.

When the greatest love story of the play is considered, undoubtedly, Casandra and Federico's love springs to mind. The role of the fortune is indubitable when the two meet after Casandra's carriage is broken and she is on the verge of death. "The river, noting [her] sylph-life figure" (I.409-10) tries to catch her but luckily Federico rescues her:

CASANDRA: As sometimes happens when a storm  
Breaks out at sea, and in the dark  
Of night St Elmo's fire burns  
And flashes brilliantly, so was

My own predicament the night,  
The river sea, my coach a ship,  
Myself its captain, you the brightest star  
In my dark firmament. (I.538-45)

When they first appear on stage, Federico enters with Casandra in his arms. The important point is that they are attracted as soon as they see each other before they know their true identities and nature unites the young people before social circumstances urge them to separate. Federico's holding Casandra in his arms can also be a foreshadowing that their attraction will cause an adulterous situation. Just as "the coach [sink] deep in mud (I.433), Casandra will find herself in a position in which she will be unable to save herself and she will end up in ruins.

The moment Federico learns who Casandra really is, he kneels before her and devotes himself to her service. The young man, who is sorry for losing his inheritance due to a step-mother, forgets his former situation and now turns into a courtly lover submitting himself to her love. However, he shields his real feelings and kisses her hand stating "I am your son" (I.448). It is possible that Federico identifies Casandra with the absent mother and lover figure at the same time. Similarly, Casandra accepts him as a son and a lord and pays compliments to him:

Your speech and manner are the proof,  
My son and lord, of noble personage;  
Your words and deeds the sign that true  
Heroic acts speak of a soul  
Whose hallmark is its boundless courage. (I.528-32)

She is equally affected by Federico's youthfulness, courage and nobility and she promises to be a mother to him. Federico as a son has been the star of the Duke's world and now he becomes the source of happiness and hope, "the brightest star in [Casandra's] dark firmament" (I.544-45). She even puts him a higher situation than the Duke's. Although it is possible that Federico's importance is because of the fact that he has saved her life, it is undeniable that theirs is a romantic attraction of the young people. As Casandra confesses:

You please me so,  
You fill my heart with so much joy,

I think I'd rather have you as my son  
Than now become the Duchess of Ferrara. (I.549-52)

Federico's love is a love-at-first-sight case and love blows him a new spirit. He considers himself only blood and flesh before seeing Casandra but now he is endowed with a soul. A body without a soul is dead and likewise, Federico remarks that he has been born again with Casandra's love. Just as a mother gives birth to a new soul, Casandra- the absent mother and lover figure- resurrects him. In courtly love tradition, that the lady should be an already married woman is a prerequisite and "[i]t appears that the characteristics of this unique woman are those of a mother image of infantile origin and that the lover's relation to her is under the spell of disguised childlike fantasies" (Moller 41). Federico does not have a mother and he makes Casandra responsible for the recognition of his lost soul thereby serving as a surrogate mother as well as a lover. It seems that his relationship with Aurora cannot feed him deeply and he cannot feel one with her. However, Casandra's presence fills Federico's heart with fresh promises, with a new life. She becomes a god-like figure who recreates Federico with her own light. He accepts full submission and outbursts that he belongs to Casandra just as Bernard de Ventadour as a 12<sup>th</sup> century troubadour "refers to his beloved as the one to whom he owes his very existence" (Moller 42):

I think my father now  
Divides in two my very being,  
For if I owe my origin to him,  
Which is to say my flesh and blood,  
To you I owe my very soul,  
Which is to say that I am born again.  
For these two births the victory  
Is yours, for if man's soul comes down  
To him from God, I cannot say  
I knew until today where my  
Soul was; and so, if I now owe  
To you this sudden recognition of  
My soul, then you alone can claim  
You have achieved my resurrection. (I.556-69)

That there is a mutual attraction between Federico and Casandra from their first meeting is obvious since they keep complimenting each other.

On the one hand, Casandra praises her would-be lover whose arms and courtesy are quite enough to carry her to perfect safety. On the other hand, Federico vigorously tells the Marquis how bravely he can act to save Casandra. However, the reason why he behaves thus is not made explicit but his only reason is “to place Casandra gently at his father’s side” (I.630). Federico identifies himself with mythological characters who are famous for their brave deeds. He is eager to be like Zeus who transforms himself into an eagle to carry the handsome Ganymede to make him the cupbearer of the gods or he is disposed to be like Phaeton who is allowed to drive the chariot of Helios and thereby destroying himself because he is unable to control the horses. Federico also considers himself the Jason of the Golden Fleece; in this context, the invaluable Casandra represents the fleece. Even though Federico turns out to be such a zealous man to be able to let Casandra unite with her husband, considering his further comment that “I shall die of love that is impossible” (I.1087-88), it is possible to claim that Federico would like to be a Zeus, a Phaeton, a Jason to achieve success in his own struggle. Seeing Federico’s ardent attitude, the Marquis emphasizes that he deserves gratitude and he remarks:

And never more can people say  
That those adversaries of old-  
A stepson and his mother- cannot live  
As one in perfect harmony. (I.635-38)

He is satisfied that they are on good terms, which he labels “most unusual and rare” (I.639) and he puts forth that their relationship will be acclaimed by all of Italy. His remark is quite ironic in that Casandra and Federico deserve to be remembered not because of their amiable relations but due to their excessive closeness which is frowned upon. In the end, the Marquis’s comment that they will be celebrated by the whole country just ends in a starkly opposite position and their perfect harmony only serves as “a timely lesson for all Spain, a wondrous sight for all of Italy” (III.1081-83).

When the Duke, Casandra and Federico come together among the other courtiers, Federico insists to kiss Casandra’s hand as a sign that he truly desires to obey her. He promises to present an unrivalled loyalty,

unrivalled in that it even overcomes his loyalty to his father, although he claims that kissing the hand will also be the mark of his obedience to the Duke. Besides, showing his loyalty to his father and stepmother, Federico kisses her hand to prove his own sincerity:

And this the proof that everything  
You wish is my command.

.....  
That I, as long as I shall live,  
Intend to be the image of  
Unrivalled loyalty; the second is  
The mark of my obedience to  
The Duke, whose wishes I observe  
Respectfully; the third is for  
Myself. (I.548-58)

Casandra is respected by Federico and she, being a mother figure, has an authority over him. The fear of separation and “[t]he child’s fear of loss of love . . . [have] become the adult’s anxiety over rejection by the lady . . . The lover has a strong need to obey her in order to earn her approval” (Moller 46). That fear of being unfavourable to her may be the reason why Federico rigorously repeats that he is under her command.

Being his son and subject simultaneously, Federico has always been under the authority of the Duke because the father has been the head of the palace and the district he governs. His secondary position proves that Federico has to behave in accordance with what the Duke commands and he says that he really obeys what his father wishes. It is apparent that he is possibly going to marry to Aurora after the journey and even his choice of wife will be determined by his father. In this respect, Casandra’s presence functions as a turning point in Federico’s life because he discovers his youth, his emotions and what he really wants by virtue of her. Thanks to Casandra’s love, he overcomes the Duke’s dominion and behaves according to his own desires regardless of the consequences. He becomes aware of his feelings and in this sense his remarks that Casandra bestows soul upon him, that he is reborn again become significant. He considers Casandra the sun, the life-giver since only through her he gains freedom of action. As Larson comments:

No longer is love a mere temptation of the flesh. . . . It has become . . . a force so powerful that the will is not simply

inclined under its weight but totally subjugated. It is an emotion that arises spontaneously, grows with astonishing rapidity, and ends by taking control of the entire being. (119)

It is true that he wants to have Casandra as his sun only for himself but he also feels in-between because of his love for his father. His young, manly side yearns for Casandra's love yet his bond with the Duke as his one and only son makes him feel guilty. In this case, he can only explain it "as some form of utter madness" (I.1050). He follows a path that a sane person does not yield to, that is why he thinks that he is crazy. He is half mad and at the same time he is aware that he can never reach Casandra. The lady, being married, becomes an unattainable entity and he laments that his love will be like dreams; it will be a pure fantasy. He is absorbed in a state of melancholy both because he cannot have Casandra's love and because he feels ashamed of having coveted his father's wife. His grief also stems from the fact that he cannot tell his problem to anybody, not even to his confidante Batin. He reproaches that he is unwell yet "the cause of it, no one can tell" (II.131). His suffering becomes the proof of love. Federico suffers from lovesickness and he finds himself in such an intolerable agony that he cannot compare his unhappiness with anything else. Even Marquis de Sade (1740-1814) in his *Justine, Philosophy in the Bedroom, and Other Writings* warns that love is dangerous:

What is love? One can only consider it . . . as the effect upon us of a beautiful object's qualities; these effects distract us; they inflame us; were we to possess this object, all would be well with us; if 'tis impossible to have it, we are in despair. (285)

This is exactly what Federico suffers from. He is in despair because there is no solution to his problem and he cannot lay hands on her. He neither wants to have Aurora as his wife nor somebody else as his heart is covered with Casandra's love- only she can make him feel alive "because he who shines with the light of one love can hardly think of embracing another woman, even a beautiful one" (Capellanus 31). Now that Federico does not touch her, he considers himself dead and in this case to live or to die is of no significance. As he soliloquizes:



I welcome his displeasure more,  
 So I can truly say I have enjoyed  
 The fullest measure of unhappiness.  
 The depth of my despair is such,  
 I do not really care if I  
 Should die; and if I were to die,  
 I'd want to live a thousand times  
 Again, so I could die again  
 As many times as I had lived.  
 And yet I neither wish to live  
 Nor die, because to live means I  
 Must suffer anguish in its way  
 As terrible as death; and if  
 I do not kill myself, it is  
 Because death is a lesser evil than  
 The pain that in this life I am  
 Obliged to bear. (II.237-53)

Owing to his desperate situation, he welcomes death as a salvation because he considers it the mere solution to his torment. He does not want to live since he does not want to suffer from love and he knows that he will not have Casandra. Yet he does not choose to kill himself because he thinks that even after death he will go on suffering because of his unrequited love. The other reason why Federico does not commit suicide might be his fear of divine punishment. After Laura's death, Petrarca also wants to commit suicide. However, since Christianity forbids suicide, his fear of eternal damnation stops him. Petrarca reflects this fear in sonnet CCLXXII of *Il Canzoniere*:

And remembrance and expectation grip my heart,  
 Now on this side, now on that, so that in truth,  
 If I did not take pity on myself,  
 I would have freed myself already from all thought.

As Batin comments on his situation, Federico is like a hermaphrodite—neither a man nor a woman- he is split between not knowing if he is alive or dead. Life without Casandra is meaningless for Federico since not being able to attain her sweeps away his future hopes and his zest for life. His melancholy situation is summarized by Bernard de Ventadour: “There is only one being in the world through whom I could have happiness, and from her I shall never receive it, but from another I could not even want it” (qtd. in Moller 49).

Now that he cannot tolerate the pain of love, Federico is willing to die. Just as the Duke imagines him to be reborn so that he can kill him again when he learns about the adultery, Federico craves for the same circle to emphasize the anguish he has to endure. Even though he associates Casandra with love when he first sees her, she and her love turn out to be a malady, an indescribable pain which cannot be told but only felt.

You are the cause of my suffering and the cure for my mortal pain, for you hold both my life and my death. . . . If you grant what I ask, you will give me back the life I have lost . . . but if you deny me, my life will be like a torment to me, and that is worse than if I met with sudden death; for a quick death would be preferable to suffering continually such terrible torture. (Capellanus 45-46)

The fact that he cannot tell it to anybody doubles his pain and he prays that no one will have to encounter with the same feelings he has undergone. Federico drowns in an unnatural melancholy and he quickly loses his joy of living. Since he has already put his soul under Casandra's command and accepts to "be [her] humble slave" (II.330), when she does not smile at her and when he remembers that she will never be his, Federico feels terrible grief. Only death can release him from his heartache:

If only I could die and not,  
In imitation of the Phoenix, be  
Reborn, I could resist the pain  
Of love. (II.351-54)

Finally, Federico confesses his infatuation. He pours out his immense feelings of love and exclaims that Cupid's arrow has shot him too. However, "the very sun itself" (II.464) consumes Federico and unable to find a remedy, he gets closer to death "like a burning candle" (II.437). When Casandra cunningly asks who she is, Federico makes a comparison and states that even though Aurora is as beautiful as the dawn, he associates his beloved with the sun and resembles her to it that "is incomparable in every way" (II. 468-69). This is typical of a courtly love tradition since the lady of a courtly lover is "absolutely unique and irreplaceable. She is the most beautiful and in every respect the best of all women" (Moller 41).

Just as the Greek and Roman dramatists do in their plays belonging to the Pagan tradition, Lope de Vega consults Greek mythology and compares Federico with Phaeton, Icarus and Bellerophon to show the dangerous situation he is in as well as emphasizing how foolishly he acts. The three figures tasted downfall in spite of their initial triumphs and Federico intuits that his end will be like them. He both foreshadows that his temerity is likely to bring his death and means that his bravery is nothing but foolishness.

Love, which has been seen to be an overpowering force, is also a significant hindrance to logical thinking. Federico's choice of Casandra 'el mismo sol' [the sun itself] causes him to lose the 'luz del entendimiento' [light of understanding], his honour, his life and, it is suggested, his soul. (Stroud 129)

Casandra pretends that she does not realize yet she is intelligent enough to figure out Federico's trembling or his submissive attitude as indicators of love. Still behaving naively though, she remarks that if his love were known by the lady, she would love him too. Casandra urges Federico to confess his love and holds forth:

The building that  
Seems strong is often soonest to  
Fall down. The passion spoken's far  
Less dangerous than that still hidden. (II.527-30)

Suggesting that appearances may not comply with reality, Casandra seems to allude to their future intimacy. Her emboldening makes Federico yearn for more and he tells the tale of pelicans. According to the story, the hunters start a fire in their nest and pelicans, to safeguard their family, burn their own wings to become an easy prey for the hunters. The reason why Lope de Vega inserted the pelican tale is not known but T. H White in *The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts* (1954) relates that

[t]he Pelican is excessively devoted to its children. But when these have been born and begin to grow up, they flap their parents in the face with their wings, and the parents, striking back, kill them" (Thompson 236).

Just like the pelicans, Federico is aware of his father's deep concern for him. This is the reason why he desires to confess his love although his responsibility as a son traps him. Love undermines his reason. Hence, he cannot decide what to do and is stuck between his desires and reason. While his heart and feelings drive him to declare his love, his reason stops him since, for the matters of honour, it will bring about his death:

Oh mad and foolish thought!  
What would you have of me? What would  
You drive me to? Why do you seek  
To end my life by forcing me  
To think and do what I dare not? (II.852-56)

He is torn between love and hell because being in love he is both sad and glad. He is sad and in hellish despair because he is in love with his stepmother; he is glad because love flourishes his monotonous life with its brightness. The smart Casandra estimates "forbidden love to be the cause of everything" (II.958-59) and states that like "Antiochus [was] enamoured of his stepmother" (II.950-51), Federico cannot deny that he is ill without the hope of recovery because of the same forbidden love, the situation which pleases her. Relieved to hear that she is not frustrated, Federico soliloquizes how he is deprived of himself, how he has lost his fear of God and of his father because of her love. He climaxes his submission telling that his soul belongs to Casandra as he worships her more. He prefers death than not having her. He is willing to die since only it can stop his sufferings. Being dead is a state when a person cannot feel anything anymore and Federico considers himself already dead as Casandra belongs to his father. He is so deeply absorbed in Casandra that he even forgets who created him. He even dares to compare her with God, the creator of heavens. It makes him guilty as an adulterous, ungrateful son and he almost becomes a heretic comparing and equating Casandra with God. He now thinks he is at a loss not knowing what to do, having already forgotten who he is, to whom Casandra belongs to, and who is the originator of his soul. He mediates that losing himself is not a problem since he is lost and dead as long as he is deprived of Casandra. He even rejects God if he commands not to adore such beauty but he also knows the cruel truth that he cannot

escape the black abyss without God, without Casandra and without himself. He is not able to take action. "At this point the word 'action' takes on a symbolic meaning. [It] prevents 'passion' [of Federico] far from being complete, for passion is 'what is suffered'- and its limit is death" (Rougemont 44):

What can we do, the two of us,  
When I forgot to worship God,  
And have no other god but you,  
Nor self to which I can lay claim,  
If I myself must live in you? (II.1033-37)

He forgets his father's love, he even sacrifices God's love and charity on him because Casandra becomes the only one he devotes himself to without thinking of its aftermath. If it is remembered that the Duke kills him due to God's command, it is possible to conclude that Federico's punishment in essence is a divine punishment because of his heresy. He rejects to worship God and accepts Casandra as the soul, the life-giver but God who has actually bestowed life upon him takes his soul away. Until he reaches the final relief, Federico is condemned to eternal suffering in a mode of "utter helplessness" (II.1046) for he can neither have Casandra nor self-possess. In such a circumstance, his only wish is to find comfort in death:

This life  
Is meaningless; this body has  
No soul; I see my death, convinced  
That it is not a source of fear;  
Rather, my one remaining pleasure.  
I only ask you let me kiss  
This hand, so i may taste the poison that  
Now ends my life. (II.1074-81)

Since *El castigo* was not written under the influence of the Pagan tradition, the Olympian gods do not appear on stage. Lope uses mythological characters but his figures believe in God who is one and only.

Like a death wish, Federico asks for a kiss before he leaves so that their souls can be united. However, Casandra does not let him because "to do so is to put a spark to powder" (II.1052-53). Upon Federico's confessions, she is aware that theirs will be both human and divine punishment. Love

as carrier of happiness deviates and comes to mean poison from this point on. As it is defined in *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, poison means “an idea, a feeling, etc. that is extremely harmful” or “a substance that causes death or harm if it is swallowed or absorbed into the body” and in their case love serves exactly as a poisonous feeling that would harm both parties summoning them to death. The fire of love burns them and recognizes no obstacle. As Paris of *Troilus and Cressida* observes, “hot blood begets hot thoughts, and hot thoughts beget hot deeds, and hot deeds is love” (III.I.127-29). To Federico, Casandra becomes one of the legendary Sirens who lure the sailors with their beautiful voices and thereby causing their death. Similarly, being young and passionate, Casandra loses her strength and surrenders to love:

FEDERICO: You were the siren who  
Beguiled me on this fatal sea,  
And sweetly lured me to my  
Own death

CASANDRA: As I, if I go on,  
Am certain to destroy myself

.....  
And I [have]  
No consciousness of what I think  
Or do.

FEDERICO: Such strange infirmity!

CASANDRA: I die for you. (II.1088-101)

To their dismay, Federico and Casandra learn that the Duke is on the way home. While one exclaims that he is mad already, the other bemoans that her soul is consumed with pain. They create a world of their own and do not need anybody since they complete each other. They undergo sexual blockage which is “defined as the degree to which one is not able to have sexual relations with someone as often and as intensively as desired” (Wilkinson 142). The Duke’s returning home means that they will not be able to consummate their love easily, which is why they feel sad as love yearns for nearness. In this vein, falling in love can be described as the condition in which both lovers are in dire need of each other.

Both sides know that theirs is a sinful, forbidden and an adulterous relationship and they consider death the only way out. They are suffering

from melancholy typical of hopeless lovers as Robert Burton analyses in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*. He states that this kind of people “are soon tired with all things; they will nor tarry, now be gone; now in bed they will rise, now up, then go to bed, now pleased, then again displeased; now they like, by and by dislike all” (320). Federico and Casandra are out of balance too. As Batín observes:

Besides, I don't know if the Count's  
Gone mad. He's either happy or  
He's sad. He either laughs from ear  
To ear, or else his mouth drops down  
To here. Then there's the Duchess, just  
Like him, as if she's in a constant spin. (III.844-49)

Ever since the moment Federico learns Casandra's real identity, he feeds a hopeless love for her. Casandra is also attracted to him and she responds to his advances having in mind her future revenge. Even though their initial meeting means rebirth for Federico, Casandra eventually becomes responsible for taking his soul away. The Duke is intelligent enough to understand what they have undergone and in the name of restoring honour, he kills them both. “The pelican's filial rebellion and the parent's murder of the offspring bear an obvious resemblance to Federico's dishono[u]ring his father and to his murder by his father at the end of the play” (Thompson 236). His powerful anger overcomes his paternal love. Since theirs is a forbidden relationship, the head of the house both as a husband and a father secures the justice and punishes the guilty ones who do not conform to the rules of the society. Love compels them not to submit to the vows of marriage. Love is blind and the flames of passion of the youth destroy the couple. They are left with no choice: love itself compels them to be in love with each other. Casandra and Federico have to sacrifice themselves and their love because man's love is more dominant than the natural law. It is nature's hand that they fall in love but it is unacceptable. However, the reader cannot help but sympathize with their love since no wonder it is natural that the young should unite with the young. Casandra and Federico's love bears the features of courtly love tradition in that Casandra is a married woman, Federico submits to her service, and their love provokes

desire. Their love includes happiness as much as agony as “[c]ourtly lovers suffer because society is against them” (Singer 2: 29). Marriage is no real excuse for not loving according to Capellanus as well. The Duke, being an old-aged, libertine man is not the one who deserves the beautiful, young, passionate Casandra but it is Federico who should be a husband to her with his devotion to her and their love.



## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION

*Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge*, though penned four centuries earlier to demonstrate the breakdown of a marriage due to mismatched partners, still keep their universal appeal thanks to their time-independent themes of jealousy, honour, revenge and love. John Ford and Lope de Vega illuminate the social framework of their cultures through their tragedies. Although the idea of honour in Spain is more systematically constructed than it is in England, both playwrights reflect a society driven by excessive concern for honour in their plays. Hence, *Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge* follow a similar structural and thematic plot line.

In both plays, even the characters seem to be the replica of each other. The old Dukes marry young and beautiful women probably without their consent and in turn their marriages are shattered by the handsome and young men who are closest to them: "in the business of love all men are rivals" (Capellanus 113). Philippo Caraffa's best friend and courtier Fernando cuckolds him while in *El castigo* the Duke of Ferrara is betrayed by his illegitimate son Federico. The matrimonial bond of the mismatched couple cannot withstand the forbidden love affair of the young man and the young woman since the women, who are suffering from unhappy marriages, follow their feelings of love. The bad marriages result in dissatisfaction and the married women commit adultery even though they are aware that it will beget catastrophic consequences. The forbidden lovers embrace their deaths as they live in a world ruled by honour from whose yoke they cannot escape.

There are no physical limitations, no bars, no locks, but in their place there is an all-embracing, underlying fear, an obsessive concern with honour which limits and curtails by fixing the boundaries within which individuals may think, feel and act. (Edwards 63)

The women are enclosed by their husbands and they have to endure their controlling attitudes but the men feel the same pressure of the honour code as well. The lovers suffer from a moral dilemma since they are stuck between their individual desires and the rules they are supposed to obey. All lovers –Bianca, Fernando, Casandra and Federico– undergo the passion versus reason conflict. Their state can also be identified with the clash between society and nature: the former restricts human relations and tries to create puppet-like people yet nature cherishes naturally born feelings and values them as individuals due to their independent decisions. In both plays, however, the characters cannot act in accordance with their wishes but honour directs them what to do. When they do not submit to its tyranny, they are punished with death. Bianca and Fernando, Casandra and Federico do not surrender to social rules and they are sentenced to death. The ones who pursue love actually chase their ends.

The women, who are captured by the patriarchal system, rebel against it and their falling in love serve as an agent by which they can assert their free will. On the other hand, their husbands, who are driven by their crises of love, jealousy and honour, manipulate death to reimpose their authority.

The world of honour is a world imprisoned, its inhabitants condemned to the tortures of their own contrivance in the sense that those who perpetuate the laws of honour become themselves its sacrificial victims. (Edwards 60)

In both plays, Filippo Caraffa and the Duke of Ferrara appear as the supreme authority of their dukedoms and therefore they represent not only the voice of the patriarchy but they become the embodiment of law as well. They are the ones who hold the power but they are also restricted by the rules. Filippo marries Bianca although his senate does not approve of and the Duke of Ferrara has to marry Casandra because his subjects force him to. As a result, the characters, despite being powerful, face with the circumstances beyond their control and finally they are left with no alternative but to obey what the social rules preach.

The women's freedom is excessively restrained by the male authority but the men are also imprisoned by the impositions of honour. Both Filippo Caraffa and the Duke of Ferrara have to kill their wives and the people dearest to them because this is what honour demands. Both of them dwell in a world where the threat to their honour should be avenged with bloody murders. Indeed, neither of the murderers is willing to kill the lovers but there is no option for them to follow. In Richard Lattimore's words, "[i]t is the *philos-aphilos* still, or love-in-hate, the murder committed not against an external enemy but against a part of the self" (Larson 113). While the Duke of Ferrara prepares a plan to get his wife and son killed, Filippo Caraffa avenges the wrong with his own hands by stabbing Bianca.

The men are obliged to kill the ones they love a lot and thus, to salve their conscience, they reflect their act as if it was a punishment by God. Filippo Caraffa, whose cuckoldry is made public, kills his wife because he puts forth that it is what God asks for. Similarly, the Duke of Ferrara decides to kill his son with an excuse that he cannot disobey God's will. Fortunately, his cuckoldry is not made public and he manages to cover the shame since for the husbands, being cuckolded is bad but if it is known by the people, it is worse.

The honour code obliges the husbands to murder their supposedly adulterous wives. Although they link their punishment to God's order, beyond doubt their instinct to retaliate is also triggered by their desires to restore their honour and there is only one way to cleanse the disgrace: violence. The frustrated husbands can only soothe their anger through bloodshed.

The playwrights choose marital problems and honour as their subject matter and since honour turns out to be an obsession for the Spanish men, as Wetmore states, the plays in which husbands are forced to take revenge, generally killing both his wife and her lover, come to be known as tragedies in the Spanish manner- *tragedia al estilo español* (33).

Both *Punishment Without Revenge* like a rewriting of the Phaedra myth and *Love's Sacrifice* can safely be ranked among the honour/revenge tragedies in which love and death intermingle. Both plays consist of

certain elements which function as catalysts for tragedy- namely jealousy, suspicion, observation, honour and revenge. Philipppo Caraffa and the Duke of Ferrara are the old-aged husbands of the plays and since they are married to young and beautiful women no wonder that they are jealous of them. What is more, they have the most unexpected rivals –a son and a friend- who fall in love with their wives. In their quest, nature helps the lovers and the beloved women are shot by the arrows of Cupid too: when Philipppo is absent for hunting and the Duke of Ferrara for the papal war, the young people find themselves deeply embedded in love. Othello sighs:

Oh curse of marriage!  
That we can call these delicate creatures ours,  
And not their appetites! (III.III.268-70)

The husbands in both plays undergo the same experience. They justly claim their dominion over their wives and consider them as their property but they cannot prevent them from falling in love.

Just as the husbands feel jealousy towards their wives, the women turn out to be jealous of the unmarried, free women. Casandra and Bianca are jealous of the peasant women and the waiting-women. As they are under the hegemony of their husbands and unable to act as they wish, the women feel suffocated. They can only taste freedom through forbidden love. They are willing to maintain it because they have never tasted real love with their husbands.

All lovers cherish love over all mundane issues and sacrifice themselves for the sake of it. Aurora's comment on love stands like an epitome of what the characters endure in both plays:

It is also true  
That love is powerful, that neither wealth  
Nor life nor honour can withstand  
Its influence. (II.630-33)

On the other hand, “[r]eal jealousy always increases the feelings of love” (Capellanus 162) and suspicion. It is impossible to observe female solidarity in both tragedies because the female characters, due to their jealousy, quicken the course of events. Aurora, who is in love with

Federico, through her letter which discloses the forbidden affair, and Fiormonda, who is infatuated with Fernando, through her machinations, lead the husbands to take revenge. The women first secretly observe the couples because of their suspicions and then they encourage the husbands to restore their honour in reprisal for their unrequited love. One can only witness the female solidarity in *Love's Sacrifice* when Colona, Morona and Julia kill Ferentes to avenge his deceit.

Jealousy blocks reasonable thinking. Likewise, suspicious thoughts “dispose kings to tyranny, husbands to jealousy, wise men to irresolution and melancholy” (Bacon 84) and the husbands decide to peep at the couples to find out the truth. When they catch them *in flagrante delicto*, they kill the lovers because “not only do they suffer from *celos de amor* when they see their wives’ attentions to another man, they also suffer from *celos de honor*” (Stroud 130) as well. They cannot control the feelings of their wives but they exert their authority to restore their honour. After the secret examination of their wives behaviours, the husbands think that they are morally-defect and eventually punish them. The jealous women –Casandra, Aurora, Fiormonda- struggle to win the ones they love back but the cuckolded, jealous men –the Duke of Ferrara and the Duke of Pavy- decide to punish their wives. Their solution to the problem of adultery is a severe one: they can only avenge the wrong and soothe their distorted mind through murder. Just as the Senecan protagonists, they take law into their own hands and employ violence in reprisal for the adulterous behaviours of their wives. The jealous, old-aged husbands terminate the object of their jealousy. Since both women are not the mere owners of the title and they can become a Duchess only through marriage, they can rebel against their husbands to some extent and eventually they are exposed to violence without hope of salvation.

As said above, the husbands also suffer from their actions, though. Living in a society which prescribes them to kill the dishonourers, the husbands are left with one choice which puts them in the most unfortunate position. The Duke of Ferrara kills the lovers but he remains in a desperate situation with a broken heart unable to know what to do. Philippo Caraffa experiences the worse and he kills himself since he

regrets that he has hastily killed his wife without consideration. The lovers at least have a mitigating factor that they die for the sake of love yet the husbands merely turn out to be the victims of the social conventions. The Dukes, who initially appear as the happiest of the humankind, find themselves in the most grieving positions.

[H]onour [seems to be] a mysterious power looking down on everyone's life, forcing people to abandon their feelings and natural inclinations, sometimes forcing them to acts of sublime sacrifice. (Defourneaux 34)

The lovers cannot withstand love's overwhelming power and select between salvation and damnation. The women prefer to lose their chastity, to rebel against the matrimonial bond and to face with damnation. When their guilt is manifested, they have to undergo punishment. Before sentenced to death, however, they experience a process of temptation, accusation and defence: although both Casandra and Bianca reject the advances of Federico and Fernando due to their matrimonial responsibilities, in the long run they surrender to love. After being accused of adultery, they defend themselves and their feelings. They do not remain silent, they confess their real emotions and they are judged to be guilty.

Actually, love is the fundamental reason of these events in *Love's Sacrifice* and *El castigo*. Monson lists the courtly themes repeated by Andreas Capellanus as

the ennobling power of love, the necessity for fidelity and for concealment, the haughtiness of the lady, the danger of slanderers, the importance of sight and beauty in the generation of love, the passion of the lover, the beloved as object of dreams and meditation, and love as a cause of suffering and death. (97)

Considering the items listed above, it is safe to conclude that both plays are heavily influenced by the conventions of courtly love. The grand love stories of Bianca-Fernando and Casandra-Federico make all these features observable in both plays. The ennobling power of love is undeniable since all lovers ascend to heavens for the sake of love. Despite being sentenced to death, the lovers never give up love and

become the martyrs of love. Without their soul mates, they cannot find a purpose to live. Casandra becomes the soul-giver of Federico while Fernando considers himself a dead body during Bianca's absence.

Whatever happens, the lovers always remain loyal to each other: Fernando never sets his eyes on Fiormonda, Federico rejects Aurora. Similarly, Bianca and Casandra give up their husbands because of their fidelity to genuine love. Furthermore, since theirs is a forbidden love, they are forced to conceal their feelings and nobody should notice their meetings.

There is always the danger of slanderers: Aurora catches the lovers and informs the Duke of Ferrara through a letter just as Fiormonda and D'Avolos see Bianca and Fernando kissing. The slanderers notify the affair as soon as possible which turns the devout love into a cause of suffering and death.

In both plays, the great love stories always start at-first-sight. The ladies are extremely beautiful while the gentlemen are handsome and polite. Their love is always passionate and fearless. Since they are in love, they undermine the social rules. They cannot resist love's power. Although they do not succumb to love initially, the lovers never hesitate to voice their devotion soon. When unable to unite, they always suffer, life becomes meaningless and they meditate on love at length.

Lope benefits from the idea of destiny of classical plays: fate and coincidence also have undeniable effects in their relations. Casandra meets Federico when she most needs help after her carriage is broken besides she encounters him before her husband-would-be. That is, when she sees the Duke of Ferrara, she has already been attracted to Federico. Similarly, Bianca can meet Fernando because it is Filippo Caraffa's best friend. Caraffa himself creates the chance for them to fall in love. The characters themselves shape their destinies but it is indubitable that the cruel fate triggers a chain of events.

As well as fate, the woman also plays a fundamental role in both plays. The harmony, prevalent before their arrival, is disturbed soon since one of the men-ironically not the husband is attracted by her beauty. The Duke of Ferrara and Federico as a father and a son do not have any

problems but Casandra's presence change their relationship. Similarly, Filippo Caraffa and Fernando are fond of each other till Bianca interferes. Either by themselves or through tertiary characters, the husbands soon realize the strange situation they are part of. Combined with the dramatic motives of revenge and jealousy, they decide to restore their honour by means of bloodshed. Just as the husbands cannot give up their vengeful intentions, the lovers cannot abandon love:

For love *is* strong as death;  
Jealousy *is* cruel as the grave: (Song of Solomon 8.6)

Both plays pose the same question: marriage without love or love without marriage, which one is more precious? Marriage is a sacred bond and God orders humankind to marry and procreate. However, unless it is based on love, marriage becomes unbearable. Therefore, the women devote themselves to genuine love and defend it against social conventions. They even do not hesitate to sacrifice themselves. Their love makes the couples invincible even in the face of death. Considering the fact that love is a natural feeling as opposed to matrimony being an artificial contract, one cannot help but sympathize with the lovers and celebrate them for their courageous commitment to love.

It is safe to conclude that both plays have circular plot structures. In circular plot, the action ends where it starts and this structure is applicable to both plays. In *Punishment Without Revenge*, the Duke marries Casandra because he is in need of a wife to produce a legitimate heir but he kills his wife and he cannot find a solution to the problem of illegitimacy in the end. In *Love's Sacrifice*, the Duke of Pavy marries Bianca because he has been attracted to her but he ends up murdering her due to her alleged adultery. He gets married to be happy but he turns out to be the one who sinks into suffering and despair. Similarly, the forbidden lovers *Casandra-Federico* and *Bianca-Fernando* strive hard so as not to cheat on their beloved ones but they cannot do so and finally they indulge in forbidden love affairs. Casandra is conscious of the responsibilities of her marriage and she is sure that betrayal will bring about her death but she cannot resist love's power as well as her desire to take revenge. Similarly, Bianca harshly rejects Fernando three times



and even prefers to “prostitute [her] blood / To some envenomed serpent than admit / [His] bestial dalliance” (II.III.73-75) but eventually she is conquered by his love and forgets her vows. The characters meditate upon their decisions but they end up with doing just the opposite of what they have thought.

Based on a detailed analysis, it is safe to conclude that both *El castigo* and *Love’s Sacrifice* bear the characteristics of Greco-Roman drama tradition. Since they are written during the Renaissance period, however, some deviations are observed. To start with the similarities, being tragedies, both plays vividly portray the human suffering just as Medea or Sophocles suffered centuries ago. In Senecan plays, the characters are always motivated by a basic drive which approximates them to their doom. In *El castigo* and *Love’s Sacrifice*, all the characters discussed above are driven by their feelings of jealousy, honour and revenge. They cannot control their desires and eventually they confront death.

Murder is an indispensable part of a tragedy. The audience sees blood and witnesses multiple deaths on stage. Federico, Casandra, Fernando, Bianca, the Duke of Pavy and Ferentes all die before the eyes of the audience and horror over horror captivates the ones watching them. The playwrights intentionally put violence on stage so that they can stimulate the audience. As Lord Byron in *Don Juan* expresses, whether it is an ancient or a Renaissance one, “all tragedies are finished by death” (Robertson 70).

Ford and Lope are influenced by Seneca when choosing their themes who employs infanticide and adultery in his plays and similarly, the women of *Love’s Sacrifice* and *El castigo* commit adultery or the Duke of Ferrara kills his son.

The passions of jealousy, hatred, ambition, revenge and love create a chain of events because a hero pursues revenge as a result of a personal affront or humiliation. In *Love’s Sacrifice*, the Duke, due to his blind jealousy, decides to pursue revenge and his action causes multiple deaths. Similarly, the Duke of Ferrara in *El castigo* resolves to avenge the wrong because he feels humiliated and thinks that his honour has been

stained. Both men wait for the best opportunity to act. Nevertheless, they experience a momentary hesitation before killing their wives.

While some characters are driven by their passions of jealousy and revenge, some of them –Federico, Casandra, Fernando and Bianca– experience love's irresistible power and that is the reason why the audience comes across with the outbursts of passionate feelings. The suppressed women express their love towards the forbidden men; they voice their feelings about why they cannot love their husbands. Likewise, upon learning about adultery, the husbands lengthily express their agonies. They can portray their emotions through soliloquies just as their Greco-Roman counterparts. When expressing how they feel, the characters employ lofty language and they make use of mythological allusions.

Fate has an undeniable effect on characters since they have to fulfil the will of the gods in the classical plays. The same idea of destiny can also be observed in *Love's Sacrifice* and in *El castigo*. Casandra and Federico meet on the way when she most desperately needs someone to help him and they experience love-at-first sight. Similarly, Bianca and Fernando can only meet because the Duke of Pavy marries her.

Renaissance as the rediscovery of the ancient wealth served as a Muse for the Renaissance people and the Renaissance playwrights were influenced by the Greco-Roman tragedies as a result of which above mentioned episodes have been observed. Both *Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge* belong to the Renaissance age, however, some differences are also detected.

Greco-Roman plays follow three unities of action, time and place. Lope and Ford disregard these unities, though. Indeed, Lope in his *Arte nuevo* openly states that he is against using them. His play covers a time span of five months and it includes place shifts. Ford does not specify the time span but it is understood that it takes more than one day and he also uses different places as his setting. Ford and Lope do not follow the unity of action either: while the former adds the Ferentes-Julia-Colona-Morona sub-plot to his main plot, Lope creates a parallel love story of Aurora and the Marquis as a sub-plot.

While the Greco-Roman plays displayed man's helplessness towards the divine power, in the Renaissance plays, the idea of free will and the responsibility of an individual have been emphasized. In the classical plays, the hero was a puppet-like character in the hands of numerous gods and goddesses. The Christian tradition, however, shattered the idea of the multiplicity of gods. The Scripture accepted only one almighty God for the creation of human beings. Although God created the humankind, he gave them free will to decide what to do and in turn the men chose between sin and benevolence. As *El castigo* and *Love's Sacrifice* are the plays of the Renaissance period, it is observed that the playwrights give their characters freedom to act as they wish. Instead of the pagan gods, the characters feel responsible against God's order. Thus, the ideas of salvation, damnation and sin are embedded in the texts. The characters do not want to commit adultery since they know that the Scripture strictly forbids it.

Since the plays bear Christian influences, the reader does not come across with morals delivered through Delphi oracles or ghosts asking for vengeance but the playwrights make use of mythological figures and introduce classical names such as Aurora and Casandra.

The themes of jealousy, honour, revenge and love pervade *Love's Sacrifice* and *Punishment Without Revenge*. Both tragedies are the representations of the fatal consequences of submission to love while disregarding marriage as a social institution. The lovers of the plays are victimized by the pressures imposed upon them by their cultures and when they decide to act in accordance with their individual desires, they become the sacrifices of the mismatched old-aged husband- young wife marriages.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Donald K., Jr. *John Ford*. New York: Twayne, 1972. Print.
- Anderson, Robert. *The Works of the British Poets*. London, 1795. *Google Book Search*. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. S. H. Butcher. 2013. PDF file.
- Bacon, Francis. *The Essays or Counsels, Civil and Moral, of Francis Ld. Verulam Viscount St. Albans and the New Atlantis*. 2007. PDF file.
- Barajona, Renato. *Sex Crimes, Honour, and the Law in Early Modern Spain: Vizcaya, 1528-1735*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003. Print.
- Barber, C. L. *The Idea of Honour in the English Drama 1591-1700*. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1957. Print.
- Barash, David P., and Judith Eve Lipton. *Payback: Why We Retaliate Redirect Aggression, and Take Revenge*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
- Barker, Simon, and Hilary Hinds, eds. *The Routledge Anthology of Renaissance Drama* London: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Barthes, Roland. *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 2010. Print.
- Bowman, Sylvia E., ed. *John Ford*. By Donald K. Anderson, Jr. New York: Twayne, 1972. Print.
- Ben-Ze'ev, Aaron. "Jealousy and Romantic Love." *Handbook of Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Multidisciplinary Approaches*. Ed. Sybil L. Hart and Maria Legerstee. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. 40-54. Print.
- Bradbrook, M.C. *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969. Print.
- Breitenberg, Mark. "Anxious Masculinity: Sexual Jealousy in Early Modern England." *Feminist Studies* 19.2 (1993): 377-98. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.

- Brewster, William T., trans. *The New Art of Making Plays*. By Lope de Vega. New York: Dramatic Museum of Columbia U, 1914. PDF file.
- Bowers, Fredson. *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1966. Print.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. London, 1883. PDF file.
- Buscaglia, Leo. *Love*. Greenwich: Fawcett, 1972. Print.
- Bywater, Imgram. *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*. New York: Oxford UP, 1920. Print.
- Campbell, Jodi. *Monarchy, Political Culture, and Drama in Seventeenth-century Madrid: Theater of Negotiation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. Print.
- Camus, Albert. "Reflections on the Guillotine." *Resistance, Rebellion and Death*. Trans. Justin O'Brein. New York: Knopf, 1960. PDF file.
- Capellanus, Andreas. *The Art of Courtly Love*. Trans. John Jay Parry. New York: Columbia UP, 1960. Print.
- Carter, Ronald, and John McRae. *The Routledge History of Literature in English: Britain and Ireland*. London: Routledge, 1997. Print
- Craig, Hardin. "The Shackling of Accidents: A Study of Elizabethan Tragedy." *Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. J. Kaufmann. New York: Oxford UP, 1961. 22-40. Print.
- Defourneaux, Marcelin. *Daily Life in Spain in the Golden Age*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1979. *Google Book Search*. Web. 26 Sept. 2012.
- Denomy, Alexander J. "Courtly Love and Courtliness." *Speculum* 28.1 (1953): 44-63. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.
- Dixon, Victor. "Lope's Knowledge." *A Companion to Lope de Vega*. Ed. Alexander Samson and Jonathan Thacker. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2008. 15-28. Print.
- Eliot, T.S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1951. Print.
- Evans, Peter W. "Character and Context in *El castigo sin venganza*." *Modern Language Review* 74.2 (1979): 321-334. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.

- Ewing, Blaine S. *Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford*. New York: Octagon, 1969. Print.
- Edwards, Gwynne. *The Prison and the Labyrinth: Studies in Calderonian Tragedy*. Cardiff: Wales UP, 1978. Print.
- . Introduction. *Three Major Plays*. By Lope de Vega. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. vii-xli. Print.
- Fehr, Beverley. "A Prototype Approach to Studying Love." *The New Psychology of Love*. Ed. Robert J. Sternberg and Karin Weis. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006. 225-48. Print.
- Ferber, Michael. *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- Fitcher, William L. *Lope de Vega's El castigo del descrito: Together with a Study of Conjugal Honor in His Theater*. New York: Instituto de las Españas, 1925. Print.
- Flores, Angel, ed. *Masterpieces of the Spanish Golden Age*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957. Print.
- Ford, John. *Love's Sacrifice*. Ed. A. T. Moore. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002. Print.
- . *Three Plays: 'Tis Pity She's A Whore, The Broken Heart, Perkin Warbeck*. London: Penguin, 1985. Print.
- Foyster, Elizabeth A. *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex, and Marriage*. London: Longman, 1999. *Google Book Search*. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- Gerstinger, Heinz. *Lope de Vega and Spanish Drama*. Trans. Samuel R. Rosenbaum. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1974. Print.
- Greer, Margaret R. "Spanish Golden Age Tragedy: From Cervantes to Calderón." *A Companion to Revenge Tragedy*. Ed. Rebecca Bushnell. Malden: Blackwell, 2005. 351-69. Print.
- Harrison, G. B. Introduction. *Webster and Ford: Selected Plays*. London: Dent, 1933. vii-xii. Print.
- Hayes, Francis C. *Lope de Vega*. New York: Twayne, 1967. Print.

- Hatfield, Elaine, and G. William Walster. *A New Look At Love: A Revealing Report on the Most Elusive of All Emotions*. Lanham: UP of America, 1985. *Google Book Search*. Web. 10 Nov. 2012.
- Highet, Gilbert. *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1957. Print.
- The Holy Bible*. 2012. PDF file.
- Horace. *Ars Poetica*. 2012. PDF file.
- Huebert, Ronald. *John Ford: Baroque English Dramatist*. Cambridge: McGill- Queen's UP, 1977. Print.
- Hopkins, Lisa. *The Female Hero in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. Print.
- , ed. *'Tis Pity She's A Whore: A Critical Guide*. London: Continuum, 2010. Print.
- Hume, David. *Four Dissertations and Essays on Suicide and the Immorality of the Soul*. South Bend: St. Augustine's P, 2000. Print.
- Hatfield, Elaine and Richard L. Rapson. *Love, Sex, and Intimacy: Their Psychology, Biology, and History*. New York: Harper Collins, 1993. *Google Book Search*. Web. 25 Oct. 2012.
- Hendrick, Clyde, and Susan S. Hendrick. "Styles of Romantic Love." *The New Psychology of Love*. Ed. Robert J. Sternberg and Karin Weis. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006. 149-70. Print.
- Ingber, Alix. "Lope Félix de Vega Carpio." *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook*. Ed. Mary Parker. Westport: Greenwood, 1998. Print.
- Ingram, Martin. *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988. Print.
- . "Family and Household." *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. 93-108. Print.
- Jacoby, Susan. *Wild Justice: The Evolution of Revenge*. New York: Harper and Row, 1983. *Google Book Search*. Web. 25 Oct. 2012.
- "Jealousy." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1989. *OED Online*. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.

- Johnson, Geraldine A. *Renaissance Art: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.
- Jones, Joseph Estil. "Contributions of Lope de Vega to the Golden Age of Spanish Drama." *Rice Institute Pamphlet* 23. 2 (1936): 134-58. JSTOR. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- Keeble, N. H., comp. and ed. *The Cultural Identity of Seventeenth-century Woman: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 1994. PDF file.
- Keenan, Siobhan. *Renaissance Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2008. Print.
- Kennedy, Edward Donald. "Medieval Drama." *Western Drama Through the Ages: A Student Reference Guide*. Ed. Kimball King. Vol. 1. Westport: Greenwood P, 2007. 81-94. Print.
- Kerrigan, John. *Revenge Tragedy: Aeschylus to Armageddon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996. *Google Book Search*. Web. 20 Nov. 2012.
- Kluge, Sophie. "A Hermaphrodite? Lope de Vega and the Controversy of Tragicomedy." *Comparative Drama* 41.3 (2007): 297-333. EBSCOHOST. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- Larson, Donald R. *The Honor Plays of Lope de Vega*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977. Print.
- Lee, John Alan. *The Colors of Love: An Exploration of the Ways of Loving*. New York: New Press, 1973. PDF file.
- Leech, Clifford. *John Ford*. London: Longmans, Green & CO, 1964.
- . *John Ford and the Drama of His Time*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1957. Print.
- . *Tragedy: A Critical Idiom*. London: Methuen & CO, 1969. Print.
- Lo, Louis. *Male Jealousy: Literature and Film*. London: Continuum, 2008. Print.
- "Love." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1989. *OED Online*. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- MacKendrick, Paul, and Herbert M. Howe, eds. *Classics in Translation*. Vol. 2. Wisconsin: U of Wisconsin P, 1952. Print.



- McGrady, Donald. "The Comic Treatment of Conjugal Honor in Lope's *Las Ferias de Madrid*." *Hispanic Review* 41.1 (1973): 33-42. JSTOR. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.
- Middleton, Thomas. *Five Plays*. London: Penguin, 1988. Print.
- Moller, Herbert. "The Meaning of Courtly Love." *Journal of American Folklore* 73.287 (1960): 39-52. JSTOR. Web. 10 Nov. 2012.
- Monson, Don A. *Andreas Capellanus, Scholasticism, & the Courtly Tradition*. Washington: The Catholic U of America P, 2005. Print.
- Mowat, Ronald Rae. *Morbid Jealousy and Murder: A Psychiatric Study of Morbidly Jealous Murderers at Broadmoor*. London: Tavistock, 1966. Print.
- Oliver, H.J. *The Problem of John Ford*. Victoria: Melbourne UP, 1955. Print.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen. *The Renaissance: A Sourcebook*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Ovid. *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. Trans. J.H. Mozley. Cambridge: Harvard UP; London: Heinemann, 1979. Print.
- Parker, Mary. Introduction. *Spanish Dramatists of the Golden Age: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook*. Ed. Mary Parker. Westport: Greenwood, 1998. Print.
- Peristiany, Jean G., ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1965. Print.
- Petrarca, Francesco. *Il Canzoniere*. 2012. PDF file.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. "Honour and Social Status." *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Ed. Jean G. Peristiany. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1965. 21-77. Print.
- "Poison." *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. CD-ROM.
- Porter, Pamela. *Courtly Love in Medieval Manuscripts*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2003. Print.
- Pronko, Leonard C. "Closed and Open Societies: The Revenge Dramas of Japan, Spain, and England" *Revenge Drama in European*

*Renaissance and Japanese Theatre: From Hamlet to Madame Butterfly*. Ed. Kevin J. Wetmore, Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 29-44. Print.

Quinn, Edward. *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Infobase, 2006. Print.

Reichenberger, Arnold G. "The Uniqueness of the Comedia." *Hispanic Review* 27.3 (1959): 303-16. JSTOR. Web. 10 Nov. 2012.

"Religion." *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 8th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. CD-ROM.

Robertson, Connie. *Dictionary of Quotations*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1998. *Google Book Search*. Web. 20 Jan. 2013.

Rogers, Brett M. "Classic Greek and Roman Drama." *Western Drama Through the Ages: A Student Reference Guide*. Ed. Kimball King. Vol. 1. Westport: Greenwood P, 2007. 3-29. Print.

Rougemont, Denis de. *Love in the Western World*. Trans. Montgomery Belgion. New York: Pantheon, 1956.

Sacks, David. *Encyclopedia of the Ancient Greek World*. New York: Facts On File, 2005. *Google Book Search*. Web. 10 Jan. 2013.

Sade, Marquis de. *Justine, Philosophy in the Bedroom, & Other Writings*. New York: Grove P, 1965. *Google Book Search*. Web. 25 Dec. 2012.

Schelling, Felix E. *Foreign Influences in Elizabethan Plays*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1923. Print.

Schultz, James. *A Courtly Love, the Love of Courtliness, and the History of Sexuality*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006. Print.

Secomb, Linnell. *Philosophy and Love: From Plato to Popular Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2007. Print.

Sensabaugh, G.F. *The Tragic Muse of John Ford*. New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1944. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. 670-713. Print.

- . *Othello, the Moor of Venice. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. 818-57. Print.
- . *Troilus and Cressida. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. 714-52. Print.
- . *Twelfth Night. The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. 641-69. Print.
- Sharpteen, Don J., and Lee A. Kirkpatrick. "Romantic Jealousy and Adult Attachment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 72.3 (1997): 627-40. JSTOR. Web. 20 Sept. 2012.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe. *Epipsychidion*. 2012. Microsoft Word file.
- Simpson, Percy. *The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan Tragedy*. London: Folcroft, 1970. Print.
- Singer, Irving. *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: MIT P, 2009. Print.
- . *The Nature of Love: Courtly and Romantic*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: MIT P, 2009. Print.
- . *The Nature of Love: the Modern World*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: MIT P, 2009. Print.
- Smith, Emma, and Garrett A. Sullivan, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Tragedy*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.
- Soergel, Philip M., ed. *Arts and Humanities through the Eras: The Age of the Baroque and Enlightenment 1600–1800*. Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale, 2005. Print.
- Stavig, Mark. *John Ford and the Traditional Moral Order*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1968. Print
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. New York: Harper and Row, 1977. Print.
- Stroud, Matthew D. *Fatal Union: A Pluralistic Approach to the Spanish Wife-Murder Comedias*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1990. Print.

- Sturgess, Keith, ed. *John Ford, Three Plays: 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, The Broken Heart, Perkin Warbeck*. London: Penguin, 1985. Print.
- Taylor, Scott K. *Honor and Violence in Golden Age Spain*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008. Print.
- Thacker, Jonathan. *A Companion to Golden Age Theatre*. Woodbridge: Tamesis, 2007. Print.
- Thompson, Currie K. "Unstable Irony in Lope de Vega's *El castigo sin venganza*." *Studies in Philology* 78.3 (1981): 224-240. JSTOR. Web. 25 Nov. 2012.
- Ure, Peter, ed. *The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth*. By John Ford. London: Methuen & CO, 1968. Print.
- "Uxoricide." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1989. OED Online. Web. 10 Sept. 2012.
- Vega, Lope de. *Fuente Ovejuna. Three Major Plays*. Trans. Gwynne Edwards. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 1-79. Print.
- . *Los comendadores de Córdoba*. 2012. PDF file.
- . *Punishment Without Revenge. Three Major Plays*. Trans. Gwynne Edwards. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 169-266. Print.
- Vellacott, Philip. Introduction. *The Oresteian Trilogy*. By Aeschylus. Penguin: London, 1959. 9-37. Print.
- . Introduction. *Medea and Other Plays*. By Euripides. London: Penguin, 1963. 7-16. Print.
- Wagschal, Steven. *Literature of Jealousy in the Age of Cervantes*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2007. Print.
- Wardropper, Bruce W. "Honor in the Sacramental Plays of Valdivielso and Lope de Vega." *Modern Language Notes* 66.2 (1951): 81-88. JSTOR. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.
- Watling, E.F. Introduction. *Theban Plays*. By Sophocles. London: Penguin, 1974. 7-22. Print.
- Webster, John. *The White Devil*. Ed. John Russell Brown. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996. Google Book Search. Web. 20 Oct. 2012.

- Wetmore, Kevin J., Jr., ed. *Revenge Drama in European Renaissance and Japanese Theatre: From Hamlet to Madame Butterfly*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. Print.
- White, Gregory L. "Jealousy and Partner's Perceived Motives for Attraction to a Rival." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 44.1 (1981): 24-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.
- Wilkinson, Melvin L. "Romantic Love and Sexual Expression." *Family Coordinator* 27.2 (1978): 141-48. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov. 2012.
- Wilson, F. P. "Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama." *Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Ed. R. J. Kaufmann. New York: Oxford UP, 1961. 3-21. Print.
- Yarbro-Bejarano, Yvonne. *Feminism and the Honor Plays of Lope de Vega*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 1994. Print.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

#### ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### YAZARIN

Soyadı: AYDOĞDU

Adı: MERVE

Bölümü: YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ

**TEZİN ADI:** TRAGEDY AT COURT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JEALOUSY, HONOUR, REVENGE AND LOVE IN JOHN FORD'S *LOVE'S SACRIFICE* AND LOPE DE VEGA'S *PUNISHMENT WITHOUT REVENGE*

**TEZİN TÜRÜ:** Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası:

Tarih: 14.02.2013