Chapman’s *The Revenge of Bussy D’Ambois*: Fixity and the Absolute Man
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In all successes Fortune and the day
To me alike are; I am fix’d, be she
Never so fickle;...1

In a world where man is insignificant “unless he be a politician” (I. ii. 141), Clermont D’Ambois, the most reluctant and unlikely of avengers, devotes himself quite assiduously to being “no politician” and “no lawyer” (IV. i. 48, 57). However, his significance is not to be doubted. He does not suffer for being no “great and politicke man... [who] Never explores himself to find his faults.”2 Moreover, he offers no pale recastings of the desire to enjoy fame in a statue; hence, he is also unlike the “slight man” who stands “Starke as a statue” and “Whose learning formes not lifes integritie.”3 His lack of such greatness and sleightness seems commendable indeed. But Chapman’s gleanings from Wolfius’s *Epictetus* furnish more than foils for his Senecal hero. The poetry he composed at about the same time as the play corroborates the durability of Clermont, for “Best men are long in making.”4 The power of such a hero resides not in overt bluster but in learning-infused calm which can permit him to demonstrate the same yielding strength Chapman described in “Of Sufferance.” The confident bearer of a truly humane crown, “this absolute Clermont” (II. i. 90) impresses his audience with the stoic reserve of his position “To love nothing outward” (IV. v. 4).

Yet when “all is one” (IV. v. 13), such reserve seems almost inaccessible: the depiction of a “Senecal Saint”5 can tax even hagiographic enthusiasts. But while Chapman’s play is predictably demanding and scant of the immediate rewards which an impatient reader might expect, its hero is no milquetoast fifth business desperately injected as a catalyst for action. Whether lecturing on the contemporary and ancient theatre (I. i. 323-74), or clarifying his creed of absolutism (IV. v. 4-13), or explaining oneiromantia (V. i. 42-53), or reflecting on anamnesis (V. v. 128-38), Clermont is evidently a personage to be reckoned with. And perhaps because he is just such a curious authority and such a temperamentally ill-suited avenger (III. ii. 109-16), he remains a difficult yet undeniably dominant character. In addition to his usually self-appointed eminence as a pundit, Clermont moves in a play that seems crowded with incidents both unintentionally humorous and outrageously bizarre. The appearances of a bloodthirsty virago, eager to accept — if not usurp — the duty of her philosophic brother, a pusillanimous criminal who must be coaxed into a duel of revenge, and a noble mistress who blinds herself in tears of grief afford studies in extremity which actually border on caricature. Maybe as more of a reflection of the reader than the playwright, this tragedy seems able to boast of a dash of cynicism in its repartees. Tenuous examples might include the thanks announced by the Guise “for this / Virtuous digression” (I. i. 375-6) following Clermont’s lecture on the theatre, the observation of Baligny about the ease with which Clermont stimulates digressions in others (II. i. 235-7), the comment of Maillard on the prettiness of the hero’s absolutism (IV. v. 14), and his remark on the euphony (if not the echo) of Clermont’s defense of the subject whose acts are governed by native noblesse (IV. v. 26). However, without forcing the play into the niche of a Ulyssian manifesto or a renunciation of Bussy,6 the reader might realize that its difficulty and
singularity reside in the figure of its hero. He imparts its at times benumbing aura of surety and calm determination. Despite his negation of the sort of conflict we may have considered germane to a tragic situation, Clermont’s rigorous and isolating Stoicism seems to me to account for and contain the essence of Chapman’s drama in a way comparable to the manner in which the Christianity of Corneille’s eponymous hero supplies the mantic fervour of Polybeute.

Chapman’s Clermont is his own creation — as historically unreal as he is distinctively alive. Not only did such a person never exist, but this fiction mangles to kill Montsoreau on stage when the actual Montsoreau was still alive. His creator borrowed the details of his capture from Grimestone’s account of the arrest of the bastard D’Auvergne. Swinburne proposed that unfavourable response to this sort of license apparently resulted in the defensive assertiveness of Chapman’s Preface, intended to silence those “maligners” who demand “autentical truth . . . in a poem, whose subject is not truth, but things like truth.”

Chapman’s natural fiction is as far removed from historical accuracy as from close association with his heroic predecessors. Even though verbal echoes and a proposed fraternal bond link Clermont with Bussy, these brothers and the plays in which each moves are as distinct from one another as they both are from Byron. Bussy and The Revenge share an out-of-joint world, ruled by “Fortune, not Reason” (Bussy D’Ambois, I. i. 1), and resembling “untun’d confusion” (The Revenge of Bussy D’Ambois, I. i. 12). But further verbal parallels only serve to outline the distance between them. When Monsieur describes Clermont as hanging “upon the ear of Guise, / Like to his jewel” (I. i. 152), we can understand this stoic’s different prominence as teacher of a patron and friend by recalling Henry’s explanation to his eagle of a subject, that “Truth’s words like jewels hang in th’ ears of Kings” (Bussy, III. ii. 6). When Monsieur invites Clermont to present “a true glass” (I. i. 194) of himself, he must fence with such a mirror more dextrously than he had to do with his brother (Bussy, III, ii. 327) in order to prod him into responding; Clermont eventually accepts by borrowing a phrase from Monsieur’s earlier taunting of Bussy. He informs his willing listener that he is apt for anything “But killing of the King” (I. i. 278), and the moment he starts using Bussy’s argument about the random greatness of birth (Bussy, III. ii. 75-8; Revenge, I. i. 282-3), this interchange which never really began comes to an abrupt halt. Montsoreau’s treatment of his wife also uses images of the earlier play; when he speaks of blood no longer able to quench her lust which engenders with death (I. ii. 27-32), he recalls both his own vicious picture of Tamyra as a Siren dashing Bussy’s “ruffi’n Galley” (V. i. 61) against Montsoury’s rocks and Bussy’s assessment of Monsieur’s penchant to “kiss horror, and with death engender” (III. ii. 399). This vituperative cuckold describes himself as haunted by the Furies (I. ii. 102), but Bussy had early asserted his desire to be the haunter of his court enemies (I. ii. 194). The biggest difference between the two plays clearly resides in the attributes of the heroes; as the Guise characterizes Clermont, in contrast to his brother:

He hath the crown of man, and all his parts
Which learning is; and that so true and virtuous
That it gives power to do as well as say
Whatever fits a most accomplish’d man;
Which Bussy, for his valour’s season lack’d;
And so was rapt with outrage oftentimes
Beyond decorum. (II. i. 84-90)
Clermont affords less evident contrasts with Byron too. While Crequi used the example of "the camel that of Jove begg’d horns" (Conspiracy, IV. i. 139) to underscore the wrongheadedness of the Duke, Clermont himself uses the same example (II. i. 176-7) when preaching about the seemly exteriors of pompous French nobles. The picture of Clermont on his brave Scotch steed (II. i. 246-9) is predictably less detailed and encomiastic than that of Byron on Pastrana (Conspiracy, II. ii. 67-81), but so is the Atlas-like prominence which Clermont assigns to the Guise (II. i. 266-7)11 distinct from and superior to the Atlas-like role of Hercules which Byron petulantly arrogates as his thankless task (Tragedy, III. i. 151-3). Reminiscent of the Bussy of the green retreat, Clermont has no colossic designs; he knows how soon silly height can topple (III. ii. 59-60). His depiction of the God-like strength in man that yields only to the divine cosmic frame (III. iv. 66-71) and of the subject "Who breaks no law [and] is subject to no king" (IV. v. 25) recalls Bussy's defense of his own prelapsarian magnificence as one "Who to himself is law, no law doth need, / Offends no King, and is a King indeed" (II. i. 203-4). Yet The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois leaves us with only faint glimmerings of the earlier hero. When Aumale describes the captured Clermont "As something sacred fallen out of the sky" (V. i. 39), could Chapman be asking us to consider this brother as a fallen spark of Bussy's Herculean stellation? And when the assuaged Charlotte decides to "turn to earth" (V. v. 203), could she not be affording a subtle intimation that only through bloodied experience has she been able to acquire the ascetic wisdom12 of her brother's opening position, "Procumbit?"

But the wisdom of Clermont is by no means absent from The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois. In fact, it provides the peculiar élan of this play. A hero who so totally incarnates Epictetus's motto of αὐτόκειον καὶ αὐτόκειον13 seems bound to pose a problem to approach with justice and without a disinterested yawn or a suspicious smirk. We remember that Strozza had his virtuous Cynanche convincing him of the rightness of stoic endurance and so, by the sacred medicine of patience, was able to bring about his own cure and proclaim himself a virtuous man.14 Similarly, the studious Clarence in his love of Eugenia was able to bare his musical soul, yet still remain Momford's "strange and riddle-speaking friend."15 True, Clermont enjoys the friendship of the Guise and the devotion of the Countess but, in a more covert way, he stands alone.16 The play's images demonstrate this singularity in action. The teeter-totter of dichotomies that we may have come to recognize as Chapman signposts balances its way into a delicate equipoise and finally appropriates a rigid stasis that becomes quite unimportant in the stoic scheme of things. Clermont's fire, which others assign to him, never shows the characteristics of spontaneous combustion, but rather, only blazes forth in controlled and determined instances. His unquestioned nobility seems to endanger (if not victimize) itself by being so unpoltic and "credulous" (IV. iii. 81). And yet his Epictetan crown enables him to endure and surpass what others consider curiosities; his final gesture proves how completely he lived "never . . . / To please man worldly" (V. v. 162-3).

Clermont's learning affords not only the crown of the man but the direction of his life and the ambience of the play. It is not merely an enchanting "bubble" (I. i. 262); on the contrary, it is a lifelong and philosophic devotion. Clermont studies "How to be truly noble, truly wise" (I. i. 151), for his learning is "but an art to live well" (1. 170).17 Even Monsieur lauds him, albeit pragmatically, in recognizing that Clermont's "soul, more learn
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is more ingenuous, / Searching, judicial" (11. 216-7); in a similar vein, the moral adjuration of the completely Christianized Ghost of Bussy — "Reform, ye ignorant men, your manless lives" (V. i. 15) — indicates the chastened and sober tenor of this play. Since learning is "the crown of man" (II. i. 84), how fitting it is that Clermont praises Edward de Vere, patron of the arts and seventeenth Earl of Oxford, for having been "Valiant, and learn'd, and liberal as the sun" (III. iv. 92). Equally judicious in the light of his subject and the nature of the playwright is the stirring paean which the Guise offers in defense of his friend, one of "unwearied mind / Rightly to virtue framed" (IV. iv. 14-5). Clermont's knowledge involves the seeming paradoxes of ascent and fixity. "The great rising / And learning of his soul" (11. 25-6), the Guise contends, confirm his position as "this Senecal man" (1. 42), just as they ensure that "Fix'd in himself, he still is one to all" (1. 46).

Such Senecalism is really far from rigid, for the energizing vitality of Clermont's knowledge throws into relief the death-in-life existence of others. "Noblesse" is "lost" and "quick buried" (II. i. 153) in Montsurr; the foiled Baligny reflects that being "buried quick" seems better than existing as a mere puppet or "property for state" (IV. iv. 57-8); and the surviving female trio, having decided that "Too easy 'tis to die," resolves to " forsake the world" and "to cloisters fly" (V. v. 209, 212, 208), as Henry sepulchrally intones the play's knell by pronouncing "this fatal room / . . . the famous D'Ambois tomb" (11. 218-9).

While Clermont's absolutism naturally creates contrasts, the dominant characteristic of his temperament is to cancel out extremes and polarities and reduce them to either stoic calm or utter triviality. Living in a "declining kingdom" (I. i. 1) so inferior to its previous state wherein "things most lawful / Were once most royal" (11. 19-20), Clermont does indeed contemn the appearances which Epernon ably summarizes as "outward greatness, and the guises / That vulgar great ones make their pride and zeal" (11. 155-6). His unflagging concern is with things inward and contemplative; Ficinian reasoning supported a similar stand, arguing that "if . . . the way of inner or spiritual ascent is the real access to the good and perfect life, all outward life which is directed away from contemplation must be qualified as bad and imperfect." Clermont is the Florentine's echo as he denounces the vapidity of the "Huge heaps of outside in these mighty men" (1. 311), the mental deprivation of "these painted men, / All set on out-side" (II. i. 192-3), and the faulty logic of those who esteem honour "with wise men, as the price / And value of their virtuous services" (III. ii. 30-1). When outlining the poles separating good and bad, he also makes it clear that the pursuit of matter always shortchanges the mind:

... Good and bad hold never
Anything common; you can never find
Things' outward care, but you neglect your mind. (III. iv. 55-7)

The fixity he adopts in the face of good or ill fortune permits him to envisage the accomplishment of the rare human feat, "to join himself with th' Universe / In his main sway, and make (in all things fit) / One with that All, and go on round as it" (IV. i. 139-41).

While the Guise corroborates Clermont's attainment of Senecal absolutism (IV. iv. 42-6), the hero himself continues his steadfast campaign against "the unprofitable things" (IV. v. 38) which consume our attention and in favour of "All that doth profit" (1. 40) which we neglect. Because of the silence of this heroic "mouthpiece," the Countess concludes
with an antithesis which Clermont may have considered singularly apposite, in the promise that she will “In heaven’s course comfort seek, in earth is none” (V. v. 215).

In addition to the dichotomies which it tends to subsume, Clermont’s vitality is of a very cautious and self-controlled sort. He is hardly the type of the blood-crazed, treacherous avenger; the inimitable Charlotte can safely lay claim to these traits as her sole domain. Rarely is the mention of bloodshed associated with Clermont. Frequently, however, is it connected with Charlotte who, in the testimony of her husband, “thirsts for” (I. i. 118) it and who herself anxiously awaits the attainment of Revenge’s “bloody laurel” (I. ii. 3). Her noble brother realizes that if her madness were given vent “blood would flow in rivers” (III. iv. 148). Renel commiserates with Baligny by describing the ferocity of Charlotte in this negative comparison: “There is no tiger not more tame than she” (IV. ii. 38). He also appears to sympathize with the outranked Lord-Lieutenant about the undesirability of such honour, in his remark that “Vile men advance’d live of the common blood” (1. 18).

And, before his death, the Guise adds an ominous coda to this view. The wounded Duke silences Henry’s specious logic about shedding his blood “to save the blood / Of many thousands” (V. iv. 50-1) with the prophecy that the King “will find one drop of blood shed lawless / Will be the fountain to a purple sea” (11. 52-3). Following such preparations, Clermont’s confrontation with Montsourry functions as a consciously bloody climax.

Although this hero is described as “fiery” (II. i. 92), we realize quickly that his fire is always controlled. Only Charlotte, “full of her brother’s fire” (I. i. 109), has hopes of being incendiary. For while Tamry muses about the weaker sense of scintillation cherishes in the memory of her lover “That (rarefying the thin and yielding air) / Flew sparkling up into the sphere of fire” (I. ii. 17-8), the Guise, “In chief heat of his [Clermont’s] faction” (I. i. 149), qualifies his attribution of fire to “this absolute Clermont” (II. i. 90) by adding that “He can control that fire, as hid in embers” (1. 94). Fulfilling Aumale’s dread about the irressible force of “his fiery hands” (III. i. 78), Clermont sparkles with lightning to elude his hired captors; even when halted, he reacts as Bussy’s brother, casting “a blaze of such disdain, / . . . / As something sacred fallen out of the sky” (IV. i. 37, 39). But as a friend and not a combatant, Clermont deports himself with characteristic temperance and reserve:

For when love kindles any knowing spirit,
It ends in virtue and effects divine
And is in friendship chaste and masculine. (V. i. 186-8)

His friend, though, is less stalwart and more approachable. Despite his contention that kingly justice “should be hot as fire” (IV. iv. 11), the Guise advances toward his own death with the understandable yet stoically disappointing awareness of fear “melting like snow within me with cold fire” (V. iv. 9).

The marine images of the play substantiate Clermont’s prominence as surely as they reflect unfavourably on other characters. Eulogized by the Guise for being “as true as tides” (II. i. 96), the hero is also a loyal ship’s mate who “now [his] master calls,” and seeing that the vessel of the Guise has sailed, resolves to cast himself “after him into the sea, / Rather than here live, ready every hour / To feed thieves, beasts, and be the slave of power” (V. v. 183, 190-2). His resolute stance is quite different from the position of
Henry, who is, as Renel images him, like the merchant whose "wealth is swoln in mind, / When yet the chief lord of it is the wind" (IV. ii. 27-8). The King's self-description is no more flattering either. In contrast to Peacham's emblem of the rock of manly constancy, Henry pictures himself to the dying Guise with this non-regal sort of negative comparison:

... nor is a rock, oppos'd
To all the billows of the churlish sea,
More beat and eaten with them than was I
With your ambitious mad idolatry. (V. iv. 46-9)

Clermont's studies have liberated him from such pitying characterizations. Even though he considers himself the benefactor, Monsieur attests that Clermont's manhood shows "spirit, and means, and lustre" (I. i. 89); later, Clermont defends the divine potential of true noblesse against the frozen conventions of "common nobles' fashions" (III. iv. 113). This knowledgeability renders him more of an astute observer and pedagogue than a protagonist.

As a teacher his most reliable aid is the pictographic analogy. Whether using a lion, a camel, or an eagle as his example, he always manages to deliver a message, whether about true noblesse, or deserved privilege, or undefiled taste. Ideally, this absolute teacher encourages his followers to uphold and further the advance of moderation and balance over intemperance and disproportion. As distinct as a picture from a real animal, or as a tamed lion from a wild one who still retains 'th' innative fire of spirit and greatness" (II. i. 159) is the soft French noble "Chain'd up in ease and numb security" (1. 163) from his truly noble potential. Similarly, "foolish great-spleen'd camels" (1. 176) who asked Jove for horns are comparable to the unwise who beg for meaningless privileges and whose questions never turn within (1. 193). The eagle furnishes a timely lesson in self-protectiveness, for the drawing in of its talons to avoid "rebating of their sharpness" (III. ii. 19) intimates an analogous path whereby our mental acumen need not be dulled by "vile and vulgar admirations" (1. 22). Clermont's use of such pictorial aids may not move us to elevate Chapman to any Audubon echelon, but it does cause us to realize how ably and completely this playwright, so aware of the verbal enargia "requird in absolute Poems," concurred with Webbe's adulation about the poet's multi-faceted and perspective-conscious vision: "In a picture some thing delighteth beeing sette farre of, something nearer, but a Poet should delight in all places as well in sunne as shaddowe." As befits an Epictetan proselytizer, Clermont's decisive criterion is balance. When he informs us that his main objection to revenge is the imbalance it causes between "private cause" and "public laws" (III. ii. 115-6), we might recall Horapollo's hieroglyph representing justice, the wing of an ostrich, chosen because it is "more equally balanced than any other bird." It is just this sort of well-complemented interrelationship that lies behind the Countess's toxophilic observation about government, "Kings are like archers, and their subjects, shafts" (IV. iii. 53).

With their unique blending of garrulous and homiletic flavours the word-pictures of this play provide the foremost indication of its singularity. Moreover, any discussion of the images of The Revenge would remain incomplete if it did not include some acknowledgement of the hero's closing and perhaps finest metaphorical display. Clermont's ante mortem analysis of disrobing affords a stirringly metaphysical return to synthesis:
The garment or the cover of the mind,  
The human soul is; of the soul, the spirit  
The proper robe is; of the spirit, the blood,  
And of the blood, the body is the shroud.  
With that must I begin then to unclothe,  
And come at th' other. (V. v. 170-5)

Its analytical progress is mathematically precise, yet its subject remains at the same time immensely accessible. For some readers this explication of his approaching death might be a temptation to reconstruct Herbert's dressing of Aaron30 by reversing the assumption of garments and hence of pastoral responsibility into the stripping of the body and its eschatological revelation of the soul. For others it may suggest a human though less arresting view of the Crashavian "purple wardrobe."31 For others still Clermont's journey of divestiture may seem to be following the dictates of such a Ficinian exhortation as: "O divine race clothed with a mortal vestment; make yourself naked, separate yourself as much as you can . . . . O minds too ignorant of yourselves, O blind hearts! Please arise from this deep sleep; please come to reason at last. For if you come to reason you will breathe happily."32

His "aversation" (III. iii. 8) to the whole voyage of vengeance and his preference of the more abstruse and humanistic path indicated in his final conjecture may account for some of the negative critical reaction33 to this most punctilious of protagonists. True, his dilatory caution and consciously non-Achillean virtues do not contribute to an action-centred drama; in fact, they tailor a revenge tragedy into a moral apologia for its very existence. But on the contrary, they also preclude even the faintest hint of morality vice. Clermont offers none of the entertainment of a Worldly Man, nor of a protean Ambidexter; nor definitely of a faddish New Gyse. His import, like that of the play in which he moves, concerns the staid and never facile sobriety of a lesson by positive example.
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Notes


6 The departure point for critical views of the Ulyssian manifesto sort appears to be Clermont's own analysis of and dispassionate removal from the character of Achilles; see III. iv. 14-25, repeated in Chapman's poetry under the title "Of great men," Poems, pp. 249-50. Although in his study of Chapman's Odyssey, Homeric Renaissance: The Odyssey of George Chapman (London: Chatto & Windus, 1956), George de F. Lord poses that the translator's view of Odysseus shows "no traces of borrowing or even of the recognizable influence of Epictetus and Wolfitus" and that Odysseus demonstrates "nothing like a Stoic's detachment from the world" (p. 23),
Elias Schwartz uses the helpful gauge of discovering "what a writer believed at a particular time" by understanding "what he wrote at that time" as the basis for his contention that the dual influence of Seneca and Homer contributed to the unequivocal rejection of Bussy and the emergence of Clermont as "a new ideal," in his article "Seneca, Homer and Chapman's Bussy D'Ambois," JEGP, 56(1957), 164.

From the standpoint of Christian humanism, Ennis Rees is quick to recognize Clermont's didactic superiority over his brother; despite the hero's manifest incapability, Rees finds him "human" and "admirable," The Tragedies of George Chapman: Renaissance Ethics in Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 93, 101, 111, 125. Eugene Waith, however, has suggested the unique interrelationship of these two brothers whose complementary natures seem to him as "necessary" as those joining Tasso's Rinaldo and Godfredo; see The Herculane Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962), p. 109.


3 For details of Chapman's historical license, see Parrott, Tragedies, II, 572.
0 Brooke's opinion of the verbal parallel is not as enthusiastic; see his edition of Bussy D'Ambois, p. 114.
1 His natural though deathly ascent "up to the stars" (V. iv. 18) reaffirms this position.
2 Admittedly a mercurial term, when one considers how differently Bussy's pious (or peevish) isolation can be interpreted as prologue to his avowedly virtuous (yet apparently vertiginous also) court activities.


16 Millar MacLure, however, questions Clermont's self-sufficiency in light of the fact that he dies because of his devotion to the Guise; see George Chapman: A Critical Study (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), pp. 130-31.


19 Later, the Guise concurs in his judgement of Baligny, V. i. 125.

20 MacLure remarks quite astutely that Clermont provides an instance of "the mouthpiece as hero," op. cit., p. 127.

21 Cf. the corroboration of the Countess, IV. iii. 79, and of Umbra Bussy, V. i. 6, and also Clermont's own ironic echo, V. i. 135.

22 See V. v. 2, 4, 8, 9, 15.


24 Interestingly, for Horapollo the "hawk" was a symbol of "a god, or something sublime, ... or superiority, or victory, or Ares;" it could also symbolize the soul. See The Hieroglyphics of Horapollo, trans. G. Boas, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1950), Numbers 6 and 7, pp. 59-60.

25 See The Dedicatory Epistle of Ovid's Banquet of Sence, Poems, p. 49.

Both these observations climax in Clermont's admission that "There's no disputing with the acts of kings" (V. v. 151). Lilian Haddakin cites the source of Clermont's deference in the medieval jurist, Bracton; see "A Note on Chapman and Two Medieval English Jurists," *MLR*, 47(1952), 551.

K. M. Burton, however, has made it clear that the import of Chapman's play is far from political, in her article "The Political Tragedies of Chapman and Ben Jonson," *Essays in Criticism*, 11(1952), 404-5.


Crashavian clothing metaphors present an array of ramifications: divine, as in the excerpt quoted from "On our crucified Lord Naked, and bloody," 1. 4, human, as in "In memory of the Vertuous and Learned Lady Madre de Teresa that sought an early Martyr-dome," 1. 72, and natural or climatic, as in "An Himne for the Circumcision day of our Lord," 1. 18; references are based on *The Poems English*, Latin and Greek of Richard Crashaw*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957).

As quoted by Kristeller from *Opera Omnia*, p. 659, in *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*, p. 357.

Opposition to Clermont is almost predictably easy to chart. Una Ellis-Fermor found him to be an "unregenerate prig" of as puritanical a dye as Chapman himself; Robert Ornstein has viewed him as "Guyon in Jacobean dress" — without commenting that this Guyon is in no need of a Palmer; and Irving Ribner has judged him unfavourably as a "wooden failure." See *The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1936), p. 70; *The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965), p. 74; *Jacobean Tragedy: The Quest for Moral Order* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 22.

Although the few positive reflections I have encountered are neither as numerous nor as recent as the denunciations, they do raise some worthwhile counterbalances. Parrott looked upon Chapman's Senecal man as "his ideal figure of the revenger;" Frederick Boas considered that the play was probably received as "a medley of perverted history and transcendental philosophic doctrine" in its day, but that today it exercises the "singularly appealing charm" of the later phase of English humanism. Roy Battenhouse has placed the writer in the direct context of his work by suggesting that Chapman was "by intention" a Senecal Man, while Michael Higgins has viewed Clermont in connection with his more scintillating brother as a further "embodiment of Renaissance individualism." See *Tragedies*, II, 573; *An Introduction to Stuart Drama* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 39-40; "Chapman and the Nature of Man," *ELH*, 12(1945), 107; "The Development of the 'Senecal Man'," Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois and Some Precursors,* *RES*, 23(1947), 30.