



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE
2101 EAST COLISEUM BOULEVARD
FORT WAYNE, IN 46805-1499

● Marlowe Studies: An Annual ●

Volume 5 2015 ●



Marlowe Studies

A n A n n u a l

Volume 5
2015



Marlowe Studies

A n A n n u a l



Volume 5

2015

EDITORS

*at Indiana University—
Purdue University Fort Wayne*

*at Mount St. Mary's University
Emmitsburg, Maryland*

M. L. Stapleton, *Editor*
Cathleen M. Carosella, *Managing Editor*
Jessica Neuenschwander, *Pub. Assistant*

Sarah K. Scott, *Associate Editor*

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Hardin Aasand, Indiana University–Purdue University, Fort Wayne; David Bevington, University of Chicago; Douglas Bruster, University of Texas, Austin; Dympna Callaghan, Syracuse University; Patrick Cheney, Pennsylvania State University; Sara Deats, University of South Florida; J. A. Downie, Goldsmiths College, University of London; Lisa M. Hopkins, Sheffield Hallam University; Heather James, University of Southern California; Roslyn L. Knutson, University of Arkansas, Little Rock; Robert A. Logan, University of Hartford; Ruth Lunney, University of Newcastle (Australia); Laurie Maguire, Magdalen College, Oxford University; Lawrence Manley, Yale University; Kirk Melnikoff, University of North Carolina at Charlotte; Paul Menzer, Mary Baldwin College; John Parker, University of Virginia; Eric Rasmussen, University of Nevada, Reno; David Riggs, Stanford University; John P. Rumrich, University of Texas, Austin; Carol Chillington Rutter, University of Warwick; Paul Werstine, King's College, University of Western Ontario; Charles Whitney, University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Marlowe Studies: An Annual is a journal devoted to studying Christopher Marlowe and his role in the literary culture of his time, including but not limited to studies of his plays and poetry; their sources; relations to genre; lines of influence; classical, medieval, and continental contexts; performance and theater history; textual studies; the author's professional milieu and place in early modern English poetry, drama, and culture.

Manuscripts should follow *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition (with footnotes kept to a minimum). Electronic submissions only, acceptable file formats are Word (.doc or docx) or rich text format (.rtf). Please send submissions to mstudies@ipfw.edu and include complete contact information and preferred email address.

To facilitate blind peer review, the author's name and affiliation should not appear on the manuscripts; instead, attach a cover sheet with appropriate information.

Marlowe Studies is published one time per year. Annual subscription or backorder rates for individuals in the United States are \$45; for US libraries and institutions, \$90 per annual issue. International subscriptions and back-order rates are \$55 for individuals and \$110 for institutions. All payments must be made in US dollars. See <http://ipfw.edu/marlowe> for details.

Please send subscription and back order requests to mstudies@ipfw.edu or Managing Editor, *Marlowe Studies*; Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne; 2101 East Coliseum Blvd.; Fort Wayne, IN, 46805.

Under US copyright law, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ISSN 2159-8231 (Print)
 2159-824X (Online)

Abbreviations for Marlowe's Works

<i>AOE</i>	<i>All Ovid's Elegies</i>
<i>COE</i>	<i>Certain of Ovid's Elegies</i>
<i>Dido</i>	<i>Dido, Queen of Carthage</i>
<i>DFa</i>	<i>Doctor Faustus, A-text</i>
<i>DFb</i>	<i>Doctor Faustus, B-text</i>
<i>E2</i>	<i>Edward II</i>
<i>HL</i>	<i>Hero and Leander</i>
<i>JM</i>	<i>The Jew of Malta</i>
<i>Luc</i>	<i>Lucan's First Book</i>
<i>Man</i>	<i>Manwood Elegy / Epitaph</i>
<i>MP</i>	<i>The Massacre at Paris</i>
<i>PS</i>	"The Passionate Shepherd to His Love"
<i>1Tam</i>	<i>Tamburlaine the Great, Part 1</i>
<i>2Tam</i>	<i>Tamburlaine the Great, Part 2</i>

MARLOWE STUDIES: AN ANNUAL 5 (2015)

Table of Contents

- 1 “Dead Shepherd: Marlowe’s Mighty Saw”
RICHARD WILSON
- 21 “Working with Marlowe: Shakespeare’s Early Engagement
with Marlowe’s Poetics”
ROY T. ERIKSEN
- 37 “Moving with Marlowe (& Co.): Relocation, Appropriation,
and Personation in Thomas Dekker’s *The Shoemaker’s
Holiday*”
PAUL FRAZER
- 61 “Marlovian Models and Itinerant Identities: Dido,
Tamburlaine, and the Discourse of Colonialism”
LISA HOPKINS
- 79 “The Legacy of Mephistopheles: Marlowe’s Magical
Influence on *The Late Lancashire Witches*”
BRONWYN JOHNSTON
- 99 “*Dido Queen of Carthage*, *Hamlet*, and the Transformation of
Narcissism”
IAN MCADAM
- 131 “Zenocrate’s Power, the ‘Remorse of Conscience,’ and
Tamburlaine’s Ovidian Impotence in *1* and *2 Tamburlaine*”
BENJAMIN C. MIELE
- 151 “Fortune’s Breath: Rewriting the Classical Storm in the
Drama of Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare”
CHLOE PREEDY
- 175 “The Year’s Work in Marlowe Studies: 2014”
DAVID MCINNIS
- 193 NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

RICHARD WILSON

Dead Shepherd: Marlowe's Mighty Saw

I feel tempted to speak in English and to derive everything from “*may*” and “*might*” . . . (for) we have in the English “*might*” at once the form *might* and *might* as *power*, the verb and the noun, the optative subjunctive and the magic power to make or let it happen.¹

“Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might”²: By admitting his delayed reaction to Marlowe’s writing, William Shakespeare’s pastoral elegy for his deceased contemporary records a change of heart. There is a hint of self-rebuke in this retrospective tribute by the great survivor that complicates the truism that a poet “becomes his admirers” as the words of the dead man are “modified in the guts of the living.”³ *Now*, Shakespeare appears to allow in this unique act of self-correction, “I find” Marlowe’s line more “mighty” than before. The “now” of the elegy is 1599, when enough time has elapsed since Marlowe’s demise for the author of *As You Like It* to reflect ruefully on posthumous reputation, and regret that “When a man’s verses cannot be understood . . . it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room” (3.3.9–12).

These two salutes to Marlowe are among Shakespeare’s best-known lines. Yet it is seldom noticed how they are in contradiction,

1. Jacques Derrida, *H. C. for Life, That Is to Say . . .*, trans. Laurent Milesi and Stefan Herbrechter (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006), 45–46.

2. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard, and Katharine Maus (New York: Norton, 2007), 3.5.81. All subsequent references to Shakespeare’s works are from this edition unless otherwise noted.

3. W. H. Auden, “In Memory of W. B. Yeats,” in *Collected Shorter Poems* (London: Faber & Faber, 1966), 141–43.

when the implied "I" of the play claims to value the "infinite riches"⁴ that "cannot be understood" by those who strike the "shepherd" "more dead" through their obtuseness than the murderers who paid him his final "reckoning" in that "little" Deptford room. Of all contemporaries who wrote about the killing, "Shakespeare alone refers to the wording of the inquest," David Riggs points out.⁵ But his sinister pun on Marlowe's mighty *saw*, the afflatus he elsewhere jokes is used by the ham actor to "saw the air" (*Hamlet*, 3.2.4), suggests how he came to take seriously the Marlovian hyperbole that mighty "words are swords" (*1 Tam*, 1.1.74), and to appreciate that the poet who had reportedly been stabbed through the eye with his own blade had cut to the quick with what he said or "saw": "Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might: / 'Whoever loved that loved not at first sight?'" (*As You Like It*, 3.5.81–82).

Shakespeare's quotation of "love at first sight" from *Hero and Leander* (176) is in tune with other testimony about Marlowe having the same perception of "brave translunary things / That the first poets had."⁶ But this grisly wordplay on *saying*, *seeing*, and *sawing* also poses the jury's question of what it was the deceased saw *at last sight*, before the knife struck his eye. For between Marlowe's murder and Shakespeare's homage, the acuity of the poet had evidently been proved right, and biographers connect the revaluation in *As You Like It* to the shock of the scene outside Saint Paul's Cathedral in June 1599, when the dead man's translation of *Ovid's Elegies* was burned on the orders of the Bishop of London. Shakespeare's ensuing relocation to the Globe Theatre, on the south bank of the Thames, might well have been experienced as an exile like that of "the most capricious Ovid . . . among the Goths" (3.3.5–6), when the Roman poet was banished to the Black Sea by Augustus. But Riggs reads a deeper alienation in Touchstone's complaint: "The force of the fool's comparison lies in the parallel lesson of Marlowe's meteoric career . . . When they cross the line that separates art from politics, [poets] are in for a reckoning" (347).

4. Christopher Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta*, in *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*, ed. Frank Romany and Robert Lindsey (London: Penguin, 2003), 1.1.37. Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent references to Marlowe's plays are from this edition. Also, unless otherwise noted, subsequent references to Marlowe's poems are from *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney and Brian Striar (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006).

5. David Riggs, *The World of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber & Faber, 2004), 346–47. Hereafter cited as Riggs.

6. Michael Drayton, "To my Most Dearely-Loved Friend Henry Reynolds, Esquire, of Poets and Poesie," in *Works*, ed. J. W. Hebel et al. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1931), 228–29, lines 105–10.

Thus, when Jaques insists in *As You Like It* how he “must have liberty / Withal, as large a charter as the wind . . . for so fools have,” the Duke censures him as a mere “libertine.” The satirist’s appeal “for a motley coat” of princely protection had been based on the old mutual assurance between the poet and the politician that “motley’s the only wear” for artistic license (*As You Like It*, 2.7.34–65), since “There is no slander in an allowed fool” (*Twelfth Night*, 1.5.80). But the burning of Marlowe’s book clearly brought home to Shakespeare how this patronage system had been changed utterly by the events of 1593, when the “passionate shepherd” had at last been disabused about his courtship of the high and mighty.

Whatever it was Marlowe “saw of might,” of *macht*, in the final seconds of his life, his last works read like the chronicle of a death foretold. For during spring 1593, he appears to have been preoccupied with the perils of patronage, and to have ironized his own position in the tragi-comic interlude he inserted into *Hero and Leander* concerning the swimmer drowning in the luxury of King Neptune’s underwater palace, while “the lusty god” croons a song about the passion of the shepherd for a boy that sounds ominously like the poet’s own greatest hit. Leander’s impatient interruption, “Aye me,” as “upon the waves he springs” (675–90), terminates this riskily burlesque self-parody, in which the writer appears to struggle to escape the lethal embrace of court culture, and his own creative subjection. But the “revenging malice” with which the angry monarch then hurls his mace is truly menacing; and the unintended consequence of that violence, when “the mace returning back, his own hand hit” (692–95), looks uncannily prophetic of what the jury heard at Deptford.

If *Hero and Leander* is, as critics deduce, a poem in which “Marlowe tries to portray what it feels like to experience this opposition” between power and imagination, or the contrary meanings of “might,” the ending, in which the boy who has just escaped ravishment becomes the ravisher, shows how hard the writer found it to separate his hypothetical imaginary “might” from the imagination of material “might” itself.⁷ As Graham Hammill comments, it is no coincidence that so many of Marlowe’s plays turn on suicide, since he thinks of might “through self-ravishment,” with characters who react to power like moths to the flame, by destroying themselves. Hammill terms this self-destructive fascination with “mighty monarchy” (*ITam*, 1.1.138) “the Marlovian sublime” and remarks how the author’s relationship to

7. Graham Hammill, *The Mosaic Constitution: Political Theology and Imagination from Machiavelli to Milton* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2012), 132.

the mightiness that would destroy him was never exposed more troublingly than in the last moments of his final finished work, when “fully aware that Lightborne has come to kill him,” Edward II responds by imagining his own death as a collaboration:⁸

I see my tragedy written on thy brows,
Yet stay awhile; forbear thy bloody hand,
And let me see the stroke before it comes,
That even then when I shall lose my life,
My mind may be more steadfast on my God. (E2, 25.75–79)

“My father is deceas’d, come Gaveston, / And share the kingdom with thy dearest friend” (1.1). The first words of *Edward II* underline how Marlowe’s concept of sublime power coincided with the disruption of feudal clientage networks by the centralizing politics of the absolutist state, and with the subversive “world of the favorite” that this set in train.⁹ For as historians point out, this was, in fact, the first English drama to represent the European phenomenon of royal favoritism and to confront the question posed by its opening words: “What greater bliss can hap to Gaveston / Than live and be the favourite of a king?” (1.3–4). With this tragedy, Blair Worden remarks, Marlowe brought to the stage the tropes that would shape English perceptions of absolutism for a century, for the opening soliloquy “announced the birth of a literary tradition” when it launched the theme of the favorite as upstart, whose over-reaching short-circuits conventional currents of social advance.¹⁰

Gaveston’s sneer to “leaden earls, that glory in your birth,” to “go sit at home and eat your tenants’ beef” (6.74–75), foretold the irresistible rise of the favorite staged in plays like *The Roman Actor* (1626) or *Sejanus His Fall* (1603). But the difference was that while Ben Jonson and Philip Massinger would decry the fall of the old patronage system, even as they dramatized the new trajectories of professional promotion, for Marlowe the creative project had come to be identified exclusively with the ascent of “that base and obscure Gaveston” (101). For by 1592, the author of *Edward II* had obviously decided that the preferment of an absolute king, rather than the

8. Hamill, *The Mosaic Constitution*, 134–35. Hamill follows Schopenhauer’s definition of the “sublime” as the aesthetic contemplation of what would otherwise annihilate the will. See Arthur Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, trans. E. F. J. Payne (New York: Dover, 1969), 1:39.

9. For an authoritative overview, see John H. Elliott, introduction to *The World of the Favourite*, ed. John H. Elliott and Laurence Brockliss (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999), 1–10.

10. Blair Worden, “Favourites on the English Stage,” in Elliott and Brockliss, *World of the Favourite*, 159–83, 168.

patronage of feudal lords, was the fast route to the poetic sovereignty of his own counterfactual “might”:

It shall suffice me to enjoy your love;
Which whiles I have, I think myself as great
As Caesar riding in the Roman street,
With captive kings at his triumphant car. (1.171–74)

Historians are intrigued by the ways in which the gatecrashing of the favorite was keyed to the monopolization of *favor* that was “a central attribute” of absolutism; and judging by his updating of the medieval Gaveston as a Renaissance playmaker, so was the dramatist.¹¹ Thus, Edward’s invitation, which the arriviste enters brandishing in a “letter brought him from the King” (1.1.1 s.d.), is itself “a crucial written object,” Marjorie Garber notes, that proclaims how the literary field inscribes “a struggle for mastery.”¹² For it again echoes the pastoralism of Marlowe’s most quoted work, his personal and professional manifesto, “The Passionate Shepherd to His Love.”¹³ In fact, Gaveston sounds as if he is critiquing the “amorous lines” of the poem (1.6)—“Come live with me and be my love / And we will all the pleasures prove” (PS, 1–2)—when he applauds “words that make me surfeit with delight! . . . Sweet Prince, I come” (E2, 1.3–6).

Jacques Derrida, the philosopher of *l’avenir*, would have had something to say about the *arrivisme* of this promissory “come”: “the arrival as if by an enchantment, where the poetic song, the charm and magical power are allied to *kommen lassen*, make come in letting come.” For through repeated instances of such self-interpellation, Marlowe had returned over and over again to the Ovidian hypothesis of this lyric: of a world of make-believe, where “shepherd-swains shall dance and sing,” immune to economic or political realities. Yet always, until now, what he acknowledged about the structure of this virtual Arcadia as an *event* was how “the mighty power of its might” would be contingent on the material might he registered in the contract struck by successive patron-figures, that “Conditionally that thou wilt stay with me . . . it may be thou shalt be my love” (*Dido*, 3.1.113, 169).¹⁴

11. Linda Levy Peck, “Monopolizing Favour: Structures of Power in the Early Seventeenth-Century English Court,” in Elliott and Brockliss, *World of the Favourite*, 54–70, 56.

12. Marjorie Garber, “‘Here’s Nothing Writ’: Scribe, Script, and Circumscription in Marlowe’s Plays,” in *Christopher Marlowe: A Critical Reader*, ed. Richard Wilson (Harlow, UK: Longman, 1991), 30–53, 49.

13. See R. S. Forsythe, “*The Passionate Shepherd* and English Poetry,” *PMLA* 40 (1925): 692–742, 699–700.

14. Derrida, *H. C. for Life*, 79n1. For the significance of the poem as a manifesto for Marlowe’s Ovidian “cursus” or anti-Virgilian literary career, see Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe’s*

As his Jupiter had let slip in the first line of his earliest play—when the King of Olympus recited “The Passionate Shepherd” to his favorite: “Come, gentle Ganymede, and play with me: / I love thee well, say Juno what she will” (1.1.1)—for Marlowe the hypothetical “may-be” or might of art had always been conditional on the actual might of a Renaissance court. Thus, even his mightiest shepherd voiced the dramatist’s own bleak assessment of the relationship of power and the possible, when Tamburlaine vainly declaimed the same poem after the death of Zenocrate: “Come down from heaven and live with me again!” In scenes like these Marlowe had consistently undermined his own most celebrated literary creation, to show how “If words might serve, our voice hath rent the air,” yet “Nothing prevails” (2*Tam*, 2.4.117–24). So it is all the more startling when he now has Gaveston invoke this “might” as though the unlikely prospect of “Seeing shepherds feed their flocks / By shallow rivers to whose falls / Melodious birds sing madrigals” (PS, 6–8) *might* indeed suddenly become a practical possibility; and then has London imagined as the venue for activating such a “might,” where “My men, like satyrs grazing on the lawns, / Shall with their goat-feet dance an antic hay” (E2, 1.58–59), with a further self-reflexive citation of his other most escapist text, the hedonistic *Hero and Leander*:

Sweet prince, I come; these, thy amorous lines
 Might have enforced me to have swum from France,
 And like Leander gasped upon the sand,
 So thou wouldst smile and take me in thy arms.
 The sight of London to my exiled eyes
 Is as Elysium to a new-come soul. (E2, 1.6–11)

If references to “The Passionate Shepherd” and *Hero and Leander* identify Gaveston with the author, the fantasy of the king cross-dressed as a girl, like the “nun” (44) for whom Leander swam the Hellespont, constitutes an unprecedented sexual coming-out for Marlowe, in which the Shepherd’s ambiguous Love and androgynous Hero are both discovered to have been “buskined” players all along (31): boys disguised in “artificial flowers and leaves, / Whose workmanship both man and beast deceives” (19–20). “Not Hylas was more mourned of Hercules” (E2, 1.143), Edward therefore assures his lover, when he appoints him Lord Chamberlain, in command of the English theater; and shortly afterwards it is explained how:

The mightiest kings have had their minions;
 Great Alexander lov’d Hephaestion,

The conquering Hercules for Hylas wept,
And for Patroclus stern Achilles droop'd. (4.390–93)

Marlowe here provides a genealogy for same-sex desire that inaugurates “the possibility of a homosexual subjectivity,” a “*conscience ‘gay’ avant la lettre*,” it is claimed, three centuries before it could be named.¹⁵ This genealogy would be echoed in the allegations that the author would himself “report St John to be Our Saviour Christ’s Alexis”: Alexis being the boy loved by Corydon in Virgil’s Second Eclogue, a model for “The Passionate Shepherd.”¹⁶ So, when we are told that “never doted Jove on Ganymede / So much as he on Gaveston” (180–81), it becomes clear that with this spectacle of sodomy and transvestism, choreographed by a Frenchman, Marlowe is flaunting the very continental “vices” its enemies associated with the playhouse, as a marker of the “Big If” of his own aesthetic *might*.¹⁷ The challenge of *Edward II* becomes, on this view, a high-risk gamble on prospective preferment that can only have been hazarded because its creator had come to feel assured of such a royal road to power:

I must have wanton poets, pleasant wits,
Musicians, that with touching of a string
May draw the pliant king which way I please:
Music and poetry is his delight;
Therefore I’ll have Italian masques by night,
Sweet speeches, comedies, and pleasing shows;
And in the day, when he shall walk abroad,
Like sylvan nymphs my pages shall be clad (E2, 1.50–57)

The self-referencing of *Edward II* suggests the cue for its audacity must indeed have been an opening that invested power in the dramatist, as though the “collaborative homoerotics” of the playhouse were about to be officially endorsed.¹⁸ And Riggs supplies a context for this unlikely avowal of wishful thinking by noting that Marlowe was writing *Edward II* at the very time when, according to the

15. Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare’s England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1994), 223; and Didier Godard, *L’Autre Faust: L’Homosexualité Masculine Pendant la Renaissance* (Montblanc: H & O Editions, 2001), 178.

16. Thomas Kyd to Lord Puckering, after May 30, 1593, in Tucker Brooke, *Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940), 243. For “Alexis,” see Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men’s, 1982), 63–65.

17. Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992), 106.

18. Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), 37.

playwright and informer Thomas Kyd, "he would persuade men of quality to go unto the K. of Scots" and that it is therefore no accident that its scenario reprises "the leading episodes of James's love affair with (his French cousin) Esmé Stuart: the young king's impetuous homosexual desire, the favorite's giddy ascent to high office, the public scandal, the opposition of the peers, the kidnapping, the king's replacement of his deceased favorite with new male companions, and the king's enduring loyalty to his first love" (Riggs, 139).

Edward II predicts the disruption to England's patronage system that King James's favouritism would cause. But more to the point, the play also reflects the contemporary politics of Scotland in the early 1590s, when the country was "divided between two factions," with "one for the King and the other for the Queen," as English agents were reporting, after the early breakdown of James's marriage to his Danish consort Anne, when he "conceived a great jealousy of the Queen, which burns the more he covers it," and it was being predicted that "the end can be no less tragical than was betwixt his parents."¹⁹

Edward's love-letter to Gaveston echoes what literary critics have termed James's "textual intercourse" with Stuart and his later favorites, an epistolary fantasia that left the king's "interior space" open to intimacy in "unparalleled ways," as the recipients were invited to enter the privy chamber when "the king opened the door."²⁰ Riggs therefore speculates that Marlowe designed *Edward II* as an appetizer to induce James to sponsor him in a fresh start at the Scottish court, "whither Royden is already gone, and where if he had lived," so Kyd would later depose, "he told me when I saw him last, he meant to be" (qtd. in Riggs, 139).

This planned Edinburgh trajectory gains plausibility not only from a "sudden access of Scottishness" in Marlowe's references, but the implication that the poet Matthew Royden had gone ahead to seek commissions from the King of Scots.²¹ For as George Chapman reminded him in the preface to his poem "The Shadow of Night" Royden had a sharp eye for the career opportunities that emerged in the manoeuvres over Elizabeth's succession, and in the 1590s coolly

19. George Nicholson to Sir Robert Bowes, July 15, 1594, qtd. in Leeds Barroll, *Anna of Denmark, Queen of England* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001), 33; and John Colville to Sir Robert Cecil, July 26, 1594, qtd. in David Moore Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland* (Columbia: Missouri UP, 1991), 55.

20. David Bergeron, *King James and Letters of Homoerotic Desire* (Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1999), 30–31.

21. Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992), 312.

shifted from “ingenious Derby” (the crypto-Catholic claimant Ferdinando, Lord Strange), to “deep-searching Northumberland” (the Catholic figure-head, Henry Percy), to “skill-embracing Hunsdon” (the Queen’s nephew, George Carey). According to the sleuthing of Charles Nicholl, Royden was planted in each of these households as one of Robert Cecil’s “poet-spies.”²² And this was a path on which Marlowe was apparently himself now embarked, when he opened *Edward II* with an exuberant fanfare for the northern monarch and his brother-in-law, Christian IV, “The haughty Dane (who) commands the narrow seas” (6.167), and the clear insinuation that he would no longer serve James’s English rivals, but flourish in the kingdom of this absolute new midnight sun:

What need the arctic people love starlight,
To whom the sun shines both by day and night?
Farewell, base stooping to the lordly peers;
My knee shall bow to none but to the king. (*E2*, 1.16–19)

“You know that I came lately out of France, / And yet I have not viewed my lord the king; / If I speed well, I’ll entertain you all” (43–45): Gaveston’s recall to London does appear to trumpet an upturn in Marlowe’s prospects when he arrived back in England in 1592. In fact, the dramatist had been shipped across the Channel as a prisoner charged with coining, a treasonable offence for which William Cecil, Lord Burghley, had the authority to hang him. As Nicholl relates, we know nothing of Marlowe’s interview with the wily old statesman at the end of January, but it should have been uncomfortable.²³ What we can guess, however, is that the accused must have had some rapport with his prosecutors, because by March 3, when Cecil paid the escort, he had been freed. “The Lord Treasurer held Marlowe in reserve,” Riggs surmises, “banking his tools” like one of John Le Carré’s spymasters” (279). Biographers therefore decode the counterfeiting scam as a cover for Marlowe’s “turning” as an agent provocateur.

So, if he was being primed “to go unto the K. of Scots” on an undercover mission for Cecil, it is telling that it appears Marlowe now moved into the household of Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, sister of the warrior poet Philip Sidney, and of Sir Robert Sidney, the very officer who had ostensibly arrested him for coining. For the Herberts were emerging as leading fixers for James, whose reward

22. George Chapman, preface dedicated to “sweet Matthew” his “dear and most friend,” *The Shadow of Night* (1594), qtd. in Nicholl, *The Reckoning*, 257; and for Robert Cecil’s “poet-spies,” see Nicholl, *The Reckoning*, 259–60.

23. Nicholl, *The Reckoning*, 238.

would be to host the monarch during his inaugural Christmas in England, with *As You Like It* acted for the new court at Wilton, their Wiltshire seat, and Shakespeare's actors warranted under their auspices as the King's Men.²⁴ Nicholl therefore shines a penetrating light on this complicity of poetry with politics: "As a poet *per se*, as a witty companion, as a tutor, clerk, secretary or entertainments manager, the successful writer of the day found his niche in the retinue of some noble patron or family. . . . The poet has an *entrée*. He has a key to the door, and often to the intimate chambers, of the rich and the powerful, and it is precisely the rich and the powerful that the government is now so keen to keep an eye on."²⁵

Marlowe's backers knew just what things "best please his majesty," as Gaveston puts it (*E2*, 1.70), and pushed the handsome airhead Philip Herbert as a potential favorite the instant the king came south. Their success was made public at the coronation in 1603, when the teenager "had the effrontery to kiss King James," and what "shocked the congregation was that the King merely laughed and tapped him on the cheek."²⁶ Philip and his brother William would each become Lord Chamberlain, in charge of the London stage, like Marlowe's Gaveston, and acquire immortality as the "incomparable brethren" to whom the Shakespeare Folio was dedicated.²⁷ And in a probing article, "Was Marlowe Going to Scotland When He Died, and Does It Matter?" (2006), Lisa Hopkins has detected a Herbert-inspired "conception of writing" in these last works, "with a wider perspective, and a sense of its political significance," that is "more Sidneyan" than Marlovian.²⁸

So it may be significant that *Edward II* is Marlowe's most polished play and a text that conforms to the high-mindedness of the Wilton salon with its stress on "the quality of the poetic line" and "interest in plays as plays."²⁹ The countess was urging her coterie to prepare for a new dynasty with classical dramas about regime change. Mary Herbert

24. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1923), 4:168.

25. Nicholl, *The Reckoning*, 227.

26. Ethel Carleton Williams, *Anne of Denmark: Wife of James VI of Scotland: James I of England* (London: Longman, 1970), 85.

27. Shakespeare, *The Norton Shakespeare*, 33–48.

28. Lisa Hopkins, "Was Marlowe Going to Scotland When He Died, and Does It Matter," in *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, ed. Takashi Kozuka and J. R. Mulryne (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006), 167–82, 178.

29. Leeds Barroll, "Shakespeare, Noble Patrons, and 'Common' Players," in *Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England*, ed. Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 90–121, 102–3.

led the way with her own closet version of Robert Garnier's *Marc Antoine* (1578). And Marlowe gamely entered into the imperialist spirit of this Jacobean advance-guard by dedicating himself to his benefactress in a craven Latin epistle as a poet casting off the "myrtle" and "evergreen tresses" of Ovidian love for Virgilian epic ("To the Most Illustrious Woman," ll.17–18). Yet this costume change is itself suggestive of a boy-player; and it was probably at Wilton too that he added to *Hero and Leander* a parable about Mercury that reads like his scheme for a career north of the border, or the plot of *Edward II*, when it warns that the poor scholar will be led by "discontent" with the stinginess of "great lords" to seek promotion abroad in "regions far":

And fruitful wits, that inaspiring are,
Shall discontent run into regions far;
And few great lords in virtuous deeds shall joy,
But be surpris'd with every garish toy,
And still enrich the lofty servile clown,
Who with encroaching guile keeps learning down. (*HL*, 477–82)

The performance history of *Edward II* is caught up in the brief existence of Pembroke's Men, the acting company, launched as a Jacobean cultural advance-guard by the Herberts in 1592 with James Burbage in the lead, that is named on the title-page of its 1594 edition. Marlowe paid the troupe's patron the compliment of putting his namesake in charge of "triumphs and public shows" (E2, 4.349), two decades before any Herbert became Lord Chamberlain. But we know from a will drafted by one of the actors that it was Mary Herbert who pledged to sponsor Pembroke's Men, and it was doubtless the countess who subsidized their two court gigs featuring Marlowe's tragedy at Christmas. Then, after a new year run in Shoreditch, the cavalcade headed off, via Wilton, through the Herbert fiefdom of the Marches, where the earl himself held court as President of the Council of Wales. Gaveston's sugary repertoire of "speeches, comedies, and pleasing shows," was in tune with the ideological sweeteners the viceroy was presenting at Ludlow Castle, where the coming attractions included a "British" pageant of "King Arthur's knights."³⁰

The Herberts' Jacobean propaganda is prefigured in the masque trailered by Gaveston, with a mooning Queen Elizabeth, travestied by a boy, savaging her leering lover: a risqué send-up of Pembroke's rival, the antiunionist Raleigh. Only performers supported by a magnate like the earl, Henry Herbert, would have dared to commit

30. Penry Williams, *The Council of the Marches of Wales under Elizabeth I* (Cardiff: U of Wales P, 1958), 187.

such *lèse-majesté*. Yet the fact that, after pushing on from Shrewsbury, the troupe halted suddenly in June at York, before returning south to pawn their costumes, has led researchers to view this precipitate dispersal as a result of their "desperate" finances in a year of plague.³¹ Recently, however, Roslyn Knutson has maintained that "there was no theatrical crisis in the mid-1590s," and that the erratic movements of Pembroke's Men "do not mark playing conditions in 1593 as chaotic."³² So it seems that something more urgent and unexpected than the closure of the faraway London theaters had caused the Herberts to withdraw their funding of the provincial tour of *Edward II*, and from the direction in which the company was traveling, it looks as if the reason for the sudden turnaround had occurred up in the north.

The Pembroke troupe's 1593 tour was taking them "to towns where their patron was influential" and the rewards were high, Knutson emphasizes. So, "What, then, was the cause of the Pembroke's return to London?"³³ The answer likely lies in the very plot of *Edward II*. For Marlowe's tragedy turns on an unpunctuated letter with which his murderers are incited to "Fear not to kill the king" (E2, 24.9). If Pembroke's Men had indeed been bound for Edinburgh, they had therefore been unlucky in their timing, due to the irruption of the affair of the Spanish Blanks which also involved a purloined letter and rocked Anglo-Scottish relations in the spring of 1593. The scandal broke after the interception of an agent bound for Spain with a cache of blank forms, signed by James's reigning favorite, the Catholic George Gordon, Earl of Huntly, supposed to be filled with commissions to assist a Spanish invasion of England, together with a sensational memorandum in the king's hand, weighing up the pros and cons of such a coup.

The King of Scots' confidential position paper was just what Elizabeth's ministers feared most: "a project to land 30,000 Spaniards from the Netherlands, of whom 4,000 were to impose Catholic

31. David George, "Shakespeare and Pembroke's Men," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32.3 (1981): 305–23, 306; and *Records of Early English Drama: York*, ed. Alexandra Johnston and Margaret Rogerson (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979), 455.

32. Roslyn Knutson, "What's So Special about 1594?," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61.4 (2010): 449–67, 458. For the supposed problems of the company, see George, "Shakespeare and Pembroke's Men," 305–23; Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 271–73, 276–77; Siobham Keenan, *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 37–38; and Lawrence Manley, "From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men: 2 *Henry VI* and *The First Part of the Contention*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.3 (2003): 253–87.

33. Rosalyn Knutson, "Pembroke's Men in 1592–3, Their Repertory and Touring Schedule," *Issues in Review*, 129–38, 130, 135.

control in Scotland, while the remainder marched south.”³⁴ James had minuted that he would only order an English invasion, after “forewarning the King of Spain,” if there was “delay” granting “my title to the Crown of England . . . in the meantime I will deal with the Queen of England fair and pleasantly . . . she not suspecting such a thing as she does now.”³⁵

Thus, even as Pembroke’s Men toured the north of England with a play that valorized his indulgence to his favorites, the image of the King of Scots as the leading Protestant candidate to succeed the queen was overturned by this proof of the intimacy of favoritism and papistry. James would persist in kissing Huntly in public, “to the amazement of many.”³⁶ So no wonder the king’s cheerleaders now stopped the show. After the “Spanish Blanks,” there could be no question of staging *Edward II* in Edinburgh, when it contained such arch allusions as the description of the “fleering Scots” chanting before “the walls of York”: “Maids of England, sore may you mourn, / For your lemans you have lost at Bannockbourn” (*E2*, 6.165–90).

“*Item*: Given to my Lord of Pembroke’s players in June: xl s”³⁷: the entry in the York City Chamberlain’s 1593 accounts of the final payment to Marlowe’s company on their provincial tour puts the dramatist’s presence in Deptford on May 31 in a fresh perspective, if Pembroke’s players were heading north as harbingers for James. Had the dramatist intended to join the actors in Edinburgh, his voyage would have taken him not only out of the reach of his assassins, but away from the playhouse audiences that Gaveston scorns, when he says of his petitioners that “These are not men for me” (*E2*, 1.49). For what obviously excited Marlowe about the royal road of favoritism was the chance it gave, not only to trump aristocratic patronage, but to escape democratic commercial demand; as Gaveston jeers: “As for the multitude . . . I’ll fawn first on the wind” (1.20–23). So the parvenu spurns a trio of commoners who represent exactly the type of playgoer that applauded *Tamburlaine*: a groom, a tourist, and a veteran; to make way for closet dramas in which he mimes the “Greekish strumpet” Helen (9.16).

34. William McElwee, *The Wisest Fool in Christendom: The Reign of King James I and VI* (London: Faber & Faber, 1958), 77.

35. James VI, undated memorandum, *Calendar of State Papers Scotland* (London: Stationery Office, 1936), 10:829–33. For a discussion of the implications, see Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI and I* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003), 134.

36. Caroline Bingham, *James VI of Scotland* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1979), 104.

37. Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, eds., *Records of Early English Drama* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979), 1:455.

Gaveston will present the king with "a lovely boy in Dian's shape" (1.60); and with the son of the house himself dressed as "the woman in the scene" (*Coriolanus*, 2.2.92), such were, in fact, the pederastic masquerades prepared for James at Wilton.³⁸ Marlowe's relish for reveling, "With base outlandish cullions at his heels," in the "proud fantastic liveries" (4.408–9) from Lady Herbert's wardrobe is therefore palpable. But despite forelock-touching textual nods to Wiltshire (1.127, 11.49), and its "pretty" countess (9.101), his skepticism about the earl's capacity to maintain such a "god of shapes" in the "Italian cloak" of a "dapper Jack" (4.410–12) can be guessed from the way that Gaveston is betrayed, after the play's Pembroke casually "rides home, thinking his prisoner safe" (11.117). There is an undercurrent, in fact, of cynicism about these "idle triumphs, masques, and lascivious shows" (6.156) in *Edward II* that suggests Pembroke's tour was only ever, for this author, a means to an end, and a stage to something better further on:

When wert thou in the field with banner spread?
But once, and then thy soldiers marched like players,
With garish robes, not armour; and thyself,
Bedaubed with gold, rode laughing at the rest,
Nodding and shaking of thy spangled crest,
Where women's favours hung like labels down. (E2, 6.181–86)

Did Marlowe ride "but once" with Pembroke's Men as they set out north from London, "laughing at the rest," in the "garish robes" the Herberts had provided, from the superiority of his own ulterior purposes? If he did so, he was travelling a route that was already well mapped. Thus, on September 20, 1589, the Governor of Carlisle, Henry Lord Scrope had notified the English embassy in Edinburgh that on being informed of James's "earnest desire to have Her Majesty's players repair unto Scotland to His Grace, I did forthwith despatch a servant unto them where they were in furthest Lancashire." The Queen's Men were at Knowsley, where they acted for Henry Stanley, Earl of Derby, on September 13. But a month later they were being "used with great kindness and all courtesy" by the Earl of Bothwell, James Hepburn, in Edinburgh, while James escorted his Danish bride Anna from Elsinore.³⁹

38. For the sexual politics of the Wilton coterie, see Gary Waller, "The Countess of Pembroke and Gendered Reading," in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*, ed. Anne Haselkorn and Betty Travitsky (Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1990), 336–43.

39. K. P. Wentersdorf, "The Queen's Company in Scotland in 1589," *Theatre Research International* 6.1 (1980): 33–36.

It had been at Elsinore in 1586 that James's future father-in-law had become the first continental ruler to host English players, a band of Derby's stars, whom Frederick II passed on to his nephew, Christian I the Elector of Saxony in Dresden. As theater historians have lately been discovering, at a time when the older patronage system "was in an advanced stage of breaking down," and playwrights were desperately thrashing around for legitimation, Edinburgh and Elsinore became gateways to a new world of state support, where "the English comedians" would ratchet up Baroque heights of extravagance, as they shuttled between the courts of Frederick's nephews, nieces, sons, and daughters.⁴⁰

"How chances it they travel?" asks the Prince of Denmark, as "the tragedians of the City" approach Shakespeare's Elsinore, when both their "reputation and profit was better" in London (*Hamlet*, 2.2.316–18). But Hamlet's question is disingenuous; for by the time Pembroke's Men took *Edward II* north their colleagues were already crossing regularly from Scotland to Denmark. Thus no sooner had Anna's sister Elizabeth married Duke Julius of Brunswick at Wolfenbüttel, than members of the Admiral's Company were issued passports, and on midsummer night 1592 they were acting in the palace there before the ducal newly-weds.⁴¹

As the author of nine plays printed in a folio in 1594, it is tempting to see the cultural politics of Brunswick's Duke Julius in the theater

40. Alistair Fox, "The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberty: The Decline of Literary Patronage in the 1590s," in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 241. For the importance of King James's Danish family patronage network in freeing Elizabethan performers from the terms and conditions of English theater, see Peter Burke, "State-Making, King-Making and Image Making from Renaissance to Baroque: Scandinavia in a European Context," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 22 (1997): 1–8; Jerzy Limon, *Gentlemen of a Company: English Players in Central and Eastern Europe, 1590–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985), 3; Sebastian Olden-Jørgensen, "State Ceremonial, Court Culture and Political Power in Early Modern Denmark, 1536–1746," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 27 (2002): 65–76, especially 68–71; V. C. Ravn, "English Instrumentalists at the Danish Court in the Time of Shakespeare," *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft* 7.4 (1906): 550–63; V. C. Ravn, "Engelsk 'Instrumentalister' ved det danske Hof paa Shakespeares Tid," *For Ide og Vikelighed* 1 (1890) 75–92; June Schlueter, "English Actors in Kassel, Germany, during Shakespeare's Time," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 238–61, especially 244–46; Gunnar Sjögren, "Hamlet and the Coronation of Christian IV," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 16.2 (1965): 155–60; and Mara Wade, "The Queen's Courts: Anne of Denmark and Her Royal Sisters—Cultural Agency at Four Northern European Courts in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Women and Culture at the Courts of the Stuart Queens*, ed. Clare McManus (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 49–80, especially 55.

41. Willem Schrickx, "English Actors at the Courts of Wolfenbüttel, Brussels and Graz during the Lifetime of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Survey* 33 (1980): 153–68, 155.

mania of Shakespeare's Duke Theseus, who similarly celebrates an Amazonian marriage "With pomp, with triumph, and with reveling" (*Dream*, 1.1.19), but who also insists that the price the actors pay when their "play is preferred" (4.2.33), is submission to his neoclassical rules. And Hamlet's haughty sermonizing against their "antic disposition" (*Hamlet*, 2.1.173), which "though it make the unskillful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve" (3.2.23), underlines how aesthetic freedom will be lost to political expedience under such regimes.

The Prince's diktat, "O reform it all together," when informed that the actors have "reformed" their old ways "indifferently" (3.2.23–34), explicitly aligns the cultural crusade to which they have been coopted with the reformed religion of the northern courts. Jonathan Goldberg therefore reads this tense faceoff as a premonition of Shakespeare's own future in absolutism's "spectral domain of shadows," where actors and artists will be "caught and tangled."⁴² Yet the Player's reaction "shows an extraordinary reserve," Robert Weimann notes, which sounds all the more cagey when we consider "the extraordinary newness" of this fencing between a performer and a prince.⁴³ It is a backhanded compliment to Marlowe's careerism, then, when by making the Danish prince a fan of *Dido*, *Queen of Carthage*, Shakespeare posthumously awards its author the admission into the absolutist world for which he longed: "I heard thee speak me a speech once, but it was never acted, or, if it was, not above once; for the play, I remember pleased not the million. 'Twas caviar to the general. But it was—as I received it, and others whose judgements in such matters cried in the top of mine—an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning" (*Hamlet*, 2.2.416–22).

At the real Elsinore in 1590 James had been regaled with a double performance, in Danish and Latin, of a drama about Dido and Aeneas, and Hamlet's predilection for similar "caviar" seems to affiliate Marlowe directly with the king's neoclassical aesthetic, broadcast in his *Essays of a Prentice* of 1584, and with his patronizing of an "honest method" of "savoury" lines, "as wholesome as sweet, and

42. Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and Their Contemporaries* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1989), 203.

43. Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 153, 160. Compare with Mitchell Greenburg, *Canonical States, Canonical Stages: Oedipus, Othering, and Seventeenth Century Drama* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994), xxvii: "Certainly in this transitional period of European history, the theater situates itself as the privileged form of representation of the emerging absolutist states . . . at once strictly supervised by political and religious authorities and yet also escaping, by the ambivalent nature of theater itself, a totally complicitous relation with institutional power."

by very much more handsome than fine.”⁴⁴ For of all Marlowe’s works, the Prince admires the one most like the closet dramas in “womanish toge” (*Coriolanus*, 2.3.105) that he is told now threaten the players (*Hamlet*, 2.2.328). Thus Shakespeare imagined *Dido, Queen of Carthage* being read in an exclusive milieu like that of James’s “Castalian Band” of Scottish poets, a *pléiade* in which the text would be savored precisely because “there were no sallets in the lines” (421–26). So he was granting his dead competitor an international success like that of their exact contemporary, the impresario Robert Browne, who had left London for the Netherlands, and in 1590 headed a troupe at Leyden.

The Brunswick extravaganza, funded by Duke Julius’s silver-mines, was Browne’s breakthrough, and by 1594 he was in Kassel, “loaded with gold and silver” by the Landgraf Moritz of Hesse.⁴⁵ Over the next thirty years he and his team would entertain Henri IV at Fontainebleau, Archduke Albert in Brussels, John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, at Potsdam, the Emperor Matthias in Vienna, and Frederick and Elizabeth, the King and Queen of Bohemia, in Prague. But it was the Landgraf’s funds that furnished these “English comedians” with an artistic program, and a base for their experiments, in the Baroque shape of the Ottoneum, a court theater Moritz built to Browne’s designs in 1604 at Kassel, and named for his heir, Prince Otto.⁴⁶

The Ottoneum survives to this day as evidence of how during Marlowe’s professional lifetime the marvel of absolutist state sponsorship was offering London performers like John Dowland, not just a variant of touring but a refuge from the vagaries of touring itself. This was the milieu in which King Christian’s architect and stage-designer Inigo Jones would flourish. And such was the career-move of which the dramatist was surely dreaming when he had Faustus beg his infernal masters to let him make his “merriment” out of “folly” (*DF*, 8.55), so as to be “feasted” by “noblemen” at the “royal courts of kings” (3.2–15). The doctor’s schemes to attain “the signory of Emden” (5.24), serve “Carolus the Fifth” (3.14), and “banquet and carouse” at Wittenberg (13.4) map out a European itinerary, in fact, that explains why this magus, with whom none in the Empire “can

44. See Jane Rickard, *Authorship and Authority: The Writings of James VI and I* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), 40–41.

45. “Loaded with gold and silver”: Erhardus Cellius, *Eques auratus Anglo-Wirtembergicus* (Tübingen, 1605), qtd in Schlueter, “English Actors in Kassel,” 244.

46. On the “English comedians,” see Gerhart Hoffmeister, “The English Comedians in Germany,” in *German Baroque Literature*, ed. Gerhart Hoffmeister (New York: Columbia UP, 1983), 146. On Moritz’s 1602 tour of France, see Schlueter, “English Actors in Kassel,” 250.

compare . . . for rare effects" (10.3), devotes his precious time to theatricals, like the "merriment" he stages for the Duke of Vanholt (12.1). Thus Faustus, who desires nothing more than to "bring Alexander and his paramour" before the German Emperor "in that manner they best lived in" (10.50–52), looks like a fantastic self-portrait of the London playmaker that was suddenly made feasible when absolutist politics inverted the terms of theatrical trade with the weddings of King James and his continental relations. For then the Faustian prospects for the English entertainers must have seemed truly mighty.

When he has Gaveston swear he will be like "the arctic people" (E2, 1.16) and "bow to none but the king" (19), it sounds as if Marlowe is responding to the golden opportunity that opened for "the best actors in the world" (*Hamlet*, 2.2.326) to prosper in these "regions far," after the King of Scots had married a Danish princess. Anna's brother Christian would indeed shortly travel to receive the homage of the Sami: "the arctic people" who had escorted the bride and groom as they drove from Oslo Cathedral, in a procession seemingly inspired by James's reading in *Tamburlaine* of a coach drawn by "naked negroes" when the monarch rides "in triumph through the streets" (2*Tam*, 1.3.40–41), as "By his orders four young Negroes danced naked in the snow in front of the royal carriage."⁴⁷

If the Queen's Men did stay on in Edinburgh to take part in the repeat performance in May 1590, with boys dressed as goddesses and a Bacchus throwing wine upon the crowd, Marlowe would have heard that the Africans had then to be replaced by Scottish youths wearing masks, "to make them seem like Moors and all gorgeous to the eye," because in Norway the real slaves had died of hypothermia.⁴⁸ Whether or not James Stuart had anticipated such fatalities, his cruel conceit supplied a chilling context, therefore, for Gaveston's acclamation of Edward as a king of fools, who revels in the Neronian spectacle of an actor being hunted as a beast: "And running in the likeness of an hart, / By yelping hounds pull'd down, and seem to die. / Such things as these best please his majesty" (E2, 1.68–70). For such a scenario must surely have been designed to inflame the artistic ambitions of the King of Scots:

If ever I, O mighty Gods, have done you service true,
In setting forth by painful pain your glorious praises due;

47. Antonia Fraser, *King James VI of Scotland, I of England* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1974), 52.

48. Stewart, *The Cradle King*, 120.

If on the forked hill I tread; if ever I did prease
 To drink of the Pegasian spring, that flowers without release;
 If ever I on Pindus dwell'd."⁴⁹

James liked to represent himself as the patron of "Hymen's triumph," and "The *Masque of Hymen*" that the King both wrote and acted in for the wedding of his favorite, Huntly, in 1588, reveals how challenged he had been by the "Big If" of Marlowe's "mighty line," with its lament that "If all the pens that ever poets held . . . If all the heavenly quintessence they still . . . If these had made one poems period . . . Yet should there hover in their restless heads, / One thought, one grace, one wonder at the least" (*1Tam*, 5.1.161–74).⁵⁰ The royal rhymester's theory that poetry is a "willful lie," thus echoed Sidney's maxim in *The Defence of Poesy* (1595) that poetry "nothing affirms and therefore never lieth," and it was the poet of *Astrophil and Stella* (1591) he praised as "the best and sweetest writer."⁵¹ So editors guess James was introduced to Sidney's writing when the poet's brother, Marlowe's jailor, visited Edinburgh in 1588, and "worked assiduously" to ingratiate his family with the king.⁵² But his hyperbolic "if ever I" suggests he was already familiar with *Tamburlaine*; and that this literary overreacher, who pictured himself in his own sonnets swimming to his Danish bride like a Leander, "Eagle-like on Thetis back to flee / Where she commanded Neptune for to be / My princely guard" had recognized in Marlowe a kindred spirit in the poetics of the sublime.⁵³

"Peace, ho! I bar confusion / 'Tis I must make conclusion" (*As You Like It*, 5.4.114–15): it cannot be chance that when James did grace the Sidney circle at Wilton, the welcome Shakespeare inserted into *As You Like It* was another masque of Hymen, composed as what sounds like a parody of the regal poetaster's. Their lead dramatist had been dead ten years when the project of Pembroke's Men was realized, and a Herbert was at last able to kiss a king. "They told me you salute not at court but you kiss," comments a shocked Corin, the old shepherd of

49. James VI and I, "If ever I, O mighty Gods, have done you service true," *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1955–58), 2:134. Unless otherwise noted, all references to King James's poems are from this collection.

50. James VI and I, "Hymen's triumph," 10–11.

51. James VI and I, "My Muse hath made a willful lye," 1. See also Rickard, *Authorship and Authority*, 58; and Sir Philip Sidney, *Sir Philip Sidney: Selected Writings*, ed. Richard Dutton (Manchester: Carcanet P, 1987), 130.

52. Michael Brennan, *The Sidneyes of Penshurst and the Monarchy 1500–1700* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2006), 40, 101.

53. James VI and I, "But what, madam, and shall I then deny?," lines 8–10.

the play: "That courtesy would be uncleanly if courtiers were shepherds" (3.2.44). But "If I were a woman I would kiss as many of you as had beards" (epilogue.14), retorts the boy at the end who shows that "Your 'if' is the only peace-maker; much virtue in 'if'" (5.4.90).

As You Like It thus concluded with its author's most willing suspension of disbelief in the counter-factual play-world of the "dead shepherd" who had begged the mistress of the house to take him in. For the sponsorship Shakespeare had himself dramatized for Pembroke's Men in his induction to *The Taming of the Shrew* as "a flatt'ring dream or worthless fancy" (induction.1.40) had not, of course, saved the life of Christopher Marlowe, any more than the patronage of the Pembroke of the play had protected Gaveston.

"Was this the face / That every day under his household roof / Did keep ten thousand men?" (*RII*, 4.1.271–73) asks Shakespeare's Marlovian king, and this crushing deflation of his mightiest line seems as much aimed at the system that failed the author of *Edward II* as at Gaveston's travesty of "the Greekish strumpet" (*E2*, 9.15). So, the great survivor would ground his own authority in the playhouse Marlowe spurned. Conscious of being "indifferently reformed," in theater as in religion, Shakespeare would never cease to feel how, "After a well-graced actor leaves the stage," the eyes of men "Are idly bent on him that enters next" (*RII*, 5.2.23). But with the yearning of the passionate shepherd now so royally rewarded, Shakespeare could elegize what might have been, and for this fleeting moment of a new dawn share with his hosts what Marlowe saw so mightily, "the miracle of a chant of enchantment, which is also a song of songs . . . the mighty power of the might."⁵⁴

Kingston University
London, United Kingdom

54. Derrida, *H. C. for Life*, 79.

ROY ERIKSEN

Working with Marlowe: Shakespeare's Early Engagement with Marlowe's Poetics

Two young men are sitting at a table in candlelit room. Paper, pen, and ink on the table. The slightly better dressed of the two is reading from the sheet in front of him, stops, goes over it once more, before nodding approvingly, "Mmm . . . good, very good." He then swiftly seizes the quill, dips it, and underscores some words at the top of the written text, changes a word in midtext, and others at the end, before pushing the sheet over to his companion, "What do you think? Better?" The latter peruses the sheet carefully, "Mmm . . . quite, I see what you mean . . ."

This fanciful sketch attempts to capture the close working conditions and personal relationship existing between a playwright and an actor-playwright in the making—in this case between Marlowe and Shakespeare—who are working for the same theatre company. Collaboration and competition provide, I propose, a likely explanation for what Charles Forker terms the "symbiosis" and contiguity of some of their texts in 1591–92,¹ especially when considering that an actor and emerging dramatist like Shakespeare must have had privileged access to the scripts of Marlowe's plays when learning his lines.

Be this as it may, we cannot document the exact circumstances existing in and around the playhouse, but we may study the tangible and scripted results of their interaction. Here, I wish to consider briefly Shakespeare's response in *As You Like It* (1599) and *King John* (1595?)² to Marlowe's poetics and poetic practice as recorded in three

1. Charles R. Forker, introduction to *Edward II* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994), 1–136, 20.

2. William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, ed. Stanley Wells et al. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005). All subsequent references to Shakespeare's plays are from this edition. I think there is proof that places *King John* in 1589–90, but do not have space here to present my case for an

of the latter's first (and extant) plays: *1 and 2 Tamburlaine* and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.³ For among the Elizabethan and Jacobean poets who wrote for the stage, Shakespeare seems to be the only poet to have grasped fully the potential and energies inherent in Marlowe's "mighty line" or, in Phoebe's phrase, his "saw of might" (3.5.82), being unique in his capacity to bend that "might" to suit his own ends, preferences, and character. Critics have focused on the obvious similarities and differences in their handling of the dramatic medium, Wolfgang Clemen, Wilbur Sanders, Robert Logan, Lisa Hopkins, and M. L. Stapleton,⁴ being among the more influential critics who have focused on how the two dramatists differ, but also the many continuities existing between their works.

In spite of the dissimilarities in reach and quality of verse⁵ and characterization, Shakespeare is the dramatist who most successfully adopts and develops one of Marlowe's innovations, what I would term his art of fashioning "mighty speeches." These speeches, most readily associated with the protagonist in *1 Tamburlaine*,⁶ which are characterized by a particular dynamism and projection into the future caused by the combination of "mighty lines" and a novel use of linked metaphors.⁷ Clemen especially foregrounds how Marlowe disrupts "the static pattern of the old rhetorical structure and the old methods of rationalistic analysis"⁸ found in the rhetorical set speeches of earlier

early date.

3. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (1995; repr., Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008). All subsequent quotations from *1 and 2 Tamburlaine* are from this edition. *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is cited from Christopher Marlowe, *Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Roma Gill, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986).

4. Wilbur Sanders's seminal study, *The Dramatist and the Received Idea: Studies in the Plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1968) is a classic in this respect, but a more balanced account is found in Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare and Co.: Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Dekker, Ben Jonson . . . and the Other Players in His Story* (London: Penguin, 2007), 61–105. See also Robert A. Logan, *Shakespeare's Marlowe: The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007); Lisa Hopkins, *Christopher Marlowe, Renaissance Dramatist* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2008); and *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman: Lives, Stage, and Page*, ed. Sarah K. Scott and M. L. Stapleton (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2010).

5. For a succinct discussion of Marlowe's verse, see Russ McDonald, "Marlowe and Style," in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 55–69.

6. Wolfgang Clemen, *English Tragedy before Shakespeare: The Development of Dramatic Speech* (1961; repr., London: Routledge, 2012).

7. McDonald draws attention to the particular force of inherent in his dramatic poetry, underlining that it "proceeds from his unique combination of the transgressive and the conventional." McDonald, "Marlowe and Style," 55–69.

8. Clemen, *English Tragedy before Shakespeare*, 117.

drama, and develops speeches driven by a expansive use of *amplificatio* and a setting free of the poetic imagination: "It is no longer mere rhetoric which is responsible for the heightening effect, but imagination" (119). Clemen's observations on Marlowe's art are to the point, but need to be qualified somewhat as regards speech structure. It is true that many elements of "rhetorical formalism"⁹ are dropped, but Marlowe is far from abandoning "a preconceived rhetorical 'dispositio,'" (119). I propose that what we see instead is the application of a different concept of structure, or design, in speeches, one that is less dependent on series of rhetorical devices, but one that combines dynamism with spatial form, creating stirring and persuasive speeches that function almost as self-contained poems.¹⁰ The "theatrical magic"¹¹ of Marlowe hit the theater business like a bombshell,¹² routing University Wits like Robert Greene, Thomas Lodge, and George Peele who failed "to meet Marlowe's intellectual challenge and match his literary standard."¹³ Shakespeare fared better due to his greater versatility and talent, and engaged with the innovations of Marlowe on all levels from structure to style while hammering out his own style of drama, seen for example in the second and third parts of *Henry VI* (1589–90) and *King John*. Meredith Skura points out that "while dramatists like Robert Greene imitated Marlowe's Tamburlaine, Shakespeare rewrote him as overreaching villain like Richard III, or an underachieving hero like Henry VI."¹⁴

Still, Shakespeare did not uncritically take over or mimic Marlowe's style, that fast became a type of knowledge shared among friends and rivals (a stylistic brand of the Erasmian "*amicorum communia omnia*").¹⁵

9. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot, *Shakespeare and the Mannerist Tradition: A Reading of Five Problem Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 54.

10. I do not accept the view that when "Marlowe breaks the formal stiffness of the syntactical pattern . . . [such] moments . . . are exceptional." Maquerlot, *Shakespeare and the Mannerist Tradition*, 53.

11. C. L. Barber, *Creating Elizabethan Tragedy: The Theatre of Marlowe and Kyd*, ed. Richard P. Wheeler (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988), 45–86, 48.

12. Richard Levin, "The Contemporary Reception of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984): 51–70.

13. James P. Bednarz, "Marlowe and the English Literary Scene," in Cheney, *Cambridge Companion*, 90–105, 98.

14. Meredith Skura, "What Shakespeare Did to Marlowe in Private: Dido, Faustus, and Bottom," in Scott and Stapleton, *Christopher Marlowe the Craftsman*, 79–90, 90.

15. Erasmus, *Adagiorum chiliades, Opera omnia*, (Venetia: Aldus, 1508), 2.13F–14F. See Kathy H. Eden, "Literary Property and the Question of Style: A Prehistory," in *Borrowed Feathers: Plagiarism and the Limits of Imitation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Hall Bjørnstad (Oslo: UniPub, 2008), 21–38.

Even though echoes of Marlowe's poetry are present in various guises in works produced throughout Shakespeare's career, he seems from the outset to be somewhat wary of his colleague's style. As I will argue below, in *As You Like It* he ironizes and jokes about Marlowe's Italianate poetic excesses. Also, one wonders whether the attacks on Shakespeare for strutting with *furtivis coloribus* may have instilled in him some form of "anxiety of influence"?¹⁶ There is however a tangible tenderness in Phoebe's lines in *As You Like It*: "Dead Shepherd, now I find thy saw of might, / Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?" (3.5.81–82).

It is a recorded fact that many of Marlowe's contemporaries saw beyond the strident and hyperbolic rhetoric of some of his characters and appreciated his poetry and poetics. Michael Drayton's often quoted lines on the poet Marlowe draw attention to the Neoplatonist underpinnings of the poetics:

Neat Marlowe, bathed in Thespian springs
Had in him those brave translunary things,
That the first Poets had, his raptures were
All air, and fire, which made his verses clear
For that fine madness still he did retain,
Which rightly should possess a poet's brain.¹⁷

In the words of Madeleine Doran, Drayton responded "sympathetically" to the inspirational doctrine set forth in "the *Ion*, the *Phaedrus*, and the *Laws*," and she connects his lines to Marlowe's "poetic vision."¹⁸ Drayton aligns Marlowe with the first poets and attributes to him "that fine madness," or *furor poeticus*, discussed primarily by the philosopher and translator of Plato, Marsilio Ficino, in his work on the frenzies in late quattrocento Florence, and propagated by Italian cinquecento theorists like Giambattista Giraldis Cinzio, Julius Caesar Scaliger, and their followers in England.¹⁹ The terms Drayton uses about the quality of Marlowe's verses (air, fire, clear) characterize a poet whom nature, as it were, has taught to have an aspiring mind, and who has the four elements "always warring

16. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973), 5–16.

17. Michael Drayton, "Elegy to My Most Dearly-Loved Friend, Henry Reynolds," in *Minor Poems of Michael Drayton*, ed. Cyril Brett (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1907), 110.

18. Madeleine Doran, *Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1964), 57.

19. Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry; or, The Defence of Poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shepherd (1965; repr., Manchester: Manchester UP, 1980). Sidney mentions both Scaliger and Cristoforo Landino in his peroration (141–42).

within [his] breast for regiment.” (*1Tam*, 2.7.19) He obviously sees Marlowe, who was among the poets and intellectuals gravitating around Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke,²⁰ as a proponent of a Neoplatonizing poetics. Thus he follows in the footsteps of Sir Philip Sidney, who in *An Apology for Poetry* (1595) describes how a poet “with the force of a divine breath . . . bringeth things far surpassing [nature’s] doings.”²¹ Unlike Samuel Daniel, who wrote *A Defence of Ryme* (1603), Marlowe did not record his views on poetry, but he outlines his poetics and the formal solutions it entails in a blank verse “sonnet” in *1 Tamburlaine*, first identified by Paul H. Kocher:²²

What is beauty, saith my sufferings, then?
 If all the pens that ever poets held
 Had fed the feelings of their masters’ thoughts,
 And every sweetness that inspired their hearts,
 Their minds, and muses on admirèd themes.
 If all the heavenly quintessence they still
 From their immortal flowers of poesy,
 Wherein as in a mirror we perceive
 The highest reaches of a human wit,
 If all had made one poem’s period,
 And all combinèd in beauty’s worthiness.
 Yet would there hover in their restless heads
 One thought, one grace, one wonder at the least,
 Which into words no virtue can digest. (5.1.160–73)

The fourteen-line “poem” embedded in Tamburlaine’s speech contains clear traces of a sonnet structure consisting of three quatrains with identical beginnings, or anaphora (“If all,” “If all,” “If these . . . all”; [2, 6, 10]), followed by a couplet, much in the manner of Daniel’s sonnets 9 and 19 in *Delia* (1592).²³ In short, Marlowe here allows us a glance into his poetic laboratory, providing us with a snapshot of his poetics and compositional method, doing exactly what Torquato Tasso had done in his *Lezione* (1567–70) on a sonnet by Giovanni Della Casa.²⁴ Marlowe emphasizes poetry as an intellectual endeavor of the highest order, and the importance of heavenly inspiration, or

20. Patrick Cheney, *Marlowe’s Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1997), 222–26.

21. Doran connects Drayton with Sir Philip Sidney and Marlowe, *Endeavors of Art*, 57, citing Sidney’s passage on divine inspiration, *An Apology for Poetry*, 101.

22. Paul H. Kocher, “A Marlowe Sonnet,” *Philological Quarterly* 24.4 (1945): 39–45.

23. Samuel Daniel, *Delia: Contayning certayne Sonnets: with the complaint of Rosamond* (London, 1592; rpr. Menston, Scholar Press, 1963), Sig. Cr and D2r.

24. Doran, *Endeavors of Art*, 56–57.

what Sidney termed “the force of a divine breath.”²⁵ Moreover, he stresses the importance of loftiness and unity of theme (“admired themes . . . heavenly quintessence”), while adhering to the compositional ideal of what Tasso termed “unità mista,”²⁶ mixed unity (“immortal flowers of poesy . . . all combined”) kept together by a unifying formal template furnished by the syntactic unity of a multimembered period (“one poem’s period”). The metaphors drawn from alchemy (“quintessence” and “still”) further underline the purity of form and essence aimed at when writing poetry, a quest for beauty that is unattainable and never-ending even for “restless heads,” or in Sidney’s “things far surpassing [nature’s] doings.”

It is precisely this type of Neoplatonist and poetics that Shakespeare later pokes fun at in *As You Like It*. The idea of the poet as a divine maker and endowed with extraordinary, even Orphic, powers to move listeners and work miracles, probably seemed high-blown and outlandish to Marlowe’s Warwickshire contemporary, who in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1595) makes Theseus lump together lunatics, madmen, and poets as being “of imagination all compact” (5.1.8).²⁷

Although Shakespeare from the very beginning actively engages with Marlowe’s style, he may have found aspects of the latter’s magniloquent speeches in *Tamburlaine* a suitable target for merriment. In *As You Like It*, written two or three years after Marlowe’s death, he undercuts the lofty claims and the artificiality of Marlowe’s Italianate style. This is particularly evident in the love poems Orlando writes to Rosalind. In one of them we learn that he will “at every sentence end . . . Rosalind write” (3.2.132–33), alluding, I suggest, to a rhetorical device that Marlowe uses for example in *Tamburlaine*’s panegyric lament on Zenocrate (“Black is the beauty of the brightest day” [2*Tam*, 2.4.346–70]) where her name is repeated in rhyme position six times in all, as seen below:

Now walk the angels on the walls of heaven
As sentinels to warn the ‘immortal souls
To entertain divine Zenocrate.

25. Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, 101.

26. Torquato Tasso, *Discorsi dell’Arte poetica*, ed. Luigi Poma (Bari: LaTerza, 1964), 2.17.

27. When this is said, we remember that Theseus also allows the poet’s “frenzy” is “fine”:

The poet’s eye, in fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to Earth, from Earth to heaven.
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet’s pen
Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name. (5.1.12–17)

Apollo, Cynthia, and the ceaseless lamps
 That gently looked upon this loathsome earth
 Shine downwards no more, but deck the heavens
To entertain divine Zenocrate.
 The crystal springs whose taste illuminates
 Refinèd eyes with an eternal sight,
 Like tried silver, runs through Paradise
To entertain divine Zenocrate. (15–25, emphasis mine)

Here and elsewhere,²⁸ Tamburlaine repeats his queen's name at the end of several lines, and we recognize the same device in the poem that Celia reads, opening with an allusion to Francesco Petrarch's *Canzoniere* 269 (1374),²⁹ which Marlowe uses in the epilogue in *Doctor Faustus*.³⁰

CELIA. From the east to western Ind,
 No jewel is like *Rosalind*.
 Her worth, being mounted on the wind,
 Through all the world bears *Rosalind*.
 All the pictures fairest lines
 Are but black to *Rosalind* . . .
 Let not face be kept in mind
 But the fair of *Rosalind*.
 (*As You Like It*, 3.2.86–93, emphasis mine)

In Orlando's verses on Rosalind, Marlowe's high seriousness becomes transposed to farce, when Shakespeare comically exaggerates the Scythian's "impassionate fury, for the death of his Ladie and loue, faire Zenocrate."³¹ It seems done for the fun of it, but he seems to have forgotten that his initial attitude to this technique may have been somewhat more positive, for in *King John* one of the citizens of Angiers eulogizes Lady Blanche in a manner we know well by now:

CITIZEN. If lusty love should go in quest of beauty,
 Where should he find it fairer *than in Blanch?*
 If zealous love should go in search of virtue,
 Where should he find it purer *than in Blanch?*
 If love ambitious sought a match of birth,
 Whose veins bounds richer blood *than Lady Blanch?*

28. The same technique is used in the first part of *Tamburlaine* (2.4.1–38).

29. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: The Rime Sparse and Other Lyrics*, ed. and trans. Robert M. Durling (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976), 442–443.

30. Cheney, *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession*, 223–24.

31. See the advertisement on the frontispiece of *2 Tamburlaine* in the 1593 edition (repr. [Menston]: Scolar, 1973).

Such as she is, in beauty, virtue, birth,
 Is the young Dauphin every way complete.
 (*King John*, 2.1.426–34, emphasis mine)

Here we not only spot the device of placing the name of the praised woman at the ends of several lines, but may also notice that the influence of Marlowe's "sonnet" on beauty. The influence is strongly felt both in terms of theme, that is, beauty, and structure: the three hypothetical clauses ("If lusty love," "If zealous love," "If love ambitious") echo those in Tamburlaine's "sonnet." As in Marlowe's play the three hypothetical questions ("If all . . .") lead up to an expression of the Neoplatonist principle of "infolding,"³² which is when three positive qualities—here beauty, virtue, and noble birth—are combined in the excellence of Blanche.

But let us return to *As You Like It* and Shakespeare's comic treatment of Marlowe's Neoplatonizing poetics in Orlando's love poems to Rosalind. Here, too, Shakespeare plays around with the principle of infolding which he treats with antipetrarchist gusto by rehearsing some of the other metaphors employed in Marlowe's "sonnet" on beauty:

But upon the fairest boughs,
 Or at every sentence end,
 Will I 'Rosalinda' write?
 Teaching all that read to know
 The *quintessence* of every sprite
 Heaven would in little show.
 Therefore Heaven Nature charged,
 That *one body* should be filled
 With *all graces* wide-enlarged:
 Nature presently *distilled*
 Helen's cheek, but not her heart,
 Cleopatra's majesty,
 Atalanta's better part,
 Sad Lucretia's modesty.
Thus Rosalind of many parts
By heavenly synod was devised,
 Of many faces, eyes, and hearts,
 To have the touches dearest prized . . .
 Heaven would that she these gifts should have,
 And I to live and die her slave.
 (3.2.132–51, emphasis mine)

32. Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 120–27.

Alchemy is important also in Orlando's view of writing poetry for he repeats key terms ("quintessence," "distilled," "one body . . . filled with all graces"), where Marlowe had used "quintessence" and "still." Here, however, the process is hardly an act of creating quintessential beauty even though the principle of infolding no doubt is intended when "Rosalind of many parts / By heavenly synod was devised" (46–47), and in this respect it alludes to the similar principle of combining three elements into one seen in the attempt describe beauty in Tamburlaine's "sonnet." There the poets fail to combine "one word, one wonder, one grace" into a description that does justice to "beauty's worthiness" (5.1.170). These allusions to the Neoplatonist principle of infolding that was so central to the cult of the universality of Queen Elizabeth are here, as they indeed are in *Love's Labour's Lost* (1590),³³ a cause for merriment. This is especially true because Shakespeare also cites the Italian patriarchal aesthetic commonplace that no single woman could be perfect.³⁴ Therefore theorists recommended that particularly desirable and excellent parts of diverse women should be combined into a perfect image of female beauty, as described for example by Agnolo Firenzuola in *Delle bellezze delle donne* (1540).³⁵ Orlando foolishly explains in detail the highly mundane process of selecting female body parts ("many faces, eyes, and hearts").³⁶

Shakespeare may have outgrown Marlowe's exuberant rhetoric and offered a *serio-ludere* critique of his colleague's style by the time he wrote *As You Like It*, but he continued to practice one basic compositional technique that he had learned while working alongside and competing with his innovative rival: the use of the periodic speech. For in Marlowe Neoplatonist ideas and the classical rhetoric often come together in a very practical manner in the theory of the "one poem's period," or periodicity, which is the practical and technical template of his poetics.

33. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, Berowne (Biron) passionately replies that eminent qualities are infolded in Rosaline, too, because "Of all complexions that culled sovereignty / Do meet as at a fair in her fair cheek, / Where several worthies make one dignity" (5.1.233–35). See *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance*, 225–26.

34. See Nancy J. Vickers, "Diana Described: *Scattered* Woman and *Scattered* Rhyme," *Critical Inquiry* 8.2 (1981): 265–79.

35. Agnolo Firenzuola, *Dialogo delle bellezze delle donne*, in *Prose di M. Agnolo Firenzuola Fiorentino* (Florence, 1540), fol. 75.

36. See also *Love's Labour's Lost*, 5.1.179–84.

It has been argued by a number of critics³⁷ that Marlowe tends to build his plays by extended paragraphs of impassioned poetry rather than by scenes. This may be partially true as regards speeches that mark important structural points in the action, but he also pays great attention to the structure of scenes and their architectural integration into plots.³⁸ In such key-point speeches, John Russell Brown noted, elements are assembled to create a total effect: “he preferred to build, to progress by marked degrees, retaining each element within the final large impression.”³⁹ For the spatially designed periodic speech, in which we also often find his typical moving flashes of poetry, is his main building block and one that appealed in particular to Shakespeare.

In fact, in their use of patterned speeches Marlowe and Shakespeare are almost unique. For all his imitations of Marlowe, Greene for example did never quite take to this technique, which was fully developed already in *Dido*, *Queen of Carthage* and *Tamburlaine* to the extent that nearly one-third of the text in the plays is found in periodic speeches of varying length and complexity.⁴⁰ In this, Marlowe clearly adheres to poetic ideals ultimately originating in Aristotle, who explains what creates cohesion and unity in long periods. He recommends placing verbal repetitions connecting the beginning, the middle, and end of sentences, that is, at the same points that he also argues should be interlinked if a plot in tragedy is to have unity.⁴¹ Therefore Francesco Robortello, when discussing Aristotle’s definition of plot unity in *The Poetics* (c. 335 BCE), advises his reader to look up what Aristotle has to say on the period.⁴² In fact, the formal properties of the period could serve as an aesthetic ideal or formal template for larger finished segments of text.⁴³ One such

37. See, for instance, Harry Levin’s discussion in *The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Faber, 1961), 29–32; 197–99, or Clemen, *English Tragedy before Shakespeare*, 116–20.

38. On Marlowe’s style of designing plots, see Roy Eriksen, “‘What Place Is This’: Time and Place in Marlowe’s *Dr. Faustus* (B),” *RenDrama* 16 (1985): 49–74.

39. John Russell Brown, “Marlowe and the Actors,” *Tulane Drama Review* 8.4 (1964): 155–73, 159.

40. Roy Eriksen, *The Forme of Faustus Fortunes: A Study of the Tragedie of Doctor Faustus (1616)* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities and Solum, 1987), 207–26.

41. Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1926), 2.4.13, 3.9.6–9. The relevant passages are discussed in Eriksen, *Forme of Faustus Fortunes*, 207–9; and more fully, in “Poetics, Stylometrics and Attributions Studies: Periodicity in Marlowe,” in *Approaches to the Text: From Pre-Gospel to Post-Baroque*, eds. Roy Eriksen and Peter Young (Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2014) 171–90.

42. Francesco Robortello, *In librum de arte poetica explicationes* (Florence, 1548), 72.

43. Aristotle underscores that “all these figures [which are typical of the period] may be

segment is Tamburlaine's blank verse "sonnet," discussed on pages 25–26, which incorporates a designed, extrasyntactic structure of repetitions, consisting, as it were, of the "flowers of poesy" distilled and combined.⁴⁴

Sometimes the close relationship between structure and topic is so close that we speak of emblematic speeches. Commenting on the myths of ascent, Harry Levin remarked "Marlowe could have brought the authority of Lucretius . . . to the support of his hero's restlessness."⁴⁵ Marlowe, "the Lucretius of the English language,"⁴⁶ manages to fix that restlessness within a verbally designed, spatial structure, combining dynamism with containment. A telling example is *1 Tamburlaine*, 2.7.17–29, where Marlowe underlines the inborn and upward surge in the human will to aspire and that the basis of this aspiration is the forces at work in nature and the universe:

The thirst of reign and *sweetness* of a *crown*
That caused the eldest son of heavenly Ops,
To thrust his father from his chair
And place himself in th'empyrean heaven,
Moved me to manage arms against thy state.
What better precedent than mighty Jove?
Nature, that *framed* us of four elements
Warring within our breasts for regiment,
Doth teach us all to have aspiring *minds*.
Our souls, whose faculties can comprehend
The wondrous *architecture* of the world;
And measure every wand'ring planet's course,
Still climbing after knowledge infinite,
And always *moving* as the restless spheres,
Wills us to wear ourselves and never rest,
Until we reach the ripest fruit of all
That perfect bliss and sole felicity,
The *sweet* fruition of an earthly *crown*. (2.7.12–29, emphasis mine)

Tamburlaine's description of his quest for infinite knowledge is here placed within a strongly marked rhetorical frame constituted by the

found in the same sentence at once—antithesis, equality of clauses, and similarity of endings" (*The Art of Rhetoric*, 3.9.6; 387–90). He also underlines the period's function as a template for orations and dithyrambs (3.9.6; 389–91). Compare with Eriksen, *The Forme of Faustus Fortunes*, 208, 224n.

44. See Eriksen, "Poetics, Stylometrics and Attribution Studies: Periodicity in Marlowe, 173–78.

45. Levin, *The Overreacher*, 56.

46. Una Ellis-Fermor, *Christopher Marlowe* (London: Methuen, 1927), 34.

repeated thematic key-words “sweetness/sweet” and “crown” (12, 29). We note how architectural metaphors almost function as self-referential terms. The speech and the many others of its kind in *1 and 2 Tamburlaine* behave like stanzas, or “rooms” of poetry,⁴⁷ and most of them are spoken by the towering figure of Tamburlaine, who surpasses even “Hermes, prolocutor to the gods” (*1 Tam*, 1.2.210).

Of course, not all speeches are as elaborate in their rhetorical patterning as the cited speech, some are more patterned and many more considerably less patterned, or not at all, especially with respect to the speaker and the function of the speech. However, what characterizes Marlowe’s compositional style in *Tamburlaine* is that about 30 percent of the speeches in part 1, and about 25 percent of the speeches in part 2 have structures of this kind, albeit of various complexity. The following speech by Tamburlaine to Cosroe is a tight-knit example and typical of speeches that immediately were imitated in, for example, Shakespeare’s *King John*. First Marlowe:

Hold thee, Cosroe; wear two *imperial crowns*.
 Think thee invested now as *royally*,
 Even by the mighty hand of Tamburlaine,
 As if as many *kings* as could encompass thee
 With greatest pomp had *crown’d* thee *emperor*.
 (*1Tam*, 2.5.1–5, emphasis mine)

Here we note that the repetitions (on the pattern of abc/cba) encircle the image of sovereignty in the central line (“the mighty hand of

47. Daniel writes about a poem as being a “iust periode” in *A Defense of Ryme* (1603) and amply illustrated this in *Delia* (1592; 1603). Sir John Beaumont, in *Bosworth Field: With a Taste of the Variety of Other Poems* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1629), 136, uses the same technique in an encomiastic sonnet to Charles I, “At the end of his Majesties first yeere” the “periodos”-symbolism is evident:

Your *royal* father *James*, the good and *great*,
 Proclaim’d in March, when first we felt the spring,
 A world of blisse did to our island bring;
 And at his death he made his yeeres compleate,

Although three dayes he longer held his seate,
 Then from that house when he rejoye’d to sing,
 Great Brittain torne before, enjoyes a *king*.
 Who can *the periods of the starres* repeate?

The *sunne*, who in his annuall circle takes
 A dayes full quadrant from th’ensuing yeere,
 Repayes it in foure yeeres, and equall makes
 The number of the dayes within his spheare:
James was our earthly *sunne*, who, call’d to Heaven,
 Leaves you his heire, to make all fractions even. (Emphasis mine)

Tamburlaine”). Now to Shakespeare who seizes on this technique and in *King John*:

King John. If that the Dauphin there, thy *princely* son,
 Can in this book of *beauty* read “I love,”
 Her dowry shall weigh equal with a queen;
 For Anjou, and fair Touraine, Maine, Poitou,
 And all that we upon this side the sea—
 Except this city now by us besieged—
 Find liable to your *crown* and dignity,
 Shall gild her bridal bed, and make her rich
 In titles, honours, and promotions,
 As she in *beauty*, education, blood,
 Holds hand with any *princess* of the world.
 (2.1.485–95, emphasis mine)

We note how the word “princely” and “beauty” (485–86) are echoed in beauty and princess at the close of John’s speech (494–95), constituting a double frame around the argument that Blanche’s dowry will match her status and qualities and be equal to the status and virtues of the Dauphin.⁴⁸ At the center of the eleven-line speech, Shakespeare creates a rhyme (sea *versus* dignity) that encircles the significant word “crown.” There are many similar speeches in *King John* and they are more evenly divided between the characters. King John, King Lewis, Constance, and Blanche use them, and also the Herald has one, although the Marlovian Bastard dominates as the character with the most lines. For even here we find Shakespeare reconfiguring Marlowe, forging his own versions of the mighty speech. It would be wrong, however, to say there is no variation in Marlowe’s practice, for already in his first play, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, both Aeneas and Dido speak repeatedly in periodic speeches,⁴⁹ and the perhaps finest one is Dido’s last.

Although the play is highly experimental, displaying the poet’s acquaintance with a number of sources and a varied handling of poetry and dramaturgy, the mighty speech then is already fully developed. There is no need to explain away what (wrongly I think) has been seen as the play’s lack of cohesion, because the effects created underscore the studied experimental and innovative quality of

48. This involves yet another reference to infolding, when Blanche’s “beauty, education, blood” match those of a princess.

49. Albeit Dido herself has most of the long speeches displaying periodicity in the play, the longest speech of all is delivered by Aeneas (2.1.161–208), when he recounts how the Greeks enter into Troy.

Marlowe's original creation, which engages with and transforms the kind of courtly and mythological play John Lyly had written.

In Dido's most frantic and almost comic wooing speech, Marlowe includes a reference to how one of her suitors as an "Orator . . . thought by words / To compass me, but yet he was deceived" (3.2.155–56), which interestingly is what she too will do with a similar result, being rejected by Aeneas. As a result of him abandoning her⁵⁰ and suppressing his love for her and instead fulfilling his political mission ("Italiam non sponte sequor"), she commits suicide by sacrificing herself on the pyre (5.1.292–313). She swears vengeance on Aeneas in a moving speech that illustrates how the young playwright-poet has made the *concininitas* of humanist rhetoric into an art of his own:

*Now, Dido, with these reliques burne thy selfe,
And make Aeneas famous through the world
For perjurie and slaughter of a Queene.
Here lye the Sword that in the darksome Cave
He drew, and swore by to be true to me,
Thou shalt burne first, thy crime is worse then his;
Here lye the garment which I cloath'd him in,
When first he came on shoare, perish thou to:
These letters, lines, and perjur'd papers all,
Shall burne to cinders in this percious flame.
And now ye gods that guide the starrie frame,
And order all things at your high dispose,⁵¹
Graunt, though the traytors land in Italy,
They may be still tormented with unrest,
And from mine ashes let a Conqueror rise,
That may revenge this treason to a Queen,
By plowing up his Countries with the Sword:
Betwixt this land and that be neuer league,
Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
Imprecor: arma armis; pungent ipsique nepotes:
Live false Aeneas, truest Dido dyes,
Sic iuvat ire sub umbras. (292–313; emphasis mine)*

50. See Ann Christensen, "Men (Don't) Leave: Aeneas as Departing Husband in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*," *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 2 (2012): 5–24.

51. Lines 202–03 possibly echo divine order described in the *Latin Book of Wisdome* 8:1 (*Liber Sapientia*): "adtingit enim a fine usque ad finem fortiter et disponit omnia suaviter" ("She [i.e. divine wisdom] also reacheth from one end to another mightely, and comely doth she order all."). The verse is cited from *The Geneva Bible*, ed. Lloyd E. Berry (Madison, Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, 420. The references to order and frame can be taken to allude to the structure of the speech.

The speech falls into two main parts, each half beginning with the adverb “now” (292, 302) and repeating the verb “burne” (292, 301) to form a chiasmic pattern (“now . . . burne // burne now”),⁵² thus providing a strong link between the beginning and the middle of the speech. Then, too, the speech has its own a peripety when Dido turns from private sacrifice to an invocation to the gods to avenge her (302–11), before returning to the private sacrifice in the last two verses (312–13). This peripety is furthermore made prominent when the word “all” is repeated in verses 300 (“papers all”) and 303 (“all things”) as a frame, whereas the center itself is marked by a rhyme (flame-frame). In this manner a combination of *epanados* and *antimetabole* links the peripety to the opening of the speech.⁵³ Turning now to the several other rhetorical “flowers” iterated in the speech, we note that the beginning is linked to the end, but also that key-words in the first half also occur in the second half, and some in inverse order, in this manner: Dido / Aeneas / *Queene* / Sword / all / *flame-frame* / all / *Queene* / Sword / Aeneas / Dido. Note that I have underscored the repeated rhymes within this structure, as the repetition of rhyme-words and rhymes is an additional form of adornment that Marlowe came to use quite frequently in his blank verse and that he later takes up and develops in *Hero and Leander*. However, Marlowe does not end his engagement with Virgil and, in a final flourish, combines Virgil’s Latin and his own words (“Live false, Aeneas, truest Dido dyes”) into a cross-linguistic chiasmic “rhyme” structure for Dido’s lines of farewell: *undas . . . nepotes / dyes . . . umbras*.⁵⁴ Such verbal games many would say are details, but because the details are words and poetry is words put in order, such repetitions do indeed matter. They did to Marlowe, Shakespeare, and their contemporaries.

Critics have noted how Shakespeare returned to and engaged intellectually and competitively with lines and passages of Marlowe throughout his career, but more attention, I propose, needs to be paid

52. For multimembered chiasmi, or recessed symmetry, see Alastair Fowler’s groundbreaking *Triumphal Forms: Structural Patterns in Elizabethan Poetry* (Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1970), 91–124.

53. For these terms and *epanalepsis*, see Abraham Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (London, 1588). Fraunce explains *epanados* as “regression or turning to the same sound, when one and the same sound is repeated in the beginning and the middle, or middle and end. *Epanalepsis* is when “the same sound . . . iterated in the beginning and ending.” *Antimetabole* (or chiasmus) simply means the inverted repetition of two or more words (1.22, sig. D3v).

54. Here Marlowe seems to allude to the meaning of *contraria* as *antitheta* in rhetorical theory when he integrates the Latin poet’s verses into his own periodic composition in his attempt to surpass the famous predecessor.

to his response to Marlowe's periodic speeches in which strategically placed verbal repetitions increase the impact on the audience. Shakespeare's critique of the hyperbolic tone of Marlowe's speeches seems to have been an element in his dramatic poetry that is traceable as far back as in *King John* in the magniloquent Marlovian character of the Bastard. His high-blown rhetoric at act 5, scene 2, lines 17–58 is interestingly commented on by King Lewis: "We hold our time too precious to be spent / With such a brabblers" (162). For in the imitation, revision, and critique of Marlowe's style voiced, for example, by King Lewis in *King John* or in the poetry of Orlando in *As You Like It*, we also perceive the ambivalence in his response to and fascination for the art of the "Dead shepherd."

University of Agder
Kristiansand, Norway

PAUL FRAZER

Moving with Marlowe (& Co.): Relocation,
Appropriation, and Personation in Thomas
Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*

Nostalgia advertising, teasing out that “yearning for yesterday,” becomes particularly potent and prominent at “transitional times” such as the end of a century: “a time of cultural anxiety” when “there is a perceived discontinuity between the centuries, the old one metaphorically dying, the new one still on the horizon. Therefore the public may look towards the less threatening and comfortable past rather than face the present or future.”¹ Conditioned correctly, nostalgia marketing places lucrative emphasis upon past successes and provokes emotive feelings of comfort, safety, and assurance. Public appetite for the new and exciting can be trumped by products that offer safety and protection, rooted in familiarities of old. At the close of the sixteenth century, the Admiral's Men faced ominous market threats in the form of a new rival theater on their doorstep, and the heady prospect of leaving their Bankside residence at the Rose to finally assume their new playing venue: the Fortune at Golding Lane, Cripplegate. Since the Privy Council installed the Lord Chamberlain, Henry Carey, and his son-in-law the Lord Admiral, Charles Howard, as aristocratic protectors to a new duopoly of playing companies, formed from the remnants of the Queen's Men in May 1594, professional acting in London had undergone a remarkable metamorphosis.² The troupes were allotted fixed playhouses, and with no plague stoppages since 1596, this represented an unprecedented period of

1. Timothy H. Reisenwitz, Rajesh Iyer, and Bob Cutler, “Nostalgia Advertising and the Influence of Nostalgia Proneness,” *The Marketing Management Journal* 14.2 (2004): 55–66, 55.

2. On the geneses of the London acting companies, see Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 19–35.

stability, with both companies entirely absent from provincial touring records between 1598 and 1600. The nature of playing was changing from a model of occasional fixed performance and regular touring beyond the capital to a settled and localized dramaturgy, for which plays were being designed for specific playing venues and familiar audiences.

Moving venues was, however, a complicated business. And Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn's plan to vacate the Rose was met with stern opposition from local magistrates resistant to the idea of a theater opening for business within their precincts. S. P. Cerasano and Andrew Gurr agree that Henslowe and Alleyn had been planning the Fortune's move from as early as 1597.³ But despite Alleyn signing the Fortune site lease on December 22, 1599, Middlesex justices continued to oppose and contest the new theater's construction up until April 1600—when the Lord Admiral himself forced the move through with his monarch's decisive backing: Elizabeth I “having been well pleased heretofore at tymes of recreacion with the seviles of Edward Alleyn and his Companie.”⁴

One of the plays that had most recently been staged for Elizabeth's entertainment was Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (c. 1600), which (according to its title page) saw in the “New-yeares day at night” celebrations at court. Given that the Admiral's Men sold the playscript less than a year after its court performance at a time that coincided with their movement to the Fortune, it seems reasonable to ponder why a play held in high enough regard to entertain the Queen at the cusp of 1600 might have been surplus to requirements at the new playing venue.⁵ As far as we know, *The Shoemaker's Holiday* was not written specifically for court performance (unlike Dekker's apparent rewriting of *Old Fortunatus* [1599] that year).⁶ But its prologue, which *was* written for court, couples its fawning praise of Elizabeth with two disclaimers of the play: “being indeed no way

3. Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company 1594–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009), 19; S. P. Cerasano, “Edward Alleyn's ‘Retirement’ 1597–1600,” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 10 (1998): 99–109, 108.

4. Charles Howard to Justices of Middlesex, April 8, 1600, Privy Council letter, qtd. in Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites*, 21.

5. On the plays shed by the Admiral's Men in 1600–1601, see Paul Menzer, “Shades of Marlowe,” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 1 (2011): 181–92, 183.

6. See my discussion of this text's relationship with its court performance in Paul Frazer, “Performing Places in Thomas Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*,” *Philological Quarterly* 89.4 (2010): 457–80. Helen Hackett has recently suggested that *Shoemaker's Holiday* may have been performed as early as Shrovetide 1599 in “‘As the Diall Hand Tells Ore’: The Case for Dekker, Not Shakespeare, as Author,” *Review of English Studies* 63.258 (2012): 34–57.

offensive” and that “nothing is purposed but mirth.”⁷ Preempting potential offence twice in twenty lines is suggestive that the text *could offend someone* at court, wherein the patrons of both London companies (including Henslowe and Alleyn) and Edmund Tilney, Master of the Revels, would presumably have been in attendance. Whilst the Admiral’s company prepared to move playhouse, playwrights like Dekker were carving out their own theatrical reputations and targeting London audiences in revealing ways.

This paper argues that reading Dekker’s play against its immediate commercial–theatrical contexts reveals important details of its acting troupe’s market identity, and the varying pressures of influence and competition being experienced by its playwrights. I begin by highlighting how the comedy typifies the Admiral’s cultivation of a distinctively metatheatrical identity, whereby Dekker’s “goodfellow” shoemakers are written as a running gag for a company of players. Dekker employs this trope to figure Simon Eyre’s workshop as a playhouse, using theatrical in-jokes and intertextual allusions to celebrate and market the Henslowe-Alleyn company’s popular repertory and playing practices. Through the prominence of the Admiral’s Marlovian classics, Dekker personates both Marlowe and their celebrity master-actor Alleyn through the bombast of Eyre, whose many intertextually charged speeches embody the company’s most cherished playwriting and playing talents.⁸ Extending this discussion beyond Marlowe, I survey and analyze *Shoemaker’s Holiday*’s other personations. By figuring the Rose playhouse itself through the character Rose Oatley, Dekker playfully and pointedly intervenes into the debates surrounding the Admiral’s company’s impending relocation from Bankside—at a time at which permissions for the move were still being negotiated. Dekker’s play ridicules civic opposition to the company’s move and, partly by echoing Shakespearean metatheater, attempts to off-set the market-threat posed by his competitor’s increasingly dominant reputation at the newly opened Globe. By celebrating the Admiral’s Men’s recent “victory” over the short-lived Swan Theater, moreover, Dekker alludes severally to actors and playwrights associated with Francis Langley’s failed attempts to capture a significant market-share of the Rose’s South-bank audiences. By invoking the Swan playhouse, Dekker also draws

7. Thomas Dekker, *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris, 3rd ed. (London: Bloomsbury, 2008), 6, 19. Hereafter cited parenthetically as *Shoemaker’s Holiday*.

8. On the contemporary prevalence of imitation and emulation, see Janet Clare, *Shakespeare’s Stage Traffic: Imitation, Borrowing and Competition in Renaissance Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014).

upon the scandalous reputation of his great rival Ben Jonson, and the vexed way in which he does so raises important questions about the latter's relationship with the Admiral's company in these years. Though personations can only ever be traced at what Matthew Steggle terms "the level of very plausible guesswork," a hitherto unnoticed Jonsonian shadow flickers throughout *Shoemaker's Holiday*.⁹ Figurations of Marlowe, Alleyn, William Shakespeare, and Jonson shade this play from start to finish, and understanding the market conditions of its 1599 reception can help us place Dekker's own commercial motivations alongside those of his patrons.

Metatheatricity and Marlowe

Though the conceptually proximate space of the shoemakers' workshop and actors' playhouse has been anecdotally observed by David Scott Kastan, the depth of this play's metatheatricity has yet to be fathomed.¹⁰ Eyre's repeated references to "the gentle craft," "gentle trade," and "gentleman shoemakers" are not, as Paul Seaver claims, merely "an assertion of a new gentility to be gained not by birth but by honest labour," but a barbed witticism over the maligned business of playmaking.¹¹ An extremely metatheatrical play, *Shoemaker's Holiday* typifies what Gurr describes as the "distinct identity" being cultivated by the Admiral's servants in the years that they shared exclusive London performance rights with the Chamberlain's Men:

Once they had settled into their daily routine of performing a different play each day to much the same body of customers, they invented a device that enhanced each performance in ways the Shakespeare company, so far as we know, seems to have ignored almost completely. They faced the fact that the same familiar faces had to appear on stage each playing a different role every afternoon, say, Tamburlaine, Faustus, Hieronymo or Barabbas, alongside the equally familiar faces of their fellows in each play. (*Shakespeare's Opposites*, 1)

Heightened, playful attention to the actors and their roles resulted in a theatrical output made of in-jokes and intimate allusions to the

9. Matthew Steggle, *Wars of the Theatres: The Poetics of Personation in the Age of Jonson*, ELS Monograph Series (Victoria, Canada: University of Victoria, 1998), 27.

10. David Scott Kastan, "Workshop and/as Playhouse: *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (1599)," in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (London: Routledge, 1995), 151–63.

11. Paul S. Seaver, "Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*: The Artisanal World," in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Stier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 87–100, 100.

company's distinctive and rooted playing space at the Rose—where they performed year-round, in contrast to the Chamberlain's company who moved from Shoreditch to the indoor playing space of Blackfriars in the winter months. This type of what Stanley Wells terms “self-referentiality,” whereby playgoers “enjoyed being reminded of previous visits to the theatre,”¹² drew heavy emphasis from stock Marlovian classics like *Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine*, centering upon audience familiarity with the company, their history of roles, and their fixed playing space.

This is especially evident in Eyre's mercantile rise to Lord Mayor, which is peppered with references to playing, parting, and performing. In the opening scene, for instance, Eyre tells his company of shoemakers to “give me audience” (*Shoemaker's Holiday*, 1.126) before describing how his wife “will never tire”¹³ (1.126, 128–29); later he instructs Firk to “*basa mon cues*” (1.219)—a malapropism for *baisez*, that is, “fuck my cues”; journeyman Ralph correlates acting with commercial reward, “Rich men at parting give their wives rich gifts, / Jewels and rings to grace their lily hands” (1.225–26), only to be later told by Firk that “thou hast lost thy part” (14.37); and Margery complains, “We have not men enough but we must entertain every butter-box” (4.49–50). Eyre's various promotions voice similar sentiments. When he is invested as alderman, he is costumed on stage with the direction “*Enter boy with a velvet coat and an alderman's gown*” (7.93–94 s.d.), and then requests his men's assistance: “Help me, Firk; apparel me, Hodge. Silk and satin, you mad Philistines, silk and satin” (95–97). Upon his advancement to Sheriff (a role for which Margery attests “my lord must learn to put on gravity” [11.10]), he then instructs his men to “shut up the shop” and “make holiday” with “some device, some odd crotchets, some morris or suchlike”—to which Firk replies, “We'll be with them for a morris-dance” (10.145–46, 151). Indeed Dekker's location of Eyre's workshop “in Tower Street” (preface, 12)¹⁴ itself instances a location of performance and spectacle, where thousands of spectators would gather to observe public executions and royal processions: it “is not implausible,” argues Paul Hartlen, “that the mere mention of Tower Street was enough to conjure images of both Tower Hill and the Tower of London.”¹⁵ The

12. Stanley Wells, *Shakespeare & Co.* (London: Penguin, 2007), 111.

13. *Oxford English Dictionary online*, s.v. “tire (verb3),” accessed December 19, 2015, <http://www.oed.com>: “To dress (the hair or head), esp. with a tire or head-dress.” Eyre also refers to his wife as “my brown Queen of Periwigs” at 17.24.

14. Also alluded to at 1.127, 1.213, 3.19, 4.30–31, and 14.1.

15. Paul Hartlen, “Tower Street,” *The Map of Early Modern London*, accessed April 21, 2015,

characters and locations that surround Eyre's narrative of upward social mobility repeatedly couple cobbling with theatrical performance.

Much of the banter generated by this trope centers upon the deviant reputation of the playhouse as a place of loose morality and carnivalesque consumption. Chief vice among the shoemakers is their love of alcohol. In one instance Eyre orders the Boy to "bid the tapster of the Boar's Head fill me a dozen cans of beer for my journeymen" (7.66–67)—invoking the tavern name made famous by Hal and Falstaff in *1 Henry IV* (1596–98)—and implores his "mad Mesopotamians" Firk, Hodge, and Hans/Lacey to "Wash your livers with this liquor!" (72), and in another, to "drink you mad Greeks, and work like true Trojans" (4.106). In the scene in which Lacy (disguised as Hans) joins the company, Firk variously alludes to the intimacy between shoemaking and carousing; he questions whether Eyre has "drunk this morning, that your throat is so clear?" (4.11–12); claims "if I should speak after him [Hans] without drinking, I should choke!" (69–70); predicts that Hans will "give a villainous pull at a can of double beer" (86–87); states that "Hodge and I have the vantage; we must drink first, because we are the eldest journeymen" (87–88); informs Hans that he'd be "drunk with, wert thou Gargantua" (98); and painfully puns that "this beer [Hans] came hopping in well" (109). Meanwhile Eyre prompts Firk to "scour your throat" and "wash it with Castilian liquor" (103–4), before scorning Margery as a "soused conger" (eel) (113). All of this serves to preempt and then exaggerate Lacy's ridiculous Dutch pretense (as Hans), as he enters the workshop singing:

Der was een bore van Gelderland
 Frolicke sie byen
 He was als dronck he cold nyet stand,
 Upsolce sie byen;
 Tap eens de canneken,
 Drincke, schone mannekin. (36–41)

(There was a boor from Gelderland, merry they be; he was so drunk he could not stand, pissed they all be; clink once the cannikin, drink, pretty manniken, 27n36–41)

Contemporary satirists regularly echoed these associations between the Dutch and overindulgence, playing upon the same national stereotypes that render Lacy's broken Dutch as akin to drunken, unintelligible English.¹⁶ In 1600, for instance, Samuel Rowlands has the dissolute "Sir Revel" consider his plans:

<http://mapoflondon.uvic.ca/TOWE3.htm>.

16. In his pamphlet *Work for Armourers; or The Peace is Broken* (1609), Dekker imagines an

what shall we do today?
 Drink some brave health upon the Dutch carouse
 Or shall we to the *Globe* and see a Play?
 Or visit *Shoreditch* for a bawdy house?

Rowlands concludes the association between carousing and play watching with a couplet expressing how Sir Revel “Drinks drunk in kindness, for goodfellowship / Or to Play goes but some Purse to nip.”¹⁷ And this use of “goodfellow” became, according to Jeffrey Knapp, an important term of endearment and comradeship among playwrights, partly because it was appropriated from antitheatrical diatribe.¹⁸ For all early modern playhouses were ale sellers, linking their popular reputations as conterminous with London’s shady inns and brothels.¹⁹ Alleyn, for instance, would identify himself as a London innholder, and he also owned an inn in St Botolph’s at Bishopsgate.²⁰ Eyre uses the term to describe his shoemakers as “a crew of good fellows” (11.48), Hodge states “we are good fellows” (4.95–96), and Firk warns “you would have lost us a good fellow that will teach us to laugh” (4.108–9). Here Dekker appropriates the moralist term of abuse toward players, inflecting and celebrating the debauchery, revelry, and carousing associated with the playhouse he wrote for.

Such debauchery is heroized throughout the play, though the comically menial comparison of making shoes and plays on demand registers most clearly when journeyman Ralph takes an impromptu order at the Eyre workshop:

RALPH. Who calls there? What want you sir?

invading army “more scattered then the *Jewes*, and more hated; more beggerly then the *Irish*, and more uncivil; more hardy then the *Switzers*, and more brutish: given to drink, more than the *Dutch*, to pride more than the *French*, to irreligion more then the *Italian*.” Dekker, *Work for Armorers; or The Peace is Broken* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1609), sig. B4v (STC 6536).

17. Samuel Rowlands, *The Lettin[g] of Humours Blood in the Head-Vaine* (London: W. White, 1600), sig. B2r (STC 21392.7).

18. Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare’s Tribe: Church, Nation and Theater in Renaissance England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002), 23–60. Knapp cites Gabriel Harvey who, in 1592, called Thomas Nashe and Robert Greene “notable good fellows” in his *Fowre Letters* (23–24). Thomas Heywood famously addressed his *Apology for Actors* “To my good friends and fellows the City Actors” in 1612 ([London: Nicholas Okes, 1612], sig. A3r [STC 13309]).

19. Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574–1642*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009), 119. See also Mark Hailwood’s account of *Alehouses and Good Fellowship in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2014).

20. S. P. Cerasano, “The Patronage Network of Philip Henslowe and Edward Alleyn,” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 13 (2000): 82–92, 85.

SERVINGMAN. Marry, I would have a pair of shoes made for a gentlewoman against tomorrow morning. What, can you do them?

RALPH. Yes, sir, you shall have them. But what length's her foot?

SERVINGMAN. [*banding Ralph the shoe*] Why, you must make them in all part like this shoe. But at any hand fail not to do them, for the gentlewoman is to be married very early in the morning.

RALPH. How? By this shoe must it be made? By this? Are you sure, sir? By this?

SERVINGMAN. How, 'by this', 'am I sure', 'by this'? Art thou in thy wits? I tell thee, I must have a pair of shoes, dost thou mark me? A pair of shoes, two shoes, made by this very shoe, this same shoe, against tomorrow morning by four o'clock. Dost understand me? Canst thou do't? (14.1–16)

Pandering to patrons' unrealistic desires and deadlines was stock in trade for authors like Dekker, who seems to have worked collaboratively on at least twenty plays between March 1598 and December 1599.²¹ In *Shoemaker's Holiday*, Dekker compares the collaborative nature of playwriting and cobbling when Ralph instructs his wife to "take this pair of shoes cut out by Hodge, / Stitched by my fellow Firk, seamed by myself, / Made up and pinked with the letters for thy name" (1.228–31). And elsewhere in the play the profession of shoemaking yields a number of metatheatrical puns upon players' violent and sexual deviancies: Eyre instructs the shoemakers to "yerk and seam, yerk and seam" (7.81), carrying doubled meanings of to strike blows or to strike up song,²² and perform (seem); Firk vows that he "may prick mine awl²³ in the walls and go play" (4.61–62); and Ralph follows his admission that he is "heavy at parting" by instructing his comrades to "cram thy slops with French crowns and thy enemies' bellies with bullets" (1.220, 222) in a remarkable allusion to the Admiral's Men's notorious *Tamburlaine the Great, Part Two* rehearsal disaster in which a pregnant woman and a child were killed by a misfiring firearm.²⁴

Such emphasis upon the company's scandalous reputation appears to coalesce with the immediate market context of 1599. For the

21. These involved collaborations with Drayton, Wilson, Jonson, Henry Chettle, William Haughton, and (probably) John Marston. For an expansive list of Henslowe's recorded titles, see John Tywning's entry for Dekker in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

22. *Oxford English Dictionary* online, s.vv. "yerk," "seam," accessed December 19, 2015, <http://www.oed.com>.

23. *Oxford English Dictionary* online, s.v. "awl," accessed December 19, 2015, <http://www.oed.com>: "A small, cylindrical stabbing device used by shoemakers."

24. See Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites*, 8.

Chamberlain's Men's move to Bankside put severe pressures on the Admiral's playwrights to write reactively and collaboratively. In October that year, for instance, Henslowe had hired Anthony Munday, Michael Drayton, Richard Hathway, and Robert Wilson to collaborate on the first part of *Sir John Oldcastle* (1600): "designed as a reprimand, a respectful account of the man as a famous Lollard, rightly cited as a Protestant hero in Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs.'" ²⁵ The play overtly advertised itself against Shakespeare's *Henriad*, mordantly stating "it is no pamper'd glutton *we* present, / Nor aged Councillor to youthful sinne." ²⁶ Such proximity to the Chamberlain's new theater brought the companies into intimate dialogue. There is no reason to divorce Dekker's play from the market context of its inception, and the playwright's own financial conflict with Shakespeare's troupe—who had taken him to court in January 1599—rather suggests that we should read this play in light of its company's, author's, and patrons' financial concerns.

An important aspect of the company's notoriety was, of course, its theatrical past, and the many roles its actors moved between. So when, for instance, Eyre commends the conscripted Ralph's military prowess, he does so using layered metatheatrical terms: "Hector of Troy was hackney to him, Hercules and Termagant scoundrels. Prince Arthur's Round Table, by the Lord of Ludgate, ne'er fed such a tall, such a dapper swordman. By the life of a Pharaoh, a brave resolute swordman" (1.164–67). Aside from bawdy allusions to actors as "dapper" and "resolute" swordsmen, Eyre also instances the multiple roles performed by the Admiral's players over the previous decade. Though many of the classical theatrical appropriations from the period have not survived, roles such as Hector and Hercules were central to the Admiral's back-catalogue and theatrical reference pool. Cerasano states that between 1590 and 1603 "the company purchased eighteen plays based on classical history or legend," including *Hercules, Parts 1 and 2* (c. 1595), and Dekker himself had a hand in *Hannibal and Hermes* (c. 1598), *Troilus and Cressida* (c.1599), and *The Tragedy of Agamemnon* (c. 1594) (all lost), which must have staged classical heroes in various guises. ²⁷ Plays such as Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (c. 1589; printed 1594) staged prominent sultans and pharaohs, referencing Greek and Trojan heroes alongside England's Arthurian legends; and according to Cyrus Hoy, Termagant refers to a more far

25. Gurr, *Shakespearian Playing Companies*, 245.

26. Qtd. in Gurr, *Shakespearian Playing Companies*, 245, emphasis in original.

27. S. P. Cerasano, "Edward Alleyn, the New Model Actor, and the Rise of the Celebrity in the 1590s," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2006): 47–58, 57n9.

flung theatrical past: “the god of the Saracens in the Romances and mystery plays.”²⁸ Dekker’s reference to Ludgate, moreover, possibly evokes use of the gate (since the fourteenth century) as a debtors’ prison—perennial threat to playwrights like Dekker, who spent time in the Poultry Counter for his unpaid dues in both 1598 and 1599.²⁹ So when Eyre recommends Ralph as a proven performer, he frames his forced indenture to the wars in France using the language of a theatrical translation, perhaps to another company.

Alongside (and through) references to other play texts that the company had acquired, such as Thomas Kyd’s *Soliman and Persida* (1588–89), and the anonymously authored *Tamer Cham* (c. 1596), Dekker also inevitably invokes his most famous Admiral’s playwright, Christopher Marlowe.³⁰ When, for instance, Margery advises Eyre to “have a care what you speak” (20.44) to the King, the master shoemaker makes this scathing and deeply Marlovian riposte:

Away you Islington whitepot! Hence, you hopperarse, you barley pudding full of maggots, you broiled carbanado! Avaunt, avaunt, avoid Mephistophilus! Shall Sim Eyre learn to speak of you, Lady Madgy? Vanish, Mother Miniver-Cap, vanish! Go, trip and go, meddle with your partlets and your pishery-pashery, your flews and your whirligigs! Go, rub, out of mine alley! Sim Eyre knows how to speak to a pope, to Sultan Soliman, to Tamburlaine an’ he were here. (20.45–52)

This speech is riddled with Marlowe. Beyond the references to Alleyn’s most famous of roles, Dekker also echoes Tamburlaine’s threat to Bajazeth, “Take it up, villain, and eat it, or I will make thee slice the brawns of thy arms into carbonadoes and eat them” (*1Tam*, 4.4.43–45).³¹ His reference to speaking with popes and repetition of “vanish” certainly instances Faustus’s invisible antics, but could also rebound Mephistopheles’s spectacular “Vanish villains!” (after he

28. Cyrus Hoy, *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to Texts in “The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, edited by Fredson Bowers,”* 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), 1:30.

29. See Gil Harris’s excellent discussion of “Spectres of Debt” in his introduction to the New Mermaids edition of Dekker’s play on pages xxii–xxvi.

30. EYRE. My liege, a very boy, a stripling, a younker. You see not a white hair on my head, not a grey in this beard. Every hair, I assure thy Majesty, that sticks in this beard Sim Eyre values at the King of Babylon’s ransom. Tamar Cham’s beard was a rubbing-brush to’t. Yet I’ll shave it off and stuff tennis balls with it to please my bully King (21.19–24).

31. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays*, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (1995; repr., Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008). All subsequent references to Marlowe’s plays are from this edition unless otherwise noted. The word “carbonado” was also used in Thomas Nashe’s *Have with You Saffron-Walden* (1596) and Shakespeare’s *Henry IV, Part I* (1598).

sticks “squibs” to the hapless Rafe and Robin) (*DFa*, 3.2 s.d.). The word “vanish” is uttered exactly fourteen times in *Shoemaker’s Holiday*, and every instance but one is scripted to the character Eyre. Vanish is also used in memorable speeches of Barabas: “Think me so mad as I will hang myself, That I may *vanish* o’er the earth in air, And leave no memory that e’er I was?” (*JM*, 1.2.264–67); Tamburlaine: “weep, heavens, and vanish into liquid tears!” (*2Tam*, 5.3.1), and Edward: “But day’s bright beams doth vanish fast away, / And needs I must resign my wishèd crown” (*E2*, 5.1.69–70). Eyre’s reference to “whirligigs” also possibly alludes to the infamous conjuror’s circle from which Faustus summons Mephistopheles.³²

Another Marlovian innovation parodied here is the trope of demonology as metaphor for playing. For when Faustus reads from the book of magic, he admires “Lines, circles, signs, letters, and characters,” prompting him to contemplate the “world of profit and delight . . . promised to the studious artisan!” (*DFa*, 1.1.53–57), and presenting the book of incantations Mephistopheles asserts that “The iterating of these lines brings gold; / The framing of this circle on the ground / Brings whirlwinds, tempests, thunder, and lightning” (2.1.158–60), and yields to Faustus “all characters” of “the heavens” (168–69). In Faustus’s command of books of magic he masters stagecraft and illusion, summoning Helen of Troy, Alexander the Great, and the Persian King Darius III—all, of course, *played* by devils.³³ By asserting how his command of Marlovian dialogue and dramaturgy qualify him to speak to royalty, Eyre’s words suggestively foreshadow the success of his playwright who, in 1599, had reached the apotheosis of his career in terms of court performances.

32. John Deacon’s *Diological Discourses of Spirits and Devils* (1601) uses this word to describe diabolic conjuring: “by this meanes, *the mysterie of iniquitie*, doth more freely and more forcible worke in the mindes of men: and the *diuell* may more easily seduce their soules at vnwares: by vsing at his pleasure, *the power which he hath*, while the whole worlde (at their pleasure) so improuidently, and so carelesly stand musing vpon an *imagined power which he hath not indeed*. And, herein the subtile dealing of *Satan*, is nothing inferiour to the craftie *bird-catcher*: who (while the silie poore *birdes* sit prying at, and playing with the *whirligig*, or *staling* before them) doth cunningly clap them (vp at vnwares) in his *net*, and *nippes* them all dead in the *head*.” Deacon, *Diological Discourses of Spirits and Devils* (London: Impensis Geor. Bishop, 1601), 230 (STC 6439).

33. Thomas Lodge used this association in his *Wits Misery* (1596): “They say likewise there is a *Player Devil*, a handsome son of *Mammons*, but yet I have not seen him, because he skulks in the country.” Lodge, *Wits Misery* (London: Adam Islip, 1596), 40 (STC 16677). Dekker himself returned to it in *Lanthorne and Candlelight* (1609) by describing the “Jack in a box” as “this Devil in man’s shape, wearing (like a player on a Stage) good clothes on his back.” Dekker, *Lantern and Candlelight* (1609) in *The Elizabethan Underworld*, ed. A. V. Judges (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1930), 358.

Appropriating Marlowe in this way offered Dekker a clever referential point of dramatic esteem; claiming to master Marlowe was to bring one's theatrical proficiency most clearly into focus.³⁴ This echoes the wider Admiral's company strategy of restaging Marlowe as even by the close of the century, argues Tom Rutter, "Marlowe's plays were a central feature of the repertory of the Admiral's Men, and for over a decade playwrights had attempted to deal with them in a variety of ways: through emulation, through parody, through plain derivative imitation."³⁵ When Eyre claims, moreover, "Prince am I none, yet I am nobly born, as being the sole son of a shoemaker," he directly personates Marlowe, who was the son of Canterbury shoemaker John Marlowe (1536–1605).³⁶

Virtually all of these lines were made famous by the Admiral's leading player and comanager Alleyn, whose "dominance in the repertory" became a key market strategy throughout the 1590s.³⁷ According to Cerasano, roles like Tamburlaine "shaped Edward Alleyn's career, elevating him to the status of celebrity performer" and "created audience expectations for the future repertory of the Admiral's Men."³⁸ Henslowe's company continued to shape their dramatic repertory around Marlovian memories of Alleyn's physical and verbal stature, even after he withdrew from the public stage from 1597 to 1600, and retired from acting after 1601.³⁹ In Eyre's "Islington whitepot" speech above, the master shoemaker flexes his ability to speak with royalty through his knowledge and command of Marlowe, inevitably impersonating the voice of Alleyn as he does so. Furthermore, Eyre's repeated phrase "Prince am I none yet I am nobly born" is an echo of Orlando's catchphrase from Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, a role that Alleyn had not only performed but seems also to have partially authored.⁴⁰ By 1599–1600, Alleyn had not only

34. See Menzer, "Shades of Marlowe."

35. Tom Rutter, "Marlovian Echoes in the Admiral's Men Repertory: *Alcazar*, *Stukeley*, *Patient Grissil*," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1 (2009): 27–38, 35.

36. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Marlowe [Marley], Christopher," by Charles Nicholl, accessed December 19, 2015, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18079>.

37. Cerasano, "Edward Alleyn, the New Model Actor," 53.

38. Cerasano, "Edward Alleyn, the New Model Actor," 47.

39. See Menzer, "Shades of Marlowe"; and Tom Rutter, "Marlovian Echoes," 27–38.

40. Eyre uses versions of this phrase six times. See Waldo F. McNeir, "The Source of Simon Eyre's Catch-Phrase," *Modern Language Notes* 53.4 (1938): 275–76; and on Alleyn's apparent additions to the Orlando part, see R. A. Foakes, "The 'Part' of Orlando in Robert Greene's Play *Orlando Furioso*," *The Henslowe-Alleyn Digitisation Project*, accessed March 19, 2015, <http://www.henslowe-alleyn.org.uk/essays/orlando.html>.

achieved public adulation for his renowned performances, but enjoyed a privileged position at court. Supported by Henslowe, Alleyn held connections to a sizeable network of powerful and wealthy patrons amongst the Sussex gentry and nobility, bringing “together patronage networks that were among the most powerful in England.”⁴¹ Firmly established in court circles, Alleyn rose to such social heights as to seek a knighthood in later life, embodying the sharp social elevation experienced by Eyre in Dekker’s play. Such was Alleyn’s theatrical fame that he developed what Gurr terms a “wry capacity for self-mockery over his strutting parts,” performing parodic personations of his own former roles in George Chapman’s *Blind Beggar of Alexandria* in 1595–96 (*Shakespeare’s Opposites*, 12, 22). Emulating (and perhaps pandering to) such self-mockery and pastiche, Dekker’s comedy seems at times to reach beyond Alleyn’s theatrical career. When, for instance, Eyre is promoted to Sheriff of London, he quips: “When I go to Guildhall in my scarlet gown, I’ll look as demurely as a saint, and speak as gravely as a justice of the peace” (11.11–13). The scarlet gown was an honour bestowed upon the Queen’s Men (with whom Alleyn performed) between 1583 and 1594 that marked their status as *the* elite theatrical ensemble before the duopoly years that followed.⁴² Similarly, after Eyre assumes the mantle of Lord Mayor, Dekker uses the image again to assert the collective achievement of his social climbing: “‘tis trash, trumpery, vanity!—Simon Eyre had never walked in a red petticoat, nor wore a chain of gold, but for my fine journeyman’s portagues” (17.15–18). Eyre’s success rebounds upon his company of shoemakers, enhancing their status as his increases—in a play that concludes with the shoemakers celebrating before (and with) their king, in tandem with the Admiral’s rewards of performance at court. The shoemakers’ indebtedness to Eyre is also testified in his earlier warning to “move me not. Have I not ta’en you from selling tripes in Eastcheap, and set you in my shop, and made you hail-fellow with Simon Eyre the shoemaker?” (7.60–62). The relationship between Eyre and his shoemakers is depicted as codependent, an idealized model of Alleyn’s relationship with the Admiral’s Men.

Alleyn did not play the part of Eyre however, though it seems likely that he would have attended the play’s court performance.⁴³

41. Cerasano, “Patronage Network,” 82–83.

42. Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988), 92.

43. The role was likely played by Thomas Downton, who took over Alleyn’s major roles during his absence. See *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, 22.

Henslowe's records suggest that he had withdrawn from the company in the autumn of 1597 and did not return to acting with the troupe until the opening of the Fortune in the latter half of 1600.⁴⁴ Cerasano interprets Alleyn's hiatus from the stage as a planned attempt at "revivifying political alliances that he hoped would assist him in acquiring the court-appointed position of master of the bears, bulls, and mastiff dogs"—a lucrative title that would have considerably enhanced both Alleyn and Henslowe's social and political statuses.⁴⁵ Though he had definitely returned to London by mid-December 1599 to make arrangements for the Fortune site lease, Alleyn may, claims Cerasano, have been in "London for almost a year before the lease for the Fortune grounds was signed" (on December 22, 1599).⁴⁶ This puts Alleyn in London and almost certainly at court during the known performance run of Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday*, and raises the possibility of Dekker's play addressing Alleyn's absence from (and return to) the Admiral's players for three logical reasons. Firstly, by restaging Alleyn's catchphrases and dramatic repertory Dekker's comedy was drawing nostalgic appeal from the beloved actor to his familiar audiences at the Rose. Secondly, by penning a text so company-driven, Dekker may have been attempting to fashion a more stable and dependable place for himself as a core Admiral's playwright. And third, Dekker was (likely under the instruction of Henslowe) building anticipation for the company's long-awaited movement to the Fortune by marketing Alleyn's hotly anticipated return to the stage. Alleyn had already made his fame and fortune, but the movement of the Admiral's company to the new theater was an important and risky venture for the future of the company. Dekker's play addresses the move overtly, not least through the other personations that surround his shoemakers.

Appropriation and Personation: Shakespeare, the Rose, and Jonson

For all of his market-driven motivations, Dekker's stagecraft was influenced by more than just the Admiral's classics, often reflecting how (to borrow again from Rutter) "influence takes place between, as well as within, repertorial boundaries."⁴⁷ Shakespeare exemplified this when he

44. On Alleyn's hiatus from playing, see Cerasano, "Alleyn's 'Retirement.'"

45. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Alleyn, Edward," by S. P. Cerasano, accessed December 19, 2015, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/398>.

46. Cerasano, "Alleyn's 'Retirement,'" 101–2, 102.

47. Tom Rutter, "Marlowe, Hoffman, and the Admiral's Men." *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 3 (2013): 49–62.

appropriated Marlowe's theater-devilry trope several years hence in perhaps his most deeply metatheatrical play: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (c. 1594–96). At the heart of this text's preoccupation with the movement of characters (and actors) away from city precincts, is chief acting spectacle and "merry wanderer of the night" (2.1.43) Robin *Goodfellow* (Puck).⁴⁸ With reference to the rising dawn, Robin anticipates the Marlovian stirring of "ghosts, wand'ring here and there" who

Troop home to churchyards; damnèd spirits all

.....

For fear lest day should look their shames upon.

They wilfully themselves exiled from light,

And must for aye consort with black-browed night, (3.2.382–88)

in a comical allusion to playgoers traipsing back to their London homes under cover of darkness. When Oberon reflects upon Titania's place of domicile, moreover, locations of London playgoing come to the fore:

I know a bank where the wild thyme blows,
Where oxlips and the nodding violet grows,
Quite overcanopied with luscious woodbine,
With sweet musk-roses, and with eglantine.
There sleeps Titania sometime of the night,
Lulled in those flowers with dances and delight;
And there the snake throws her enamelled skin,
Weed wide enough to wrap a fairy in;
And with the juice of this I'll streak her eyes,
And make her full of hateful fantasies. (2.1.249–58)

Here the fairy king's use of "bank" and "rose" situates Titania at the Admiral's playhouse at Bankside.⁴⁹ And the wild time to be had correlates with Shakespeare's imaginative metaphor of shed snakeskin, where "wrap a fairy in" rebounds as "ferrying" in an allusion to the movement of playgoers across the Thames to Southwark. Titania's subsequent infatuation with the ass-headed Bottom plays out a sardonic commentary upon the patronage being enjoyed by Shakespeare's rivals at the Rose.

In *Shoemaker's Holiday* Dekker makes similar but more overt references to the geography of city playing through the names of his characters (nomenclature). This is chiefly expressed through the central illicit love affair between Roland Lacy and Rose Oatley

48. *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. John Jowett et al., 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon P, 2005).

49. She alludes to "the musk rose buds" within three lines of her entrance in act 2, scene 2, and instructs Bottom to "stick musk-roses in thy sleek smooth head" (4.1.3).

(daughter to Sir Robert, Lord Mayor of London). According to W. K. Chandler, Dekker imported the names Oatley and Lacy from his historic and literary sources, but the name Rose has no historical precedent from the Eyre tale.⁵⁰ Read against the context of Henslowe and Alleyn's imminent plans to depart from Bankside, the name must instance and personify the aging playing venue that had become so synonymous with Alleyn and his company's productions throughout this busy decade. When, for instance, Eyre asks "How looks my little Rose?" (20.36), he invokes the site name of the Little Rose Estate upon which the theater was constructed.⁵¹ And when Rose enters the play "*making a garland*" (2.0 s.d.), Dekker not only echoes Titania's "Come, sit thee down upon this flow'ry bed" (4.1.1),⁵² but alludes to the (dis)location of his patrons' acting site in arresting ways:

Here sit thou down upon this flowery bank,
 And make a garland for thy Lacy's head.
 These pinks, these roses, and these violets,
 These blushing gillyflowers, these marigolds,
 The fair embroidery of his coronet,
 Carry not half such beauty in their cheeks
 As the sweet countenance of my Lacy doth.
 O my most unkind father! O my stars,
 Why loured you so at my nativity
 To make me love, yet live robbed of my love?
 Here as a thief am I imprisoned
 For my dear Lacy's sake, within those walls
 Which by my father's cost were builded up
 For better purposes. Here must I languish
 For him that doth as much lament, I know,

50. W. K. Chandler, "The Sources of the Characters in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*," *Modern Philology* 27.2 (1929): 175–82. On the Dekker's comedy as "an Elizabethan history play," see Brian Walsh, "Performing Historicity in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*," *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 46.2 (2006): 323–48.

51. On Henslowe's acquisition of the "Little Rose estate," see Julian Bowsher and Cerasano, "The Deed of Partnership in the Rose Playhouses (January 10, 1587)," *Henslowe-Alleyn Digitisation Project*, accessed March 11, 2015, <http://www.henslowe-alleyn.org.uk/essays/rosecontract.html>. Henslowe also referred to the stage as "the littell Roose" in 1603. Philip Henslowe, *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. R. A. Foakes, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), 213.

52. Alongside other allusions to *Romeo and Juliet* (1595) and *Henry V* (1599), Stanley Wells has noted that there "is no doubt Dekker's own familiarity with Shakespeare that peeps through" at this moment when "the substitution of 'bank' for 'bed' may be a subliminal echo of Oberon's 'bank where the wild thyme blows.'" Wells, *Shakespeare & Co.*, 111–12. Rose's "O my stars / Why loured you so at my nativity" here also echoes Faustus' "You stars that reigned at my nativity" (*DFa*, 5.2.81).

Mine absence as for him I pine in woe. (2.1–16)

Rose's father Lord Oatley begins the play as Lord Mayor of London—a role to which Eyre is later promoted. Gurr reads Oatley as a “thin disguise” for the notoriously unpopular Sir John Spencer (Lord Mayor 1594–95), who “for decades had led the anti-theatre protests from Guildhall” (*Shakespeare's Opposites*, 179). Thus her allusion to “the better purposes” of “those walls” echoes the antitheatrical diatribe being peddled throughout this period by the City's municipal authorities. When Dekker's play stages Rose languishing on her “bank,” it imaginatively satirizes the Middlesex magistrates' attempts to block Henslowe and Alleyn's movement to the Fortune site; this situation is echoed when Oatley intercepts his daughter at Old Ford, when he proclaims: “Fortune offers you / Into my hands, you shall not part from hence” (6.50–51). Such opposition to the company's move threatened a Southwark imprisonment beside the Globe playhouse, which Eyre alludes to with gusto when he implores his company of “fat midriff-swig-belly-whores” to “sweep me these kennels, that the noisome stench offend not the nose of my neighbours!” (4.5–7). That Eyre trumps Oatley's Lord Mayorship too functions as a tongue-in-cheek reminder of Alleyn's (and therefore the Admiral's Men's) rise to social eminence and royal favor, out of reach from the civic authorities that opposed them.

The multifaceted personations of this play (Eyre as Alleyn; Oatley as Spencer; and Rose as the Rose) might, moreover, point to other personated traces. For instance, where Dekker anachronistically imposes the name “Hugh” on Lacy's uncle, in what Chandler terms “a serious historical error” for “none of the Lacies who were earls of Lincoln bore the name,” he deliberately invokes Saint Hugh of Lincoln, patron saint of shoemakers and *swans*—instancing the namesake of the ill-fated Bankside Swan Theater, whose doors were forcibly closed after the *Isle of Dogs* fiasco of 1597.⁵³ Dekker's play repeatedly pays homage to the saint: Eyre instructs himself to “set a good face on it, in the honour of Saint Hugh” (17.36–37); Firk claims Hans a born “brother of the Gentle Craft” who bears “Saint Hugh's bones” (4.42–43); and Hodge describes how “we are the brave bloods of the shoemakers, heirs apparent to Saint Hugh, and perpetual benefactors to all good fellows” (18.1–3).⁵⁴ Accentuating the financial

53. Chandler, “Sources,” 178. Hoy notes that the character Lincoln “is a character of Dekker's creation, since Crispine in *The Gentle Craft* has neither father nor near relative serving as his guardian” (Hoy, *Notes*, 1:17).

54. The shoemakers' use of Saint Hugh's bones for tools is taken from the first of three tales recounted by Thomas Deloney's *Gentle Craft* (1597). See Hoy's summary of Deloney's

patronage of the saint also emphasizes a suggestive link to the most recent Earl of Lincoln, Edward de Clinton, who held the title of Lord High Admiral from 1558 to 1583. In this post, de Clinton was Henry Howard's immediate predecessor. This combination of Saint Hugh and the Earl of Lincoln title carries onomastic links to the patronage protection of the Admiral's company's lofty patron and several of the actors' former employments.

These connections imbue Dekker's fictitious Sir Hugh Lincoln with weighty ties to patronage and protection. That he enters the play complaining about how he has "furnished" his nephew Lacy "with coin, bills of exchange, / Letters of credit, men to wait on him" and solicited his "friends in Italy / Well to respect him" (1.21–24) casts him as theatrical sponsor and benefactor—personifying both the patronage of Henslowe and protection of Howard. Chief recipient of Lincoln's generosity in the play, Lacy is also linked to a venue called the Swan in two instances from scene 7: Hodge reports that Eyre "and he [Hans/Lacy] are both drinking at the Swan" (7.84–85); and Lacy (as Hans) states "*Mine liever broder Firk, bringt Meester Eyre tot den signe van swanniken. Daer sal yow find de skipper end me*" (7.7–9) (My dear brother Firk, bring Master Eyre to the sign of the Swan. There you will find the skipper and me) (36n7–9). Langley's Swan was completed in 1595 and, also located in Southwark at Paris Gardens, the playhouse had only briefly been in business before the furore surrounding Jonson and Thomas Nashe's *Isle of Dogs* led to its near-permanent closure in late summer 1597. In this short period, according to David Mateer, "its closeness to the Rose *did* have a detrimental effect" on Henslowe and Alleyn's takings.⁵⁵ It had also lured away some of the Admiral's best acting talent, as Thomas Downton, Richard Jones, Martin Slater, and Richard Perkins defected to Pembroke's servants at the Swan at some point between 1596–97, only to return again after Pembroke's dissolved. Such tangled history between the companies manifested during the 1597 closures, when according to Henslowe's papers: on "the xj of octobe be gane my lord admerals & my lord of pembrokes men to playe at my house," listing joint payments for Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (c. 1587), Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, and Chapman's *An Humorous Day's Mirth* (c. 1597; printed 1599).⁵⁶ The Admiral's Men had ultimately profited from the Swan's

text in *Notes*, 7–23.

55. David Mateer, "Edward Alleyn, Richard Perkins and the Rivalry between the Swan and the Rose Playhouses," *Review of English Studies* 60.243 (2009): 61–77, 63, emphasis in original.

56. *Henslowe's Diary*, 60. See also pages 71–72 for the joint-payments received by Henslowe—"a Just a cownte of all Suche monye as I haue Receued of my lord [of] admeralles

demise, and Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday* seems also to personate important aspects of this conflict through its many allusions to the French wars which form the backdrop to its storyline.

In particular, Dekker focuses upon the French wars through the double romance narrative of Lacy and Ralph (who both enter this play bound for military service in France). Lifted from Deloney's tale of brothers Crispine and Crispianus (chapters 5–8 of *The Gentle Craft* [1599]), Dekker's characters play out a similar plotline whereby the low-born Ralph goes off to fight in the French conflict, and the high-born Lacy absconds his post to pursue his romantic desires for Rose, against the wishes of her Lord Mayor father.⁵⁷ When truant Lacy enters disguised "*like a Dutch Shoemaker*" (3.0 s.d.), he justifies his desertion so that he "may unknown possess / The only happy presence of my Rose" (6–7):

But thus it must be: for her cruel father,
Hating the single union of our souls,
Hath secretly conveyed my Rose from London
To bar me from her presence; but *I trust*
Fortune and this disguise will further me
Once more to view her beauty, gain her sight.
Here in Tower Street with Eyre the shoemaker
Mean I a while to work. I know the trade:
I learned it when I was in Wittenberg.
Then cheer thy hoping sprites be not dismayed;
Thou canst not want—*do Fortune what she can*,
The Gentle Craft is living for a man! (3.13–24, emphasis mine)

Mourning his love's displacement to the Lord Mayor's residence at Old Ford, Lacy plans to act in Eyre's company (as Hans), using knowledge gleaned from Wittenberg (like Marlowe's Faustus) in order to save his relationship with Rose. Read metatheatrically, Lacy's movements correlate with the returning talent from *Paris Gardens* to Henslowe and Alleyn's troupe, and this reading is strengthened through his double-allusion to the Fortune—an association firmed up later with Ralph's line "of all good fortunes my fellow Hans had the best" (13.21).⁵⁸ Furthermore, the empathy that surrounds his temporary (albeit illusory) departure is heightened through forlorn Rose's "Will my love leave me then and go to France?" (2.48) and "Meantime wretched I / Will sit and sigh for his lost company" (65). Indeed

& my lord of penbrocke. men"—dated October 21, 1597 through March 4, 1598.

57. See Hoy, *Notes*, 13–14.

58. The following line is Firk's, "'Tis true because Mistress Rose drank to him" (13.32).

when Sybil (Rose's maid) reports Lacy's departure, she frames it as "your fault mistress, to love him that loves not you. He thinks scorn to do as he's done to, but if I were as you, I'd cry: go by, Hieronimo, go by!" (40–44). The distinctly theatrical subtexts of Lacy's storyline seem to personate a valued actor or playwright's intimate (and perhaps turbulent) relationship with the Rose playhouse.

This allusion to Kyd's Spanish Tragedy could be another instancing of Alleyn's theatrical past—the part of Hieronymo was certainly one of Alleyn's notorious parts. But the reference is barbed rather than celebratory, and is unattached from the Eyre character who voices virtually all of the "Alleyn echoes" in this play. Dekker lampooned this part later in *Satiromastix* (1601), in what is generally accepted as his first (and only) intervention into the "Poetomachia."⁵⁹ In this later allusion, Dekker would ridicule Ben Jonson's acting past as an itinerant "poor journeyman," scorning that "thou has forgot how thou amblest (in a leather pilch) by a play-wagon, in the high-way, and took'st made Jeronimo's part, to get service among the mimics."⁶⁰ Whether he had acted in the tragedy or not, Jonson had also satirized the role in his 1598 *Every Man in His Humour*, where the buffoon Master Matthew quotes from Kyd's famous text (at length) before describing it, "A toy o'mine in my nonage, the infancy of my muses."⁶¹ The double-plot of Lacy's Dutch performance and Ralph's military service could also be parodying Jonson's own military service in the Low Countries (c. 1591–92).⁶² William Drummond's 1618–19 second-hand report of Jonson's battlefield prowess reported that "he had in the face of both the Campes Killed ane Enimie and taken opima spoila from him," which certainly suggests that the playwright talked openly about his exploits as a soldier.⁶³ This reputation for physical violence was also carried by the lethal wounds Jonson inflicted upon Admiral's actor Gabriel Spencer in their duel in September 1598, and was reflected upon later by Chapman: "didst

59. See James P. Bednarz's very useful chronology of the conflict in *Shakespeare & the Poets' War* (New York: Columbia UP, 2001), 9; and Steggle's account of *Satiromastix* in *Wars of the Theatres*, 48–61.

60. Thomas Dekker, *Satiromastix* (1602), in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1955–68), 1:4.1.161–65.

61. *The Roaring Girl and Other City Comedies*, ed. James Knowles (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001), 141–224, 1.4.65–66.

62. See Ian Donaldson, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011), 93–98.

63. *Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1925–52), 1:128–78.

thou not put out / A boies Right eye that Croste thy mankind poute?"⁶⁴ Among Firk's "tools" required for shoemaking (spoken to Hans), he lists "your paring knife, your hand- and thumb-leathers" (4.74–75), which might well allude to Jonson's subsequent branding (on his right thumb, the letter "M" for "manslayer").⁶⁵ Dekker's Ralph is shaded by violence throughout *Shoemaker's Holiday*: he enters the play "with a piece" (1.115–16 s.d.); leads a band of shoemakers "all with cudgels or such weapons" to reclaim his estranged wife Jane (18.0 s.d.); and is lauded as "a dapper swordman. By the life of a Pharoah, a brave, resolute swordman" (1.167–68) by Eyre. According to Hoy, Eyre's allusion to "the life of a Pharoah" is one of at least five echoes of Jonson's 1598 *Every Man in His Humour*—performed by the Chamberlain's Men at the Curtain—where Cob the water-bearer scathes to the audience, "I'd forswear them all, by the life of Pharaoh . . . By the life of Pharaoh, By the body of me, As I am a gentleman, and a soldier" (1.3.68–69).⁶⁶ Furthermore, Eyre's phrase "avoid Mephistophiles" (20.47) occurs in Jonson's *The Case is Altered* (c. 1597; printed, 1609): ("thou art not lunatike, art thou? and thou bee'st, auoide Mephistophiles," 4.7.134–35) in the playwright's earliest surviving work, which was an Admiral's play.⁶⁷ Jonson's reputation as a good fellow was also attested to by Drummond's colorful sketch, which described his love of "drink" as "one of the elements in which he liveth"; John Aubrey would also claim that Jonson "would in many times exceed in drink . . . then he would tumble home to bed, and when he had thoroughly perspired, then to study."⁶⁸ Read against the other personations of this play and Dekker's later involvement in the so-called "poets' war," the Lacy-Ralph connections to Jonson's 1598 play, the Swan Theater, military service, pseudo-Dutch swaggering, and violence are strongly suggestive of a Jonsonian presence.

64. "An invective wrighten . . . against Mr Ben Jonson," *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. P. B. Bartlett (London: Oxford UP, 1941), 374, lines 29–30.

65. See Donaldson, *Jonson: A Life*, 132–38.

66. Hoy notes that "Jonson altered the phrase in the 1616 Folio to 'the foot of Pharaoh,'" which is the line found in all modern editions (*Notes*, 30). Eyre repeats the phrase at the close of scene 17. For the other references to *Every Man in His Humour*, see Hoy, *Notes*, 35, 38, 40, 44.

67. Qtd. in Hoy, *Notes*, 67.

68. *William Drummond of Hawthornden: Poems and Prose*, ed. Robert H. MacDonald (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic P, 1976), 6; John Aubrey, *Brief Lives: Chiefly Set Down by John Aubrey, between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1898), 2:12.

These traces are numerous, and Jonson's silhouette emerges most tangibly around Lacy's turbulent affair with Rose, which holds suggestive links to the playwright's relationship with the Admiral's company in these years. From the outset of Dekker's play, both Oatley and Lincoln oppose Lacy's entanglement with Rose. Oatley complains that Rose "loves him so well / That I mislike her boldness in the chase" (1.7–8), highlighting her lowly status as unfit for Lincoln's "nephew":

Too mean is my poor girl for his high birth.
 Poor citizens must not with courtiers wed,
 Who will in silks and gay apparel spend
 More in one year than I am worth by far.
 Therefore your honour need not doubt my girl. (1.11–15)

Oatley abhors the pretensions of Lacy. Later in the scene Lincoln affirms that the Lord Mayor "Doth hate the mixture of his blood with thine" (79), and when Dodger brings news that Lacy "disguised / Lurks here in London," Oatley responds that "So much I love his [Lincoln's] honour, hate his nephew" (9.90–91; 98). Lincoln too turns on Lacy when he learns of his deceit, fuming:

Hath he despised my love, and spurned those favours
 Which I with prodigal hand poured on his head?

Since of my love he makes no estimate,
 I'll make him wish he had not known my hate. (8.26–30)

In the scene in which Lacy and Rose enter "arm in arm" (15.0 s.d.), moreover, Lacy reflects defiantly upon her "father's anger, and mine uncle's hate" (18). Nothing had provoked the Privy Council's fury more stridently than the Isle of Dogs performances in 1597, for which Jonson suffered arrest, imprisonment, and interrogation—the latter perhaps involving two of the same Middlesex magistrates (Thomas Fowler and Richard Skevington) who were opposing the 1600 movement of the Admiral's Men to the Fortune.⁶⁹ Jonson and Pembroke's Men had of course inconvenienced all of the company in staging this play, as all London playhouses were ordered to immediately cease performances, and threatened with demolition. Nonetheless, Henslowe's Rose reopened on November 11th, just nine days after Jonson had been released from custody.

Despite the infamy earned by his arrest, an exchange of payments from July 28, 1597, indicates that Henslowe thought highly enough of

69. See Donaldson, *Jonson: A Life*, 111–22.

Jonson to try to lure him to his company as a shareholder.⁷⁰ Though the deal did not progress, we might assume that Jonson's presence at the playhouse was a point of discussion (and perhaps dispute) among his competitive contemporaries. Whatever happened to the shareholding opportunity, Jonson was writing for Henslowe by the end of that year, with regular recorded payments in his papers from December 3, 1597 to September 27, 1599. In the autumn of 1599, moreover, Jonson worked collaboratively with Dekker on *Page of Plymouth* (Aug–Sept 1599) and *Robert II, or the Scots Tragedy* (Sept 1599, with Henry Chettle and possibly John Marston).⁷¹ At the same time, however, he was also jobbing for Shakespeare's company. Jonson had sold his smash-hit *Every Man in His Humour* to the Chamberlain's Men in 1598, and was preparing its much anticipated sequel for the Globe in 1600. Threat and asset to the Admiral's company, Jonson worked briefly for both companies, and perhaps had them vying for his talent. It is possible, then, that the sentimental tone of Lacy's eventual marriage to Rose, where the emotive line "Invent the means, / And Rose will follow thee through all the world" (15.7–8), and Lincoln's vindication, "Her love turned shoemaker! I am glad of this" (16.40), point to an imagined reconciliation and more permanent business partnership between Jonson and the Admiral's Men. The King's intervention in the closing scene, where he answer's Lincoln's charge "Is he not traitor?" with "he was; now we have pardoned him" (21.52–53), bestows forgiveness and royal favor onto both Lacy and Rose, settling the concerns of Oatley and Lincoln: "Arise Sir Roland Lacy. Tell me now, / Tell me in earnest, Oatley, canst thou chide / Seeing thy Rose a lady and a bride" (113–15). These lines not only bestow favor upon Lacy, but also ownership. After all, to be pardoned is to be in debt, and it is tempting to read a parallel lingering discomfort with Jonson's increased activity with the Rose's rival companies.

Whether or not Dekker was directly or intentionally personating Jonson in this play is, of course, impossible to prove. But the evidence certainly suggests a level of dialogue between *Shoemaker's Holiday* and Jonson's early drama (and acting past) that merits attention in itself. This is significant because the date of *Shoemaker's Holiday* (July 1599) predates Bednarz's chronology of the "poets' war" (beginning with

70. Henslowe's papers record a hefty sum of four pounds "lent vnto Bengemen Johnson player . . . to be payd yt agayne when so euer ether I or any for me shall demande yt" (July 28, 1597). *Henslowe's Diary*, 238.

71. See *Henslowe's Diary*, 123.

Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* at the Globe in the autumn of 1600).⁷² Whilst *Shoemaker's Holiday* certainly does not satirize Jonson to the extremes of *Satiromastix's* Horace (1601), it might help to explain Jonson's motivations in castigating Dekker alongside Marston in *Every Man Out* at the Globe. This bifurcation in Dekker's and Jonson's careers seems, then, to have important roots in Jonson's movement away from the Admiral's players, and the professional hostility of company-playwrights like Dekker. The early careers of both Jonson and Dekker should not be separated from the complexity of their wavering professional ties to locations like the Rose Theater, and further attention to this text (and other plays) might cast valuable light upon the often blurred subtextual traces of dramatic personation at this time. The market pressures created by localized dramaturgy were unique to Dekker's generation of playwrights, and their challenges unprecedented. By celebrating his company's Marlowe-Alleyn fame, Dekker attempted to build anticipation for the company's relocation to the Fortune. Targeting London audiences' desires to reexperience Alleyn's famous Marlovian performances was a direct attempt to capitalize upon the nostalgic security of known and celebrated roles, and this was evidently important at a time of relocation and unpredictable market change. Whilst Dekker revives a comforting past of Marlowe and Alleyn, the all too threatening present of Shakespeare and Jonson creeps through his words, in revealing ways. Imitating his rivals' stagecraft to supplement his company's market needs, Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday* presents a complex textual pattern that reflects the overlapping nature of late-Elizabethan theatrical competition and imitation. Drawing upon past glories to curb the threat of present dangers, Dekker's comedy indicates an intimate commercial relationship between a struggling playwright, his patrons, and his famed competitors. Though the spectral presences of other actors, authors and their works are allusive and debatable, what can be claimed with confidence is that Dekker knew a great deal more about playwriting than he did about shoemaking.

Northumbria University
Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

72. Bednarz, *Shakespeare & the Poets' War*, 9.

LISA HOPKINS

Marlovian Models and Itinerant Identities: Dido, Tamburlaine, and the Discourse of Colonialism

In this essay, I will be discussing a number of texts that share three common characteristics: all are in various ways predicated on and intervene in the expansionist drive to export Englishness to colonies or enclaves overseas; all in one way or another recall or echo the story of the *translatio imperii*, usually with specific reference to the figure of Aeneas; and all adapt or appropriate Marlowe (and sometimes William Shakespeare too). These plays include Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* (1631), John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins' *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), (Heywood's?) *The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley* (c. 1596), George Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (c. 1588), Henry Burnell's *Landgartha* (1641), and Dabridgcourt Belchier's *Hans Beer-Pot* (1618), a little-known text but one which I think is of considerable interest and to which I shall therefore devote the bulk of the essay. I shall argue that all these plays show the foundationality of that originary sea-voyager Aeneas to English myths of empire and probe the troublesome ambiguity of the template he embodies and implies,¹ and that they do so in ways that recall one or both of two texts by Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Tamburlaine the Great*. *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, which centers on Aeneas' landfall in Africa on his way to Rome, told a story that was of immense importance to English ideas

1. I have suggested elsewhere that the presence of a shipwreck motif in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (1634) should also be connected to both Marlowe and colonial voyages (Lisa Hopkins, "Shipwrecked on Horseback: *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," *Journal of Drama Studies* 6.1 [2012]: 1–13).

about colonialism because Aeneas is the *ur*-colonizer, the man who carried the cultural flame of Troy and lit it in Rome, from whence his great-grandson Brutus supposedly bore it to Britain. Tamburlaine, whom critics have read in terms of Richard Hakluyt in general and of the Muscovy Company in particular, offers an inverted picture of the English colonial enterprise in which conquered peoples are treated with a brutality that the English practiced but preferred to displace rhetorically onto the Spanish and in which the trajectory is *to* not *from* “the British shore.”² Together, these twin narratives of classical authorization and brutal conquest summed up both the theory and practice of colonialism, and set the terms of the cultural conversation in which my chosen texts participate.

Of Marlowe’s two heroes, it might well appear that Tamburlaine, who openly craves world domination, would be the more obviously useful to discourses of colonialism, but it was in fact Aeneas who in some ways spoke more urgently to the immediate concerns of the English colonial enterprise. A principal question implicit in all texts about colonies concerned who should do the colonizing. The first governor of Jamestown, Sir Thomas West, Lord De la Warr, trod a wary line between personal rule and a strictly limited nod at electoral representation because he was extremely anxious about the caliber of the colonists at his disposal, who included

not an hundred or two of deboisht hands, dropt forth by yeare after yeare, with penury and leysure, ill provided for before they come, and worse governed when they are heere, men of such distempered bodies and infected mindes, whome no examples dayly before their eyes, eithre of goodnes or punishment, can deterr from their habituall impieties, or terrifie from a shamefull death, that must be the carpenters and workers in this so glorious a building.³

De la Warr therefore counselled that in the future a different sort of emigrant should be included:

Nor would I have it conceived that we would exclude altogether gentlemen, and such whose breeding never knew what a daye’s labour meant, for even to such, this countrie I doubt not but will give likewise excellent satisfaction, especially to the better and stayed spirititts; for he amongst us that cannot digg, use the square, nor practise the ax and

2. Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great, Part One*, ed. Mark Thornton Burnett (London: Everyman, 1999), 3.3.259. All subsequent references to Marlowe’s works are from this edition unless otherwise noted.

3. Edward D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London with Letters to and from the First Colony Never before Printed* (Albany, NY: Munsell, 1869), 45.

chissle, yet he shall find how to imply the force of knowledge, the exercise of counsell, and the operation and power of his best breeding and quallitie.⁴

In fact, Mark Netzloff observes that “the proportion of gentlemen in Virginia, who were by definition excluded from labor, exceeded that of England by six times.”⁵ One very striking model for a man who could not dig personally but could plan and direct might be Aeneas, for in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, at the opening of act 5, scene 1, a stage direction is to be found: “*Enter Aeneas, with a paper in his hand, drawing the platform of the city,*” that is the city that he had been specifically directed to found in Rome but which he now briefly plans to erect in Carthage. We can learn from David Scott Wilson-Okamura that Marlowe is pointedly departing here from the contemporary tradition which had it that Dido, rather than Aeneas, was a builder: “Davies and Stanyhurst admire Dido because she was a builder, Carthage because it was industrious. . . . When, however, Dido falls in love with Aeneas, she stops building.”⁶ Marlowe clearly draws on this idea, but recasts it to throw emphasis on the idea of the skilled, gentlemanly male colonizer of the kind whom De la Warr advocates and of whom he had indirect experience given the sojourn in Roanoke of Thomas Hariot, whose name is coupled with Marlowe’s in the Baines Note.

Nor was this the only respect in which Aeneas might form a useful template for England’s colonizing activities. Traditionally land was gendered feminine, to be husbanded by men, in discourses often borrowed from the classical. In 1572 Sir Thomas Smith wrote to advise his son, who was about to set out for Ireland, that “for the first year there, and peradventure the second, ye shall do well to take one sure and convenient place to make a fort, as Byrso was to Dido, and Mons Aventinus to Romulus.”⁷ In a later letter he suggested that the principal city should be called Elizabetha,⁸ and Virginia too was in essence named after Elizabeth in her capacity as Virgin Queen. Marlowe might be seen as drawing attention to the feminization of land in the title of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Previous treatments of the

4. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company*, 47.

5. Mark Netzloff, *England’s Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2004), 120, 110, 112.

6. David Scott Wilson-Okamura, “Virgilian Models of Colonization in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*,” *ELH* 70.3 (2003): 709–37, 719.

7. Qtd. in David Beers Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith (1513–1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89.4 (1945): 543–60, 547.

8. Qtd. in Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith,” 547.

story, such as Edward Halliwell's 1564 play and William Gager's 1583 one, had been called simply *Dido*, but Marlowe's is specifically and unusually *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, and the most famous classical mention of Carthage, Cato's "Carthago delenda est," serves as an unforgettable reminder that the name Carthage was gendered feminine and helps to boost the play's already strong hints of a parallel between Dido and Elizabeth. The play itself, though, offers a rather different model of nomenclature in which land is actually gendered masculine:

CLOANTHUS. Let it be termed "Aenea," by your name.

SERGESTUS. Rather "Ascania," by your little son.

AENEAS. Nay, I will have it called "Anchisacon,"

Of my old father's name. (5.1.20–24)

Tamburlaine, too, proposes to call "the provinces, cities and towns / After my name and thine, Zenocrate" (4.4.85–86), which again proposes that land might be gendered either masculine or feminine. I do not suggest that we have here a direct precedent for the eventual naming of Jamestown, but this is a moment which does show the extent to which *Dido, Queen of Carthage* has its finger on the pulse of urgently contemporary debates about the practice and protocols of colonialism.

The reason Aeneas is in Carthage in the first place is that he has been wrecked and thus separated from the "wooden walls" (*Dido*, 1.1.67) of his ship. All journeys of colonization started at sea, and a ship, as the opening scene of *The Tempest* (1611) shows us, offered a particularly suggestive location for examining issues of government and rule. The metaphors of the ship of state and of the ship of fools were both well known to Renaissance literature, and it is possible that an actual ship, *The Dragon*, saw the earliest recorded attempt at the deliberate cultivation of an English identity through cultural activity aboard, in the shape of shipboard performances of *Hamlet* (1600) and *Richard II* (1601).⁹ A ship emblemizes its country of origin, as is made clear in *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, where much of scene 16 is taken up with the definition of a wreck, with Vernon and the ship's master insisting that their temporary absence from it does not mean that the Lantado can proclaim their ship a wreck because as long as an Englishman is technically on board, the ship remains English. Ships also, however, took Englishmen to new environments in which the very idea of Englishness might be radically destabilized, since as Mary

9. See Bernice W. Kliman, "At Sea about *Hamlet* at Sea: A Detective Story," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.2 (2011): 180–204.

Floyd-Wilson observes, “The environment—whether that meant the air, temperature, diet, and terrain, or the effects of education, rhetoric, or fashion—necessarily produced and destabilized early modern English selves.”¹⁰ In the face of this threatening sense of destabilization, allusion to the classical past could provide a welcome and comforting antidote. In Heywood’s *The Fair Maid of the West*, for instance, the voyage of Bess Bridges’ ship, the *Negro*, brings to the surface a previously unsuspected classicism in the world of the play when Bess says to Mullisheg,

Mighty Prince,
If you desire to see me beat my brest,
Poure forth a river of increasing teares,
Then you may urge me to that sad discourse.¹¹

Bess here closely parallels the preamble to Aeneas’ tale to Dido in the *Aeneid*, book 2, “Infandum regina jubes renovare dolorem” (“O queen, you bid [me] renew an unspeakable grief”), and the Virgilian echo is reinforced when Spencer, thinking that Bess has turned against him, laments that “I could be a new Sinon and betray / A second Troy, rather then suffer this” (part 2, sig. L4r). Both Bess and Spencer are discussing their own emotions and identities, and both find the tale of Troy to be a useful aid in articulating this sense of self. This proves though to be a contested discourse of which the English by no means have a monopoly, for Mullisheg too speaks of “Nestor” (part 2, sig. C3r), “Priam,” and “Hellen” (sig. C3v), positioning himself as the Trojan and the English Bess as the Greek Helen. The story of Aeneas may be a potent icon of cultural and genealogical authority, but it may be troublingly unclear who owns it.

The same cultural contest surfaces in other texts too. In *The Battle of Alcazar* Abdelmelec calls the troops of the Bashaw “Picked soldiers comparable to the guard / Of Myrmidons that kept Achilles’ tent,”¹² and in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* the Sophy himself intervenes in the struggle to map onto classically authorized paradigms when he says,

Late Sherley knight, now Lord Ambassador,
To make a league ’twixt us and Christendom

10. Mary Floyd-Wilson, *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 3–4.

11. Thomas Heywood, *The Fair Maid of the West* (London: Richard Rosyton, 1631), sig. H4v. Hereafter cited by part and signature.

12. George Peele, *The Battle of Alcazar*, in Charles Edelman, ed., *The Stukeley Plays* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2005), 1.1.15–16. Hereafter cited as *Alcazar*.

For furtherance of sharp war against the Turk,
 I'll send thee forth as rich as ever went
 The proudest Trojan to a Grecian's tent.¹³

If the Sophy is in a position to furnish Shirley as a Trojan, he himself is presumably in some sense to be identified as a Trojan, and there was certainly an awareness that historically Troy was located in Asia. Terence Spencer observes that "a considerable number of Shakespeare's contemporaries had visited Troy (at least, they visited what were supposed to be the ruins of Homer's Troy; they were really standing on St Paul's Alexandra Troas . . .)" because "nearly every boat that went to Constantinople had to wait off Tenedos, days or even weeks, for a favourable wind in order to navigate the Dardanelles and the Propontis."¹⁴ So it was common knowledge that early modern Turkey contained the geographical location of ancient Troy, even if the idea of a continuity between the two was culturally unpalatable.

It was however possible to develop a different and, to the English colonizing mind, more acceptable equation by connecting the story of Aeneas not simply to Virgil but to a more recent literary paradigm which was itself inflected by the story of Aeneas. These plays are steeped in Marlovian memories, in ways that work to build an association not just with Aeneas in general but specifically with Aeneas as remembered by Marlowe. Martin Wiggins says of Stukeley, "Like one of Marlowe's heroes, he masters fortune by positive, aggressive action,"¹⁵ and Tom Rutter too points out the widespread debt to Marlowe in these plays.¹⁶ In *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* Sir Thomas Sherley tells the Great Turk that he will be "(as sometimes were thy ancestors) / Fed in a cage and dragged at conqueror's heels,"¹⁷ an unmistakable reference to *Tamburlaine*. In *The Battle of Alcazar*, Muly Mahamet actually says, "Convey Tamburlaine

13. John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins, *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*, in *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995), 2.267–72).

14. Terence Spencer, "Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance," *Modern Language Review* 47.3 (1952): 330–33, 333. One example of such a visitor is Thomas Coryate, who called on his way to Constantinople and was termed by a companion "the first English Knight of Troy." *New Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Thomas Coryate," by Michael Strachan, accessed September 9, 2015, <http://oxforddnb.com/>.

15. Martin Wiggins, "Things That Go Bump in the Text: *Captain Thomas Stukeley*," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 98.1 (2004): 5–20, 13.

16. Tom Rutter, "Marlovian Echoes in the Admiral's Men Repertory: *Alcazar*, *Stukeley*, *Patient Grissil*," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27.1 (2009): 27–38.

17. Wilkins, *Three English Brothers*, 12.117–18.

into our Afric here, / To chastise and to menace lawful kings” (1.2.35–36), and Stukeley demands,

Why should not I then look to be a king?
I am the Marquess now of Ireland made
And will be shortly King of Ireland.
King of a mole-hill had I rather be
Than the richest subject of a monarchy.
Huff it, brave mind, and never cease t’aspire,
Before thou reign sole king of thy desire. (2.2.78–82)

This clearly evokes Tamburlaine’s belief in “aspiring minds” and the delights of “the sweet fruition of an earthly crown” (1*Tam*, 2.7.20, 29). Equally Sebastian speaks of “Spain, where all the traitors dance” (*Alcazar*, 2.2.120), recalling Theridamas’ “Nigra Silva, where the devils dance” (2*Tam*, 1.3.212) and Don de Meneses says Sebastian “storms as great Achilles erst” (*Alcazar*, 3.3.40); Tamburlaine too is compared to Achilles (1*Tam*, 2.1.24). In *Captain Thomas Stukeley*, Stukeley proclaims that “Were it my fortune could exceed the clouds, / Yet would I bear a mind surmounting that” and “I must have honour, honour is the thing / Stukeley doth thirst for”;¹⁸ like Tamburlaine, Stukeley shows himself ignorant of the laws of war when he challenges the governor of a garrison town to a duel (10.19–21) and “scorn[s] to be controlled / Of any man that’s meaner than a king” (11.95–96), echoing Tamburlaine’s “Is it not passing brave to be a king / ‘And ride in triumph through Persepolis?’” (1*Tam*, 2.5.53–54). Like the world of *Tamburlaine*, too, this is a world of *realpolitik*: when Philip declares that “the right is in Molocco” (*Stukeley*, 14.32), Botellio blandly explains that Sebastian is not interested in right but does this “for honour’s sake” (45), before adding as a bit of an afterthought that he also aims to evangelize Morocco.

In all these plays, then, Tamburlaine serves as an image of unqualified aspiration and ambition, but he also serves to anchor the *translatio imperii* firmly to England by connecting the narrative of Aeneas specifically to Marlowe. Another way of doing this is to evoke not only Aeneas but also Dido, from whom Marlowe’s play takes its name. In *Three English Brothers* a suggestive exchange between the Sophy’s Niece and her maid Dalibra positions the Niece as Dido and thus allows Robert Sherley to assume unchallenged the cultural mantle of Troy:

18. *The Famous History of the Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley*, in Charles Edelman, ed., *The Stukeley Plays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 5.118–19, 6.49–50. Hereafter cited as *Stukeley*.

DALIBRA. What, dreaming, madam?

NIECE. Yes, and my dream was of the wandering knight, Aeneas.

DALIBRA. O, the true Trojan.

NIECE. Yet he played false play with the kind-hearted queen of Carthage.¹⁹ (3.119–23)

The point is underlined even more sharply in *The Battle of Alcazar*, in which there is a sustained insistence on the extent to which it is English (and to a lesser extent British) characters who are to be identified with Aeneas, and again mention of Dido is used to achieve this. The Irish bishop notes that he and his companions were *en route* for Ireland when, Aeneas-like, they got lost and have ended up in Africa, the home of Dido (2.2.12–21). The prologue to the fifth act spells out the similarity even more clearly when we hear of how “At last descendeth Fame, as Iris / To finish fainting Dido’s dying life” (5.0.9–10) before in his own dying speech Stukeley recalls how he embarked at Ostia (5.1.162), the port of Rome, from which we can safely assume that Aeneas’ great-grandson Brutus fled from Rome on his way to found Britain.

The most sustained and systematic use of Marlovian memories to sustain a sense of an English colonial identity, though, comes in a very different context from either Morocco or Virginia, and here again, I want to argue, the aggressive figure of Tamburlaine acts as the armed guard to enforce the authority of Aeneas as paradigm for English colonial identities. For Belchier’s *Hans Beer-Pot*, the backdrop is that of the “cautionary towns” held by the English in the Netherlands as part of their campaign to assist the Protestant Dutch against their Catholic Spanish overlords and occupiers; as Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, explained in his *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex* (c. 1600), “her Maiestie hath bestowed in the action in the Low Countries at the least 4 millions of crownes, and shee hath in pawne for the debt which the states owe~ her, the townes of Flushing and the Brill.”²⁰ In its capacity as effectively a little bit of England abroad, Flushing in particular became the scene of several notable events in English history, and the home of a community demonstrating many of the characteristic features of modern expatriate life, although not, it seems, a habitual contempt for the natives, whose cultural difference was generally felt to confine itself to the not unappealing forms of drinking a lot of alcohol and eating a lot of butter. (The common

19. Wilkins, *Three English Brothers*, 3.119–23.

20. Robert Devereux, *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex* (London: J. Smethwick?, 1600), sig. D2r.

appellation of the Dutch as “butter-boxes” is well attested in Renaissance drama.) It also, however, provided an unexpectedly potent stimulus not only for reflection on England but also for investigation of a question of considerable interest to the early modern English, the supposed classical origins of their country, what if anything those really meant to contemporary English senses of self, and the extent to which literature in general and plays in particular were involved in forming and maintaining those senses of self.

Despite its relative nearness to home and an apparently general sense that the Dutch were worth fighting for, Flushing in particular did not enjoy the best of reputations. In 1592 the imprisoned Charles Chester, pleading with Robert Cecil to release him, begged pitifully, “If I am grievous in your honour’s hearing or sight let me bannished in the Brill, Flushing, Lincolnshire or in the worst place of her Majesty’s dominions, or to some vile war without pay, so I am not left in this cage of misery,”²¹ and Arthur Golding in *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe* (1582) speaks of “the abilitie of the towne of Flushing (whiche is none of the greatest).”²² In John Marston’s *The Malcontent* (c. 1603) Passarello says of Maquerelle, “Faith, I was wont to salute her as our English women are at their first landing in Flushing: I would call her whore;” the Revels editor’s note says, “Flushing was the most famous English garrison-town of the period and the usual landing-place for volunteers for the Dutch war; hence no doubt the tone of the place, and the expectations formed about women who went there.”²³ In another play, *Arden of Faversham* (1592), the villainous Black Will, who has already recalled his time at Boulogne in the service of Henry VIII, flees to Flushing in the hope of escaping justice, but is ultimately hanged there (though it is not made clear in the play whether this is for his murder of Arden in Kent or for a different crime committed in Flushing itself, so we

21. Charles Chester to Robert Cecil, July 1592, in *Calendar of the Cecil Papers in Hatfield House, Volume 4: 1590–1594*, ed. R. A. Roberts (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1892), 216–33, accessed September 9, 2015, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=111583>.

22. Arthur Golding, *The ioyful and royal entertainment of the ryght high and mightie Prince, Frauncis the Frenche Kings only brother . . . into his noble citie of Antwerpe* (London: William Ponsonby, 1592), sig. B2v.

23. John Marston, *The Malcontent*, ed. George Hunter (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1975), 1.8.34–36, 34–35n.

cannot be quite sure that Flushing might never offer a safe haven for fugitives from English justice).²⁴

Hans Beer-Pot does not name its setting but certainly takes place in the Netherlands, whether in Flushing or in Utrecht, where Belchier himself served. From it we get a clear sense of such a territory's distinctive identity, situated as it was in a war-zone and potentially subject to recapture and sacking. For all its disingenuous introduction of itself as nothing more than a play "acted . . . by an honest company of Health-Drinkers,"²⁵ *Hans Beer-Pot* is in fact an unexpectedly sophisticated piece of work which responds powerfully to this sense of threat and danger, and I want to suggest that it uses both Marlowe and Shakespeare to do so. In the dedication to Sir John Ogle, Belchier cheerfully declares that "Mine honoured Lord, I here present vnto your view, nor Comedie, nor Tragedie, as wanting first the iust number of Speakers: Secondly, those parts or Acts it should haue, which should bee at the least fiue" (sig. A3r [first of the two so numbered]). There is a touch of the Ciceronian here in the statement which acknowledges even as it disavows, and certainly one is left in no doubt that any deviations from standard dramaturgical practice are attributable to choice rather than to ignorance. Moreover, Belchier turns on its head the usual disclaimer of topicality or unduly pointed specificity by briskly advising that "if any man thinkes himselfe touched in any thing that is amisse, let him endeauour by Gods helpe to amend it" (sigs. A3r–v [first of the two so numbered]), transferring responsibility squarely onto the shoulders of the reader or audience member and implicitly aligning himself with the homiletically-driven aesthetic of Ben Jonson in which drama is in itself a civilizing force. A similar assigning of responsibility to the reader underlies his remark that "And for the names which are significant, if you take them according to their Dialect, as lesse materiall, I leaue your Lordship, at your leasure to guesse at" (sig. A3v [second of the two so numbered]); this is no spoon-feeding mode of dramaturgy but a self-consciously rough and ready one, summoning the reader to a state of alertness and self-sufficiency that chimes well with the ethos of a town on guard.

Belchier feels himself able to expect this much from his readers because he is acutely aware of the lifelong effects of a good education, and the extent to which an early initiation into literary cultures can

24. *Arden of Faversham*, in *Five Elizabethan Tragedies*, ed. A. K. McIlwraith (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1938), 6.24–25.

25. Dabridgcourt Belchier, *Hans Beer-Pot his inuisible comedie, of see me, and see me not . . .* (London: Bernard Alsop, 1618), title page. All subsequent references to the play are from this edition.

enable the ongoing maintenance of a selfhood deliberately crafted as civilized, even in circumstances that may not be conducive to that. When the Sergeant surprises his interlocutors by his erudition, he says simply, “I doe remember what I learn’t at Schoole / In Ouid” (sig. C4v), and Hanneke says to Cornelius of their son, “you did your part / To giue him learning, which will make him know / The good from euill” (sig. B4v). An early grounding lays the foundation of a life well lived and of the maintenance of core values even when amongst those who do not share them, as was of course the situation of the expatriate English in the Spanish Netherlands. As a result of such educations, the denizens of this rather rough garrison town show themselves to have a surprisingly fine ear for poetry. When the sergeant recites what he claims are verses he has composed, Younker Harmans is quick to spot the attempted plagiarism, remarking dismissively that the sergeant “Did neere make that, that famous learned Knight, / *Sir Philip Sidney*, Scholers, souldiers pride / Was his, not yours (sig. D1r). Obviously Sidney was something of a local hero in Flushing and presumably by extension in the Netherlands in general, so his works might be particularly recognizable, but he is not the only writer who seems to be remembered by the characters in the play. Hans at one point sings

*As I went to Walsingham,
To that holy Land,
Met I with an olde balde Mare,
By the way as I came.* (sig. B3r)

Later, he says “he lookt so reechilie, / Like Bacon hanging on the Chimnies rooffe” (sig. C3v). The famous Walsingham ballad is also echoed by Ophelia in *Hamlet*,²⁶ and “reechy” is Hamlet’s term for the kisses his uncle gives his mother;²⁷ it might even be possible to hear in Younker Harmans’ description of Sidney as “*Sir Philip Sidney*, Scholers, souldiers pride” an echo of Ophelia’s description of Hamlet as having “The courtier’s, soldier’s, scholar’s, eye, tongue, sword.”²⁸ Another Shakespeare play is also evoked when Younker Harmans says,

Each body well composde, it doth consiste
Of diuers members, framde by art, yet naturall;
The body where are lodgde the chiefest parts,
I liken it vnto the Infanterie;

26. Gary Waller, “An Erasmus Pilgrimage to Walsingham,” *Peregrinations* 2.2 (2007): 1–16, 2, accessed September 9, 2015, <http://peregrinations.kenyon.edu/vol2-2/current.html>.

27. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins (London: Methuen, 1980), 3.4.186.

28. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 3.1.153.

The exterior parts to the Cauallerie.
 The heart commaunds, the members execute;
 So they to vs, not we to them giue way. (sigs. E3r–v)

This clearly recalls Menenius' fable of the body in *Coriolanus* (c. 1608), albeit given a distinctive slant in aid of the play's sustained discussion of the differences between horsemen and foot soldiers.

Shakespeare is not, though, always useful. Inevitably in an expat community myths about "the old country" spring up, and on one occasion we actually catch that happening:

PASQUIL. I haue no manners: had I such an one
 As Amptill is, to which seuen Parkes belong,
 I would keepe thee to be my worships foole.
 HANS. Why? where is Amptill.
 PAS. In the Fayery land.
 Where men eate mutton, pigge, and goose, and beefe,
 Rabbets and chickens, partridge, pheasants, quales,
 And drinke rich wine, that France or Spaine sends in,
 And strong March Beere, of fīue or sixe yeeres old. (sigs D3v–D4r)

Pasquil's apparently throwaway pun on "manners" and "manors" inaugurates a bizarre fantasy sequence in which Amptill in Bedfordshire becomes the improbable location of the land of milk and honey. However, it could be that this association is introduced to mask another, because as Shakespeare and John Fletcher's *Henry VIII* (1613) reminds us, Amptill was where Catherine of Aragon was banished to,²⁹ so telling a new story about it might be a way of overwriting an image of England as troubled and divided and presenting it instead as a home of plenitude. Here, a Shakespearean memory actually needs to be shed.

More tantalizingly, there seem to be faint but suggestive indications of an interest in Marlowe, and Marlovian memories do, I think, prove useful to the play's ideological projects. When Hans asks, "But whats Meander? man, or mayde, or wife," Pasquil says, "A riuier foole, didst neuer see a play" (sig. D3r). On the face of it this appears to be a joke about Hans's ignorance, but could it also be a joke about Pasquil's? General geography could inform anyone that Meander was the name of a river, but only a play could tell you that it was also that of a character in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, where there are sufficient hints about the potentially homoerotic nature of the relationship between Meander and Mycetes to give a rather sharp point to the seemingly

29. William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *Henry VIII*, ed. A. R. Humphreys (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1971), 4.1.28.

innocent question about whether he is “man, or mayde, or wife.” *Tamburlaine* also anachronistically mentions the battle of Varna, which, as we shall shortly see, Younker Harmans discusses at length. Finally, when Hanneke says “Away you Knaue, / Take that Dutch shilling, drinke mongst your Comrades” (sig. B3r), it is tempting to hear an echo of the occasion on which Marlowe had been arrested in Flushing and brought before Sir Robert Sidney on suspicion of minting a fake Dutch shilling.³⁰ I have argued elsewhere that Marlowe’s plays are interested in the connection about shifting geographical location and nationhood,³¹ and that his exploration of the English colonial endeavor uses the image of Trojans to examine whether Englishness can survive if transplanted abroad. Both of these concerns would, I think, chime with what Belchier is exploring in this play.

The play’s interest in the ways in which identity is discursively constructed through memories of texts arises partly because of the status of this garrison town as a community of expats, where the fundamental difference proves not to be between English and Dutch but between those who have seen England and those who have not. The Dutch but highly anglophile Cornelius, in particular, whose daughter is married to an English merchant, likes

To thinke vpon the times forepast, I saw
In *Englands* Court so famous and renowmde
Of great *Elizæes* blessed memory.
That ayded so these troubled Netherlands
With men and money; still oh, oh still me thinkes
I see those Worthies marching on earthes stage;
The famous *Essex*, *Norreis*, *Sidney* too,
And wisest *Uere*, that held *Ostend* so long. (sig. B4r)

Cornelius in the seventeenth century strikes the unfailing note of the London taxi driver in the twenty-first as he seeks to impress a fare: “I had that Earl of Essex in the back of my cab once.”³² Rather less plausibly, Cornelius also claims that “Twas strange to see a younker once but drunke / In *Englands* Kingdome, when I liued there” (sig. B4r), and takes delight in English imports, saying to his English son-in-law Garland, “To morrow I enuite you to my house / To eate

30. See Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murders of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992), 234–39, for details of this.

31. Lisa Hopkins, “Englishmen Abroad: Mobility and Nationhood in *Dido*, *Queen of Carthage* and *Edward II*,” *English* 59 (2010): 324–48.

32. “I Had That David Mellor in the Back of the Cab Once . . .,” *The Guardian* (UK), November 25, 2014, <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/shortcuts/2014/nov/25/i-had-that-david-mellor-in-back-of-cab-once-taxi-driver-rant>.

some venison, here tis nouelty; / It came from England, baked in Rye paste” (sig. F3r). Cornelius himself may be Dutch, but his values, his memories, and even what he eats are English. For him, England is clearly the metropole.

The English garrison towns in the Netherlands, by contrast, are repeatedly equated with the edge of civilization. During the course of the play, Younker Harmans tells two long stories, both of which are about a famous historic battle whose outcome impacted on the whole of Christendom. Ostensibly these are adduced as evidence in a debate about whether infantry or cavalry is superior, but each also registers a rather different concern. The first describes

those three dayes cruell fight
 Huniades maintaind gainst mighty Amurath
 The second: in Cossoas fatall plaines.
 He kept an hill with thirty thousand men;
 Ten thousand horse, the rest were all on foot
 Against the Turkes that lay like Grashoppers,
 Filling those plaines, eight miles in compasse round:
 This little handfull, roulde and turnde about,
 On that hils top in strong and close array,
 Flamde like a Candle mongst a world of flyes,
 That burnt themselues, ere they could put it out:
 At length with trauell tyrde, with blows & wounds
 All rent and torne, choakt vp with smoake & stench
 Of bodies dead: match, poulder, bullets spent
 This light did glimmer, flasht, and so went out. (sig. E3v)

This describes the Turkish victory at the Battle of Kosovo in 1448, which was seen as a landmark defeat for Christendom in general and for the frontier territory of Hungary in particular, and as enabling the seemingly relentless march of the Ottoman Empire into Europe. However, the extended simile of the candle also makes it stand for more than this, as the gallant band of Jan Hunyadi, the White Knight of Wallachia, becomes a richly emblematic beacon of light and hope against an enemy as numerous but also as contemptible as grasshoppers or flies. The light that “did glimmer, flasht, and so went out” thus becomes the flame of civilization per se rather than simply an individual manifestation of it, as the imagery touches for a moment on the grandeur of myth or of epic before itself flickering out again.

Events in Hungary might seem a long way away from those in either England or the Netherlands, but in fact the Ottoman campaign in Hungary in 1566 had received as much public attention in England as the Siege of Malta had the year before, leading the two indeed to become in some sense coupled, since the attack on Hungary “was

seen by many observers as a consequence of the previous year's defeat, the 'turke' 'beyng inflamed with malice and desyre of vengeance.' An order of service that follows those of the previous year word for word confirms the continuity."³³ Moreover, Philip Sidney had visited Hungary and expressly mentions hearing stories of the past there: "In Hungary I have seen it the manner at all feasts, and other such meetings, to have songs of their ancestors' valour, which that right soldierlike nation think the chiefest kindlers of brave courage."³⁴ It is perhaps just conceivable, then, that the play's explicit evocation of Sidney is coupled with evocation of something he had been heard to talk about, but it is in any case clear that there is a particular appropriateness in telling this story in this setting because there is an obvious parallel between the beleaguered Christians at Kosovo and the beleaguered Protestants of the garrison towns.

Younker Harmans' second narrative also features Hunyadi, and it too speaks to its setting. Asked to explain what happened at the Battle of Varna, Younker Harmans recounts how

The Cardinall *Iulian* mooude this lucklesse Warre,
 Causing the King and States of Hungarie
 To breake their truce; which they had solemne sworne;
 The Pope dispenc't with them, so would not God,
 If he be witnesse: he wils faith be kept
 Without exception, be it with Infidels,
 As this was here; the sequell proude it true,
 In manner thus: *Huniades* that mannadgde all,
 Dislikte this warre: yet *Vladislans*
 This youthfull King, eggde on by *Iulian*,
 Would needs breake faith with mighty *Amurath*,
 And neere to *Varna* both their armies met,
 Where he so plac't his battels as a Lake,
 Flanckt the left side; a wood was on the reere:
 And on the right hand all their waggons went:
 Had they kept so, *Byzantium* had beene ours:
 And Greece once more it had beene Christendome. (sigs. E4v–F1r)

Once again, Christian faces Turk and is once again defeated, as we catch a glimpse of a moment that changed history. This is a battle which in Harmans' account led directly to the fall of the eastern empire and the final loss of all that had been Rome as well as

33. Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005), 70.

34. Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry; or The Defence of Poesy*, ed. R. W. Maslen, 3rd ed. (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2002), 99.

preventing the recovery of Greece, with the trauma being thus doubled by the severing of the link to the classical past as well as the danger to the Christian present.

The obvious Marlovian memory in this passage is of 2 *Tamburlaine*, in which the Battle of Varna features importantly, but in fact the more closely analogous moment in his works would be that in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* when Aeneas, describing the Trojan horse, says “O, had it never entered, Troy had stood!” (2.1.172). The rhythms of Aeneas’ lament are closely echoed in “Had they kept so, *Byzantium* had beene ours,” and in fact this would be no opportunist comparison but one that casts light on a fundamental characteristic of early modern attempts to maintain an English expatriate identity. In the first place, Belchier would not be the only playwright to connect Marlowe’s narrative of the fall of *Troy* to the fall of *Greece*. In Burnell’s 1641 play *Landgartha*, which clearly remembers Marlowe when the king of Sweland declares that “Religion is but a toy, and first invented / By politicke states, to keepe fooles in awe,” Landgartha when she weeps at Reyner’s departure becomes a new Dido (especially since he then takes a second wife as Aeneas did) and Phoebus prophesies that in the future her son

shall (by’s right) enjoy
The Land of Danes; and in this place where Troy
Now stands, shal Conquer, and build it againe.
Will also conquer Greece, and there restrayne
Th’impieties of wicked men.³⁵

The descendant of Trojan Aeneas, then, is the destined liberator of Greece.

In the second place, the idea of a connection to the world of epic lays bare something fundamental to the identity of the English garrison towns in the Netherlands and to the sense of self of the English community living there. Flushing’s myth of origins linked it directly to the classical world: popular etymology derived its Dutch name of Vlissingen from Ulysses, as when Thomas Coryate in *The Odcombian Banquet* (1611), drawing a sustained series of comic comparisons between himself and Ulysses, writes of how “*Vlysses* in his trauel builded Flushing, / Where *Coryate* ending, or’e the Sea came brushing.”³⁶

35. Henry Burnell, *Landgartha* (Dublin, 1641), sigs. B4v, F2v.

36. Thomas Coryate, *The Odcombian Banquet* . . . (London: Thomas Thorp, 1611), sig. F4v. The verses by “Iohannes a Grandi-Bosco” that appear in *Coryates Crambe* note that “Compar’d by many th’are to Odysseus” (Thomas Coryate, *Coryates Crambe, or his colwort twice sodden and now served in with other macaronicke dishes, as the second course to his Crudities* [London, 1611], sig. A3v), and in *The Odcombian banquet*, John Davies of Herefordshire calls him “our Brittain-

Elsewhere in the Netherlands, the long siege of Ostend led to the city being known as the new Troy, as noted in *The Triumphs of Nassau*, translated into English by William Shute in 1613, where we hear of “their intrenched workes called New Troy”³⁷ (the dedicatee of Belchier’s play, Ogle, had in 1601 been serving under Sir Francis Vere at the defense of Ostend). There was in fact a general structural association between ancient and modern sieges in that, as James Black notes, “The *Troy Book* illustrations depict ‘incidents’ from the Troy siege, with men in medieval or Renaissance armour using cannon and mortars”;³⁸ it is therefore no surprise that Doctor Faustus’ imagination couples the siege of Antwerp and Helen of Troy, and the stories Younker Harmans tell are thus ones that had a direct relevance to the place in which he tells them, for in a dizzying realignment of identities, the Greece that might still have been part of Christendom becomes the emblem of the classical past, defended by a Huniades whose very name echoes Greek patronymics such as Alciades and Teucrides.

Belchier’s play thus throws the spotlight onto the importance of cultural memory in the construction of national identity, as we watch an English-identified community cling on to an English identity by reciting Sidney and by remembering Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the glories of the past. This is a moment when, poised on the edge of empire, identities are threateningly blurred and civilization itself is at stake, and the only remaining point of certain access to it lies in the act of recalling it, and recalling it particularly as it had been mediated through Marlowe. Collectively, then, the plays I have discussed here touch on questions of gender, of choice of appropriate colonists, and of the importance of cultural memory and heritage, and for treatment of all these topics they find in *Dido*, *Queen of Carthage*, either alone or in conjunction with the Tamburlaine plays, a powerful and flexible discourse.

Sheffield Hallam University
*Sheffield, United Kingdom*³⁹

Vlysses” (sig. N3v).

37. Jan Janszn Orlers, *The Triumphs of Nassau* . . ., trans. William Shute (London: Adam Islip, 1613), 332.

38. James Black, “Hamlet Hears Marlowe; Shakespeare Reads Virgil,” *Renaissance and Reformation* 28.4 (1994): 17–28, 23.

39. With thanks to Arun Cheta, Tom Rutter, and Matthew Steggle.

BRONWYN JOHNSTON

The Legacy of Mephistopheles: Marlowe's
Magical Influence on *The Late Lancashire
Witches*

There is a method to the devil's magic. The demons that populate the early modern stage take no pains to hide the fact. In act 4 of *Doctor Faustus*, the scholar-magician promises to bring the pregnant Duchess of Vanholt "a dish of ripe grapes" but despite Faustus's continual boasts of his supernatural prowess, not even the devil can pull them from thin air in the dead of winter.¹ Instead, he sends Mephistopheles off to a warmer climate to fetch them. Making no effort to conceal the restrictions to his power, Faustus explains that "the year is divided into two circles over the whole world, that when it is here winter with us, in the contrary circle it is summer with them, as in India, Saba and farther countries in the East; and by means of a swift spirit that I have, I had them brought hither, as ye see" (4.2.22–27). This explanation ascribes the Mephistophelean power with a sort of realism, indicating that the devil must comply with the seasonal differences in the natural world.

In early modern drama, explaining magic's methods is part of the performance. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595), Puck is curiously precise about how long it will take him to circumnavigate the globe when he declares he will "put a girdle round about the earth / In forty minutes," while in Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome's *The Late Lancashire Witches* (1634), Moll Spencer and her lover Robert specify that a devil will help them travel three-hundred miles in eight hours.² The

1. Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus: A- and B- Texts* (1604, 1616), Revels Plays, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993), 4.2.12. All subsequent references are to the A-text in this edition unless stated otherwise.

2. William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Arden Shakespeare, ed. Harold F. Brooks, 2nd ser. (1979; repr., New York: Routledge, 1994), 2.1.175–76.

pair call on the fiend to expedite the journey but not to eliminate the need for it completely. The supernatural effects are not expected to be instantaneous. Instead, they must adhere to a clearly defined set of rules.

These examples of stage magic demonstrate not only the marvels produced with the devil's assistance, but also highlight the ways in which his power and influence were circumscribed in the early modern world. Food, riches, spirits, all must come from somewhere, or something, be summoned or substituted, because neither the devil nor the actors could conjure them out of thin air. In determining the boundaries of fiendish magic, the early modern stage lends credibility to demonological convictions by drawing a firm distinction between the possible and the impossible. The supernatural feats performed by Mephistopheles and his theatrical successors are not the far-fetched marvels found in fantastical tales. Instead, the magic is made to seem plausible. Broadly speaking, the demonism depicted in *Doctor Faustus* could be regarded as quite real to the early modern mind.

Written at least thirty years after Marlowe's play was first performed, *Lancashire Witches* evidences a continuity in demonic representation in the theater from the early 1590s to the 1630s. The two plays are rarely discussed together because they fall into such different categories: one play is tragic, the other comic; one is about a magician, the other about witches; one play is Elizabethan, the other Caroline; one is the most well-known work of a major playwright, the other was penned by two lesser-known authors. Yet reading these plays side by side gives an important insight into the continuity of early modern theatrical conventions. At first glance, no two plays could seem more dissimilar. First performed in the early 1590s, *Doctor Faustus* dramatizes the tragedy of a largely unsuccessful scholar-magician. On the other hand, *Lancashire Witches*, penned a few short years before the theaters closed, is a rollicking comedy about four capable witches. The former was so frightening that audience members allegedly identified real devils in the staged demonic displays; the latter was described by contemporary spectator Nathaniel Tomkyns as being "from the beginning to the end of odd passages and fopperies to provoke laughter . . . mixed with divers songs and dances."³ *Doctor Faustus* has enjoyed enduring popularity and has been absorbed into the canon. Contrarily, according to Tomkyns, *Lancashire Witches* did not contain "any poetical Genius, or art, or language" (Tomkyns, 213). Yet the demonism in each play is almost exactly the same. The two works

3. Nathaniel Tomkyns to Sir Robert Phelips, August 16, 1634, qtd. in Herbert Berry, "The Globe Bewitched and *El Hombre Fiel*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984): 211–30. References to the letter are hereafter cited as Tomkyns.

stand as bookends to a body of devil plays, demonstrating that the display of demonic magic in the English Renaissance theater was consistent throughout the period.

In these two plays in particular, the perceived realism of the magic is integral to the reception of each story line, but for very different reasons. *Doctor Faustus* presents an entirely heterodox view of the supernatural, reflecting accurately the predominant intellectual convictions outlined by Renaissance demonologists. In turn, the witchcraft in *Lancashire Witches* operates according to these Marlovian methods. In *Doctor Faustus*, Mephistopheles's actions are believable, to a certain extent, because they can be—and are—explained. This acknowledgment of demonic limitations feeds into Faustus's tragedy because the real magic can never quite get him what he desires. This sense of demonic realism is also important to *Lancashire Witches*, a play inspired directly by a contemporary witch trial. By knowing exactly how their alleged supernatural crimes were committed, it is possible to understand exactly how the accused could be considered guilty of witchcraft. In making clear distinctions between demonic "fact" and the fantastical, between the possible and the impossible, each play directs the audience to consider the story seriously. The believability of the magic makes each plot compelling.

In exposing the exact mechanisms of diabolical activity, *Doctor Faustus* reflects the predominant demonological thought of the time, the meticulous rationale outlined in pseudoscientific discourses penned by scholars across Europe. The magic that does manifest in the play—fetching grapes, casting illusions, summoning mythological figures and cuckold's horns, and starting supernatural food fights in the Vatican—while seeming a little far-fetched to the modern reader, is exactly the kind of supernatural activity carefully debated in early modern intellectual culture. From the fifteenth century onward, hundreds of demonological tracts were published, including Heinrich Kramer's *Malleus Maleficarum* (1487), Jean Bodin's *De la démonomanie des sorciers* (1580), Reginald Scot's thoroughly skeptical *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584), George Gifford's *A Dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcrafts* (1593), and King James I's *Daemonologie* (1597), used by William Shakespeare as a source for *Macbeth* (1606).⁴ These books functioned neither to discredit demonological belief nor to embrace it wholesale. They instead place Lucifer and his minions under scrutiny, analyzing the extent to which they were able to influence human beings and the environments they inhabited. These texts assessed the

4. *Daemonologie* was not published in England until 1604.

extent of the power of these devils, outlined their limitations, and elucidated precisely how they were able to produce wonders and give semblance of miracles. In his monumental study, *Thinking with Demons* (1997), Stuart Clark explains that “this meant asking which laws of cause and effect they obeyed, and which they infringed.”⁵ In demystifying and exposing the inner workings of demonology, these texts rendered it a valid and understandable epistemology. The idea of demonic magic was thus grounded in an inherent rationality in the early modern world; to attribute something to the work of the devil implied one knew exactly how it worked.

Like *Doctor Faustus*, these texts validate the existence of demons by demarcating their boundaries. Their magic seems plausible by emphasizing its natural restrictions. Demonic powers were centered on visual deception, and often this ability to delude the eyes was the only substantial power granted to them. As Mephistopheles exemplifies, it was considered possible for a devil to disguise or replace things quickly to give them the semblance of transformation. He could speed things up, or slow things down, and he could enable long distance communication by relaying messages at superhuman speed. The devil could also summon or fetch items already in existence, impart knowledge of the natural world, and manipulate the elements to cast temporary storms. While the precise methods and explanations of these feats were sometimes disputed, nearly all demonologists asserted the same conclusion about where demonic power fell short. Like the human souls he was so keen to acquire, the devil had to act *within* the natural laws because they were God’s laws. As a creature himself, the devil did not have God’s power to create. He could perform wonders, but not miracles. English theologian William Perkins clarifies that “the working of a miracle is a kind of creation, for therein a thing is made to be, which was not before. And this must needs be proper to God alon[e].”⁶ Of course, the devil possessed superior knowledge, having been in existence for a lot longer than humans, and this quality made him an attractive source of information for those who were driven to him either by curiosity or by revenge, but he was confined to working with people and things already in creation. As the multitude of demonologies outlined emphatically, the devil knew how to manipulate or best use the laws of nature, but was unable to break them. In doing so, these texts made the seemingly impossible believable.

5. Stuart Clark, *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997), 152.

6. William Perkins, *A Discourse on the Damned Art of Witchcraft* (Cambridge, 1608), 15.

In a work plagued with ambiguities and contradictions, Marlowe's adherence to orthodox demonology is one of the few certainties *Doctor Faustus* provides, and this adherence is continued in *Lancashire Witches*. Marlowe's play and its Mephistophelean successors are characterized by a similar anxiety about determining Satan's limitations. The playwright established theatrical conventions that determined the extent to which the devil could operate in the human world. The plot therefore demonstrates Mephistopheles's constraints and how they are overcome. The mechanisms are explained carefully and deliberately, and Faustus himself explains them at times. The actual demonism in the play is often enacted to divert attention from Mephistopheles's inability to produce the fantastical feats desired. While Mephistopheles can summon up demonic pageants, provide new books, fetch items from around the world, and transform objects or people into animals temporarily, he cannot relay detailed knowledge about heaven or hell or the future. He cannot provide his charge with a human wife, affect permanent change or transformation, or give Faustus the ability to perform magic himself. The books he hands over only detail the secrets of the natural world, not the mysterious afterlife of which Faustus really desires knowledge. Sometimes Mephistopheles tells him why his powers are limited; on other occasions, he flat-out refuses with the words, "I will not" (2.3.67). In emphasizing the devil's constraints, Marlowe contrasts Faustian expectations with Mephistophelean reality. Faustus often fails to grasp the extent of these restrictions, but they are spelled out repeatedly to the audience as the play progresses. Grapes can be produced, provided the devil can undertake the journey to fetch them. Illusions of the dead can be summoned, but not the "true substantial bodies" (4.1.48). A sound magician is not a mighty god, but as long as he overlooks the devil's shortcomings, he can certainly pretend to be one.

In stipulating the extent of the devil's capabilities, Marlowe inadvertently establishes the basic principles that govern demonic exploits on the early modern stage. The Marlovian influence on theatrical demonism is all too apparent. In the plays featuring devils that followed the first performance of *Doctor Faustus*, there is a discernible emphasis on outlining these constraints. In Thomas Dekker, John Ford, and William Rowley's *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621), the demonic Dog explains, "Though we have power, know it is circumscribed / And tied in limits."⁷ In Ben Jonson's *The Devil Is an*

7. Thomas Dekker, John Ford, and William Rowley, *The Witch of Edmonton*, Revels Student Editions, ed. Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1999), 2.1.165–66. All subsequent references are to this edition.

Ass (1616), Lucifer himself informs Pug that he has to borrow a human body because “I can create you none.”⁸ For Lucifer, the gift of human life is impossible. He goes on to predict that the bumbling Pug’s “main achievements” in London will be no more than petty mischiefs.⁹ These plays inherit from Marlowe an insistence on demonic restrictions, and these form a key part of each story. In *The Witch of Edmonton*, Elizabeth Sawyer exchanges her soul for the power to enact revenge on her neighbors only to realize that the devil cannot help her in the ways he had explicitly promised. In *The Devil Is an Ass*, Pug himself becomes the Faustian figure, and his failure to affect any evil deeds is a source of comedy. Even in plays where the extent of the supernatural influence is hard to determine, the rules are still outlined carefully. In *Macbeth*, for example, the witches’ inability to kill through magical means is explained: having been denied charity by the sailor’s wife, the witches punish her husband by calling up a storm at sea, declaring that “Though his bark cannot be lost, / Yet it shall be tempest-tossed.”¹⁰ They cannot kill the man or make him disappear; they can only make his journey a miserable one. As the play makes apparent elsewhere, the act of murder must be performed by human hands and with human motivation. The devil is merely an agent, an enabler who exploits human impulses and desires in order to inflict malice. He works at the bidding of human intent and command and is neither capable nor culpable of murder. Mephistopheles is similarly unable to kill the Old Man who appears in act 5, stating that “His faith is great. I cannot touch his soul” (5.1.79). The only harm he can inflict is “but little worth” (5.1.81). Here the play suggests that the man is protected by his piety, but other plays imply the devil cannot harm anybody, regardless of their devoutness. Dog claims he cannot kill Mother Sawyer’s chief assailant because the man is “loving to the world / And charitable to the poor” (2.1.167–68). However, Old Banks’ actions prior to this scene have already proven he is neither loving nor charitable to the poor Sawyer. Dog’s excuse hides his natural constraints in a similar fashion to Mephistopheles’s tricks and shows. The supernatural feats in these plays all conform to the Marlovian limitations: fetching or summoning but not creating; insubstantial illusions, not resurrection; disguise, not metamorphosis.

8. Ben Jonson, *The Devil Is an Ass*, Revels Plays, ed. Peter Happé (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996), 1.1.136.

9. Jonson, *The Devil Is an Ass*, 1.1.12.

10. William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, New Cambridge Shakespeare, ed. A. R. Braunmuller (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), 1.3.23–24.

Accordingly, *Lancashire Witches* adheres to the demonic realism established in Marlowe's play. Robert West confirms that all of the supernatural activity in *Lancashire Witches* is "plainly and ungrudgingly orthodox."¹¹ The demonic mechanisms are laid bare for the audience to see. Although we do not see the events from the devil's point of view, the audience can be in no doubt of his presence in the drama, his importance to the magic itself, and the clear restrictions that do not allow him to defy the laws of nature. *Lancashire Witches* may challenge the boundaries of the natural but the witches do not, as one character claims, exhibit "prodigies [or] things transcending nature."¹²

Every instance of magic in *Lancashire Witches* echoes a similar event in *Doctor Faustus*. As well as showing how the devil is able to acquire consumable goods quickly, both texts also feature human-to-animal transformations, social disruption caused by invisible spirits, and copulation with demons. In each play, the devil is called upon to assist in public humiliation, summon up demonic spirits for the amusement or horror of onlookers, and to harass those characters who are skeptical about the existence of the supernatural. They help their human clients with petty mischiefs and vengeance, sexual humiliation and sexual fulfillment, and to undermine authority, be it local or papal. Even though Marlowe's play exposes the emptiness of the Faustian pact fairly quickly, while Heywood and Brome's comic tone makes the witchcraft initially seem ridiculous, both plays are comparable in the way in which they exhibit a clear understanding of the laws of demonic intervention and influence. Most importantly, each play offers the audience an explanation of how the devil operates by carefully outlining his diabolical methods.

As the chief power afforded to the devil was the ability to delude the visual senses, most of the demonism in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches* stems from the power of visual deception. Yet almost every illusory trick is undermined by drawing attention to the flaws of demonic disguise. In both plays, the most obvious examples of demonic illusions are the apparitions summoned up to resemble people. As Clark points out, "Where [the devil's] power to produce real effects gave out—where he came up against the ultimate boundaries of nature—his ingenuity in camouflaging his limitations

11. Robert Hunter West, *The Invisible World: A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama* (New York: Octagon Books, 1969), 154.

12. Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome, *The Witches of Lancashire*, Globe Quartos, ed. Gabriel Egan (New York: Routledge, 2002), 1.1.5–6. All subsequent references are to this edition.

took over.”¹³ This interference with visual perception was achieved by manipulating the air around an object to change its appearance or interfere with the cognitive processes of sight. In *Daemonologie*, James I asserts that such displays are always illusory and nothing more than “impressions in the aire, easilie gathered by a spirite, drawing so neare to that substance himselfe. . . . And yet are all these thinges but deluding of the senses, and no waies true in substance.”¹⁴ James I explains how the devil “gathers” air around the disguised subject who is affected neither physically nor permanently by these tricks. That the disguise is “in no waies true in substance” provides the key explanation to the devil’s transformative abilities, since they had an insubstantial or incorporeal body.

This airy quality also enabled them to disguise—but not transform—themselves into anything they wished. This transformative quality is established with Mephistopheles’s first appearance. Displeased with the horrific creature that first materializes in front of him, Faustus orders the fiend to return in the form of a Franciscan friar, an order that is duly followed. Accordingly, all the apparitions or “spirits” of people summoned in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches* are simply devils in disguise. Even the stage directions specify the demonic origins of the “people” Mephistopheles summons up: the “wife” he calls in is noted as “a Devil dressed like a woman, with fireworks” (2.1.151 s.d.). Manipulating the “airy bodies” of themselves and other demons summoned meant that any devil could be disguised to resemble any human being, living or dead, real or mythological.

While this may seem like a potent and manipulative skill, the audience is never allowed to be taken in by these insubstantial illusions. The disclaimer, the explanation, is almost always provided before the disguised devils appear. In *Doctor Faustus*, Mephistopheles produces Alexander and his paramour for the Emperor Charles and, most famously, Helen of Troy, who appears twice: first to enchant Faustus’s scholars and then again for the magician’s personal pleasure. The manifestations of these classical personages have a profound effect on their viewers. Charles marvels that the figures are “no spirits” because they look so real (4.1.72), while the scholars declare that Helen’s “heavenly beauty passeth all compare,” the vision a “paragon of excellence” (5.1.30, 32). It is clear that the simulations are really just insubstantial imitations. The audience is forewarned that the rather

13. Clark, *Thinking with Demons*, 166.

14. James I, King of England, “Daemonologie” in *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2003), 149–198, 164–65.

corporeal-looking spirits of Alexander, his paramour, and Helen are not what they seem. Faustus himself admits: "it is not in my ability to present before your eyes the true substantial bodies of those two deceased princes, which long since are consumed to dust" (4.1.47–50). To the scholars, the devil's ability to bring the past into the present seems miraculously real, but Faustus again alerts them to the show's shortcomings. He warns them to "be silent then" as the apparition of Helen passes across the stage, "for danger is in words" (5.1.25). While they are all able to gaze upon the spirit of the long-dead beauty, the scholars are unable to converse with her. Marlowe never permits the audience to be fooled into thinking the magic miraculous.

Rather than summoning up illustrious figures from the ancient world as Faustus does, the witches in *Lancashire Witches* source their inspiration locally, yet the spirits have the same astonishing effects. The fool Whetstone enacts his revenge on four gentlemen who ridiculed his parentage and enlists the witches to summon the "spirits" of their true fathers. They duly produce apparitions revealing Whetstone's assailants to be the offspring of a tutor, a stableman, and other people employed in house at the time of their respective conceptions. The witches' tricks thus imply that the four men are not the descendants of gentlemen but are instead the result of adulterous affairs. The effect is just as profound as the more exotic Faustian shows, however: the men are horrified. But while the apparitions look frighteningly real to their onstage audiences, the theater audience is made all too aware that the manifestations are nothing more than visual tricks performed by the devil. The demonic origins of the "fathers" are explained well before the apparitions appear. Prior to enacting Whetstone's revenge, Mistress Generous enlists Moll Spencer and her familiar to help, explaining that she needs additional spirits to help with her nephew's supernatural pageant: "To bring a new conceit to pass / Thy spirit I must borrow more / To fill the number three or four" (4.4.56–58). Here, Mistress Generous indicates that she needs one devil to play the part of each "father," each one disguising itself temporarily. The audience is thus never allowed to be surprised or mystified by the witchcraft performed because they are forewarned by the witches themselves.

For the more physical encounters mentioned in each play, the devil has to possess a human cadaver and disguise its outward features to appear as a living person. Demonologically speaking, raising the dead is impossible. While Mephistopheles and the Lancashire coven cannot call up the actual bodies of the deceased, they can use the bodies of the recently dead. When Faustus requests, "To glut the longing of my heart's desire," to consummate his relationship with the ethereal

Helen, he must copulate with a devil inhabiting a real human cadaver (5.1.83). James I specifies that the devil “borrowes a dead bodie and so visible, and as it seemes unto them naturallie as a man converses with them.”¹⁵ This corporeal possession is performed in Jonson’s *The Devil Is an Ass* by Pug, who appropriates the body of a freshly hanged criminal in order to blend in during his day trip to London. In *The Witch of Edmonton*, Dog explains to Cuddy Banks that:

The old cadaver of some self-strangled wretch
We sometimes borrow, and appear human.
The carcass of some disease-slain strumpet
We varnish fresh, and wear at her first beauty. (5.1.148–51)

As Dog explains, the effect is achieved through a combination of bodily possession and visual deception. In *Lancashire Witches*, one of the accused witches, Meg Johnson, confesses to having slept with the devil twice a week for the past six years. When her interrogator asks for more information about these encounters, Meg agrees that there was “sweet coupling” but “his flesh felt cold” (5.5.225). Her demonic paramour has been visiting her while inhabiting a borrowed human corpse, a body that lacks the natural warmth of a living person. The devil’s illusions and visual tricks, while impressive, cannot produce a perfect, substantial simulation of a human body.

The demonic ability to disrupt the cognitive processes of sight also enable both Faustus and the Lancashire witches to simulate the effect of telekinesis, but again, both texts acknowledge how the tricks are engineered. In *Doctor Faustus*, the Pope and cardinals are terrified by the food hurled around at their feast, while in *Lancashire Witches*, when watching Moll do housework, Robert swears he saw a broom move by itself. Moll is also able to make a pail move on stage without touching it. No one suspects for a moment that the objects are actually moving by themselves. In each case, the onlookers attribute agency to the action. In *Doctor Faustus*, the action is ascribed to a ghost, while in *Lancashire Witches*, Robert knows immediately who is responsible, declaring that “I do think there is so much of the devil in’t” (2.6.48–49). Again, to attribute an action to the devil implied that the exact methods behind such tricks were known. When Moll is directing the objects, she is really calling to invisible spirits. She is unable to fool Robert into thinking otherwise. There is no need to explain verbally how this supposed telekinesis works in *Doctor Faustus* because the explanation is integrated into the staging itself. While the Pope and cardinals are confused by the flying feast, the audience can see, quite

15. James I, “Daemonologie,” 189.

clearly, that Mephistopheles and Faustus are throwing the food after the latter has been charmed “that I may be invisible,” another effective disguise (3.1.56). The papal party perform an ineffective exorcism. They are thus ridiculed by the reality of the devil himself, and again, the play endorses the existence of the supernatural by debunking false ideas about magic. Although this scene is comedic, the magic is hardly impressive. The magician and spirit are invisible to their onstage audience, they are only too visible to the play audience who are never left in any doubt about how the ghost effect is achieved. The audience is never allowed to forget that this supernatural activity is nothing more than visual tricks.

Visual tricks are also behind the seemingly miraculous incidents of metamorphoses in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches*. The magical effect is not the transformation from human to animal, but in the appearance of the transformation. In Marlowe’s play, the clowns Rafe and Robin are transformed into an ape and a dog as punishment for wasting Mephistopheles’s time.¹⁶ *Lancashire Witches* is especially noteworthy for the frequency with which humans and devils alike are turned into animals. Throughout the play, the four titular witches transform themselves into dogs, hares, and cats. They also transform several other characters into horses, reducing the entire community to a devil-filled menagerie. Yet they do so within natural boundaries. Their transformations are frequently exposed as temporary and illusory. Rather than turning people into actual animals, the devils in each text merely alter the person’s appearance so that outwardly they resemble an animal. The metamorphosis in both plays can thus be considered plausible because it is governed by clear restrictions.

The acts of metamorphosis in *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches* are thus no more remarkable than any other trick performed by the devil. While actual metamorphosis was considered “unnatural,” and therefore impossible, semblance of metamorphosis was “natural,” and therefore a distinct possibility according to early modern demonological thought. Semblance of metamorphosis was thought to be implemented by the devil changing the appearance of something, the air surrounding it to give it the appearance of something else, or even manipulating the eyes of the viewer while the essence of the thing “transformed” remained unchanged. It was almost universally agreed that the devil could not transform people into animals permanently, or in the proper sense, but could only change the façade. Like resurrecting the dead, actual transformation was reserved for God

16. Or, in the B-text, Dick and Robin.

alone. Implementing a permanent change of species was a direct challenge to God's authority and, therefore, beyond the scope of the devil's abilities. In most stories of human-to-animal metamorphosis discussed by demonologists, the victim maintains all of his or her humanness except in physical appearance. The change is appearance-based but not cognitive-based.

In *Doctor Faustus*, the transformations are short-lived enchantments broken with natural—and rather simple—methods. In the B-text, both the nonpermanence and the superficiality of demonic metamorphosis are acknowledged by Robin who declares that “one of [Faustus's] devils turned me into the *likeness* of an ape's face” (B-text, 4.5.55–56, emphasis mine). When transformed, the clownish pair retain their human minds and their ability to speak. In both the A- and B-texts, the object-animal transformation also emphasizes the temporary effects of the devil's metamorphic abilities. The horse courser discovers that the animal he has purchased is really a bottle of hay disguised, but not actually transformed, by Mephistopheles. The illusion is shattered when the horse courser rides his new steed into a lake and nearly drowns. This washing or altering of the superficial disguise reveals the true nature of the human or object beneath the bestial exterior and exposes the trick as an insubstantial ruse.

Accordingly, Heywood and Brome also take care to emphasize the temporary and incomplete nature of the witches' transformations. In the act of his abduction, the Boy accuser claims Gillian Dickinson has “put [herself] into a dog skin,” confirming that the transformation is external but not internal (2.5.22). Dickinson has evidently retained all her human faculties and chides the Boy for treating her like a dog just because she looked like one: “You young rogue, you have us'd me like a dog!” (2.5.21). Here she establishes a clear difference between conduct and outward appearance. When transformed, the witches retain their human minds and thus their ability to reason. They may look like animals, but they still think and act like people. Robert indicates that, while disguised as a horse, he understands everything he witnessed with a human intellect. This recalls Bottom's transformation in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; the weaver does not initially realize he has been transformed by some rather sinister fairy spells and cannot understand the horrified reactions of the other mechanicals. The witches also retain their human proportions. The Miller indicates that the cats that attack him are abnormally large: “‘Cats’ do you call them? For their hugeness they might be cat o’ mountains” (2.2.197–98). In terms of size, the transformations are hardly realistic. The human is always detectable beneath the animal disguise. The incomplete or unconventional forms and behavior of these animals in fact draw

attention to their artificiality, and such demonic transformations are not especially convincing. Again, the witchcraft is in the demonic effects used to simulate the miraculous, not in the miraculous itself.

Even flying assumes a form of demonic naturalism in *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches* and its staging is usually accompanied by a careful explanation of the methods involved. As noted earlier, in both plays devils are used frequently for rapid transportation or to fetch people or goods from further afield. The feat is rendered possible through a combination of visual trickery and the different physical properties of the devil's "airy body" which enabled him to move through the air much faster than humans could.¹⁷ This transportation or "transvection" was a particular concern for demonologists who reasoned that the devil could move quickly through the air because he was not weighed down by the "awkwardness of earthly bodies and the sluggishness of earthly senses."¹⁸ By forcing the direction and intensity of the wind, the devil could carry humans with him through the air. James I considered demonic transportation possible because of elemental manipulation: the devil was able to modify the air around the person he was transporting to carry them, summoning "a mighty winde, being but a natural meteore, to transporte from one place to an other a solide bodie, as is commonlie and dailie seene in practise."¹⁹ He was also able to condense the air to such a degree that it allowed humans to ride on it. As Macbeth notes when observing the weird sisters, "Infected be the air whereon they ride."²⁰ Like metamorphosis, semblance of flying was achieved by altering the environment around the object rather than altering the properties of the object itself.

Rapid transportation is employed so frequently in each text because the devil cannot, of course, create. In adhering to these natural laws, *Doctor Faustus* makes a sharp distinction between the possible and the impossible, even at the most basic level. In his initial monologue, Faustus recognizes that his necromantic ambitions are dependent on the willingness of demonic spirits to bring him what he desires, imagining that he will "make spirits fetch me what I please" (1.1.81). Even though Faustus has many delusory expectations about the extent of demonic abilities, he does at least have some idea of how this particular magic works, and the subsequent action of the play

17. Johann Weyer, *Witches, Devils, and Doctors in the Renaissance: Johann Weyer, De praestigiis daemonum*, ed. George Mora, trans. John Shea (Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Text & Studies, 1991), 40.

18. Weyer, *Witches, Devils, and Doctors*, 26.

19. James I, *Daemonologie*, 173.

20. Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, 4.1.137.

proves he was right on this point. The devil must fetch the desired objects from their original locations because he cannot create even the smallest thing. While Mephistopheles can fetch, replace, substitute, or transform, he cannot produce something from nothing. This is established before Faustus signs over his soul. When his blood congeals, Mephistopheles offers to “fetch thee fire to dissolve it straight” (2.1.63). Even fire, which should come easily to a devil, must be produced naturally and brought in; it cannot be pulled from thin air. For the fire to produce its natural effects, it must be natural itself, and thus sourced naturally: a visual trick or illusion cannot produce the same result as the real thing.

In outlining the details of the demonic delivery services, *Lancashire Witches* is even more exact than Marlowe’s play, and the supernatural realism is achieved through careful acknowledgement of the devil’s natural and physical limitations. When Robert declines to spend the evening with Moll Spencer because his master needs more wine, Moll declares he can do both: “I’ll undertake you shall be at Lancaster, and twice as far, and yet at home time enough, an be ruled by me” (2.6.20–22). She simply replaces her lover’s horse with a beast capable of carrying both of them. Moll explains that she has not transformed the original horse but replaced it with a “black long-sided jade” since Robert’s is “too short to carry double such a journey” (2.6.58, 60–61). The new steed is, of course, a devil disguised as a horse, able to fly through the air at record speeds and capable of carrying a heavy load by condensing the air. This demonic transvection enables Robert to “ride above three hundred miles in eight hours,” a rather precise account of the scope of supernatural speed (3.2.15). This method of transport, while faster than the normal way, is certainly not instantaneous. Robert later specifies they rode on a “raw-boned devil (as, in my heart, it was a devil)” (3.2.75–6). As with the bucket and broom, he knows exactly who is behind these feats.

Elsewhere in the play, the witches summon food to them rather than fetching it themselves, but they employ the same demonic mechanisms. In order to acquire provisions for an illicit banquet in the barn, the witches spirit away a wedding feast, just as Mephistopheles fetches delicacies from the other side of the world. When describing how the food was stolen, one of the distraught wedding guests declares that “All the meat is flown out o’ the chimney top” (3.1.121–22). The food cannot just disappear; it needs to physically exit the premises. The leftovers must also be physically removed rather than made to disappear. Since the borrowed feast is a real one, the witches cannot make the remnants evaporate. Instead they call on their spirits to clear away the mess, “So those that are our waiters

near, / 'Take hence this wedding cheer" (4.1.94–95). The demonic spirits are treated exactly like human servants. They are called on to perform the natural actions of fetching and carrying, but they are not expected to produce miracles.

The same principles apply for the other borrowed elements of the witches' celebrations. The women in fact steal the entire wedding party, poaching the music from the nuptial festivities as well as the refreshments. At first, the hired musicians cannot keep in time: "As [the guests] begin to dance, [the musicians] play another tune then [each plays a different tune]" (3.3.102 s.d.). They then lose the ability to produce any sound whatsoever. The Fiddler declares that they are playing "as loud as we can possibly," but the guests all state they hear nothing (3.3.146). The witches' familiars have stolen the sound for the gathering in the barn. Since music cannot be conjured from thin air, in order to produce it the musicians must keep playing their instruments in apparent silence while the witches listen to it at a different location. The music is merely transferred by devils; it is not created by the devils themselves. The play's adherence to orthodox demonology renders the creation of something from nothing well beyond the scope of the witches' capabilities.

The supernatural displays in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches*, therefore, conform to a kind of realism about how the natural world works, and how the devil is able to function within it. Both texts present a realistic cosmography governed by clearly delineated regulations. But why is it so important to acknowledge the devil's limitations? As works of fiction, these plays are under no obligation to let these demonic "truths" stand in the way of entertaining their audiences, yet they do so anyway. The spectator is never allowed to be wholly mystified or amazed by the miraculous. Instead, the playwrights keep the magic dogmatically and insistently within the bounds of the credible. The plausibility of the devil's craft is in fact crucial to the reception of both plots, but for different reasons in each case. In *Doctor Faustus*, the perceived realism of Mephistopheles's limited abilities form an integral part of the tragedy. In *Lancashire Witches*, the credibility of the witchcraft has more to do with the unusual circumstances of the first performances than with the action of the play itself.

In Marlowe's play, this plausibility feeds into the tragic outcome. The Faustian fantasy of magic is never fulfilled and is instead constantly disrupted by the reality of Mephistophelean limitations. Marlowe's devil never meets expectations, not just because he will not, but often because he cannot. As the play progresses, Faustus's initial ideas about the supernatural are repeatedly redefined to become the much more delimited—and thus more plausible—Mephistophelean magic that

more or less established the demonic stage conventions for all subsequent devil dramas. In this play, the tragedy is not that the supernatural does not exist at all, but that it is a different kind to the one Faustus had been expecting. Each time Marlowe explains or shows how the magic operates, he robs it of its mystery, and thus its attraction. Faustus is often able to delude himself into thinking that this is what he had wanted in the first place, and he consequently misses every opportunity to at least try to repent. He cannot convince himself out of hell, however. The tragic ending of the play is compounded by the fact that Faustus signed over his soul for a few temporary experiences and illusions, not the knowledge and power he had originally anticipated. His failure to understand the devil's limitations before signing the contract and his failure to realize that the devil's limitations cheat him of what he was promised do not prevent him from enduring the consequences of his choices. *Doctor Faustus* is tragic not because the eponymous character is dragged to hell at the play's conclusion, but because he is dragged to hell without the bargain being fulfilled. Faustus does not get what he had been promised while the devil does. The discrepancy between the fanciful magic of Faustus and the actual Mephistophelean magic ensures the tragic ending.

The plausibility of the witchcraft in *Lancashire Witches* is equally crucial to the story, not because the play is a tragedy but because it was based on a real witch trial. While the play is a comedy, Heywood and Brome nevertheless demonstrate how the witches could be considered guilty by keeping the supernatural activity well within the bounds of credible demonology. At the time the play was first staged, four Lancashire women—victims of the last major witch trial in England—sat in jail awaiting a verdict that would determine whether or not they were guilty of witchcraft. The case had piqued the interest of the general public and the play was just one of several forms of the story in circulation.²¹ Following a wide scale witch hysteria in which at least twenty were accused of witchcraft, four of those accused were brought to London to be tried by the Privy Council in June 1634. Much of the play's action is taken directly from the stories surrounding the infamous trial. Given the widespread interest in the

21. Laird H. Barber describes the popularity of the story in his 1979 edition of the play: "certainly the witches became a cause célèbre. Two pamphlets, 'The Witches Dance' and 'Prophane Pastime or the Witches Mad Humors' were entered in the Stationers Register on 22 August 1634. And, even on July 1635, there was still excitement; among the entertainments to be seen at Oxford was 'the Witches of Lancashire over against the King's Head, their tricks, meetings.' The sensation lasted a long time" in *An Edition of the Late Lancashire Witches* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1979), 73.

case, we can assume that many of the audience members attended the play expecting to learn about the trial, as Tomkyns seems to.²² The playwrights had also been granted access to some of the trial documents and used them as source material. Herbert Berry postulates that they were given the material deliberately to influence the verdict, but Heywood and Brome in fact present a contradictory picture by showing simultaneously how the magic could have been performed and how the idea of witchcraft could be constructed from anxiety over perceived threats to patriarchal control in the community.²³ *Lancashire Witches* contains one of the most comical treatments of witchcraft on the early modern stage, but its reception was complicated by the possibility that the play purported to be based on a true story.

This sense of realism is especially important for demonstrating how the women could be considered guilty. In order to show the witches to be culpable, they had to be in possession of their rational faculties while appearing as animals, which they do when performing much of their magic. Brett Hirsch explains that “if a man is transformed into a beast (and thereby divorced of his rational nature), he is not responsible for any sinful acts he commits, since the rational consent of the sinner is lacking.”²⁴ It was therefore necessary to emphasize that the seemingly fantastical transformations in the play are mere disguise; the outer appearance of a person may be altered, but they are still a human, in possession of their ability to reason, and are clearly responsible for any mischief caused while in that guise. This is made clear when Mistress Generous is finally implicated: the evidence produced is a cat paw that turns back into the human hand of the guilty witch when discovered. While the boundaries between humans and animals have been temporarily confused by the devil, they have not been permanently altered. Mistress Generous is guilty of both intent and action. If she had actually been a cat when she fought the miller and then the soldier in the mill, her witchcraft is mere fantasy. The complete transformation would mean she could not be held accountable for her actions, since animals were never put on trial in England. While the playwrights do not determine if the witches were innocent or not, they certainly show how they could be considered

22. Tomkyns indicates that the play ran for “three dayes together” (212). This was, as Helen Ostovich notes, “a surprising fact in itself.” Ostovich, “*The Late Lancashire Witches*: Critical Introduction,” Richard Brome Online, accessed September 25, 2013, <http://hrionline.ac.uk/brome/viewOriginal.jsp?play=LW&type=TEXT>.

23. Berry, “The Globe Bewitched,” 211–30.

24. Brett D. Hirsch, “An Italian Werewolf in London: Lycanthropy and *The Duchess of Malfi*,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11.2 (2005): 1–43, 2.

guilty by accurately presenting demonic magic that was considered natural and thus plausible.

Despite serving a different purpose in a different genre, this plausibility demonstrates the Marlovian influence on Heywood and Brome's play. The story of *Mistress Generous* follows the same Faustian pattern of a human-demon relationship echoed in many of the early modern demon plays. Like Faustus, *Mistress Generous* has made a "contract with that fiend, / The enemy of mankind," admitting she has "promise'd him my soul" (4.2.163–65). She expects to be taken to hell as a result of her supernatural activity, and she uses her demon-sourced powers for exactly the same purposes as Faustus. The petty supernatural mischiefs enacted on her neighbors, the temporary transformations, the summoning of spirits to entertain and confuse, and the hasty acquisition of food, drink, and music, are all the same as the tasks Mephistopheles is commanded to perform.

The absence of tragic tone is perhaps because *Mistress Generous* and her colleagues have a much better grasp of their demons' limitations and can thus govern them far more effectively. While the play contains the same demonic verisimilitude as *Doctor Faustus*, it lacks the pathos and elevated language. Tomkyns notes that "the onely tragicall part of the storie" is when *Mistress Generous*, on being caught, begs her husband's forgiveness (Tomkyns, 212). The spirits seldom speak in *Lancashire Witches*. They do not need to. The focus of the play is not on the complex negotiations between human and demon, but on the human-human interactions and the direct impact of witchcraft on a small community. The devil's limitations have already been established in previous plays, and there is no need for him to outline continually to his witches how his powers are restricted. Instead, these restrictions are explained by the witches to other humans, or by others to the audience. Unlike Faustus, the witches know their limits. The drama arises not from how the witches negotiate their relationships with the devil, but from how they negotiate their relationships with their friends and neighbors.

That the *Lancashire* trial details are almost entirely consistent with Marlovian demonism is testament to the fact that the concept of a demonic realism extended well beyond the bounds of early modern intellectual culture. While *Lancashire Witches* was informed by the trial details via the documents the playwrights accessed, the methods described are not at odds with the well-established conventions of stage demons. In fact, they are almost exactly the same. This continuity demonstrates that, in *Doctor Faustus*, Marlowe was drawing on widely accepted beliefs about the extent of the devil's activity in the material world. That Marlowe's specific, Mephistophelean magic

matches the stories of alleged witchcraft in Lancashire speaks to a common “truth,” indicating that the devil’s mechanisms were widely known and accepted.

It is difficult to determine whether the writers of subsequent plays were simply drawing on the conventions established by Marlowe or if they had an equally keen understanding of orthodox demonology, but it was probably a combination of both. Yet *Doctor Faustus* establishes something found neither in demonologies nor in records of witch persecution. Original to Marlowe is the very human drama of the Faustian partnership and the complex negotiations that take place between human and demon. The act of staging demonic exploits shows actively how the magic is performed and gives a voice to those who perform it. The human-demon relationships in *Lancashire Witches* are the same as that of Faustus and Mephistopheles, Friar Bacon and his numerous devils in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (c. 1589) and *John of Bordeaux* (c. 1590), Mother Sawyer and Dog in *The Witch of Edmonton*, and the inverted Faustian model of Pug and Fitzdottrel in *The Devil Is an Ass*. In each case, a devil is enlisted to perform small acts of magic on behalf of the human in question and the success of this magic is determined by the power balance in the relationship. The Mephistophelian legacy is not just in the explaining of hell’s methods, but also in the showing.

When Tomkyns wrote his account of a *Lancashire Witches* production in 1634, he thought that the play was a piece of sensational nonsense, “full of ribaldrie and of things improbable and impossible” (213). He was mistaken in thinking that *Lancashire Witches* was just fantastical fiction however. Like *Doctor Faustus*, the play legitimizes the idea of witchcraft by showing the extent—and limitations—of their magical abilities. These demonic displays could be frighteningly convincing, and the various accounts of audience members identifying real devils in *Doctor Faustus* evidence the perceived realism of the magic in the play. By revealing the devil’s methods, both Marlowe and Heywood and Brome ground their seemingly fantastical shows within the confines of a reality that permitted a limited demonic power. The magic displayed in both *Doctor Faustus* and *Lancashire Witches* was certainly considered improbable in early modern thought, as Tomkyns indicates. However, it was certainly not considered impossible. Rather, in its depiction of devils, the early modern stage disenchants, demystifying the impossible in order to validate the improbable.

IAN MCADAM

Dido, Queen of Carthage, Hamlet, and the Transformation of Narcissism

It is fairly frequently observed that Phoebe's couplet in *As You Like It* (1599)—“Dead shepherd, now I find your saw of might, / ‘Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?’”¹—is the only occasion in which William Shakespeare acknowledges and quotes the work of a contemporary author. But it pales by comparison to the even greater compliment Shakespeare bestows on Marlowe in *Hamlet* (1600), where the surviving playwright actually incorporates what amounts to a highly positive theater review of Marlowe's first play.² And such praise arises, apparently, even in spite of the lack of enthusiasm with which *Dido, Queen of Carthage* was greeted by its initial audience. As Hamlet states to the First Player:

I heard thee speak me a speech once, but it was never acted, or if it was, not above once, for the play, I remember, pleased not the million; 'twas caviar to the general. But it was—as I received it, and others, whose judgments in such matters cried in the top of mine—an excellent play, well digested in the scenes, set down with as much modesty as cunning. . . . One speech in't I chiefly loved: 'twas Aeneas' tale to Dido, and thereabout of it especially when he speaks of Priam's slaughter. (*Hamlet*, 2.2.434–48)

1. William Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, in *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington, 4th ed. (New York: Longman, 1997), 288–325, 3.5.81–82. All subsequent references to Shakespeare's works are from this edition unless otherwise noted.

2. I repeat here the usual suggestion that Thomas Nashe may have helped prepare the text for the printer, or revised it for publication, to explain the fact that his name appears on the title page of the 1594 edition of the *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. My lack of critical scruples in this case results from an unfashionably romantic intuition arising from a prolonged engagement with particular literary contexts: in spite of their authors' collaborations in other instances, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is a text that, thematically and emotionally, has Marlowe written all over it as surely as *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606) has Thomas Middleton written all over it.

The review is strikingly specific in its rhetorical praise: "I remember one said there were no sallets in the lines to make the matter savory, nor no matter in the phrase that might indict the author of affectation, but called it an honest method, as wholesome as sweet, and by very much more handsome than fine" (440–45). If we accept Bevington's editorial suggestions, this analysis apparently approves the play's avoidance of "spicy improprieties," commending its "well-proportioned" rather than "elaborately ornamented" language (1084). While Shakespeare's fiction here may not necessarily reflect an accurate record of the playwright's assessment of Marlowe's rhetoric in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, these remarks by Hamlet are in fact curiously literary, or literary critical, observations for the prince of Denmark to make at this moment in the tragic action.

The meaning of the allusion must be assessed, then, not only in the general, and profound, mythical context evoked by the constellation of Virgil, Marlowe, and Shakespeare, but also in the more specific critical and psychological responses of Shakespeare to his dramatic precursor. With respect to the mythical resonance of the Troy narrative, historicist critics remind us that the fall of Troy, which now "seems important . . . because of its literary merits, not because we recognize it to be about our own genealogy or identity or the future," was one of the "foundational myths" of medieval and early modern European culture. Alan Shepard and Stephen D. Powell argue that the myth was crucial in justifying aspirations "toward empire, or at least toward cohesive notions of national identity."³ For early modern society in particular, I would add that the myth was also crucial in consolidating—and conversely, also undermining—cohesive notions of a new masculinity participating in the foundation of the nation-state. It may not be an exaggeration to suggest that in the Renaissance the narrative in many ways carried comparable significance to the creation story of Genesis. Tracing the significance of the myth for Edmund Spenser, James Carscallen provocatively argues that the Elizabethan poet's story of "Troy becoming his own England is . . . a kind of scripture" which mirrors "the Trojan scripture that Virgil had produced for Rome. . . . Virgil has Aeneas called out by Venus, his mother, to bring the surviving Trojans to Italy and unite them there with the indigenous Latins. A new race now exists, a chosen people destined to build a new city and . . . give a biblical kind of

3. Alan Shepard and Stephen D. Powell, introduction to *Fantasies of Troy: Classical Tales and the Social Imaginary in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Alan Shepard and Stephen Powell (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2004), 1–14, 1, 3.

blessing to the world.”⁴ Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c. 1136) relates the story of the coming of Brutus—great grandson of Aeneas and accidental parricide of his father Silvius—to Britain to found a second Troy, fulfilling the prophecy of Diana he has received in a dream. The British, specifically Welsh, origins of the house of Tudor made the myth particularly attractive to Spenser—however much some in sixteenth-century England may have privately sneered at the royal family’s descent from a “Welsh butler,”⁵ Owen Tudor, who married the widow of Henry V. Even aside from the question of the possible influence of the complex Spenserian exploration of the relation of love and war, and of masculinity and femininity, in (especially) the middle books of *The Faerie Queene* (1590–96), Marlowe and Shakespeare both respond as poets within a Christian culture to the portrayal of uncertain masculinity in the *Aeneid* (c. 29–19 BCE), with its vexed identifications with, and subordination to, both female and male divine authority in the form of Venus and Jupiter.

We might temporarily simplify our approach to this question by asserting that, while Shakespeare is clearly responding both to Virgil and Marlowe, Marlowe at least can be understood as responding primarily to Virgil. Yet such an approach would itself be oversimplification, and I wish to begin by considering a significant recent critical attempt to account for the oddness or ambivalence of tone in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, the perennial question of whether Marlowe is offering a seriously tragic, or rather a comical-satirical, version of Virgil, which in some crucial ways echoes a perennial question concerning Marlowe’s art in general.⁶ Timothy Crowley, in fact, asserts that the supposed ambivalence of tone arises from a misunderstanding of Marlowe’s artistic purposes regarding “the play’s self-consciousness about its own theatrical parody rooted in compound *imitatio*.”⁷ While earlier commentators have recognized a “generally Ovidian spirit” within the play, Crowley suggests a more controlled deployment of Ovid: “The play’s imitation is not merely ‘eclectic,’ nor

4. James Carscallen, “How Troy Came to Spenser,” in Shepard and Powell, *Fantasies of Troy*, 15–38, 15–17.

5. As does Lettice Knollys, memorably, in the sixth installment of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) television series *Elizabeth R* (1971).

6. On this question the essay by J. R. Mulryne and Stephen Fender, “Marlowe and the ‘Comic Distance,’” in *Christopher Marlowe*, Mermaid Critical Commentaries, ed. Brian Morris (London: Ernest Benn, 1968), 47–64, is still highly pertinent and frequently cited.

7. Timothy D. Crowley, “Arms and the Boy: Marlowe’s Aeneas and the Parody of Imitation in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*,” *English Literary Renaissance* 38.3 (2008): 408–38, 408. Hereafter cited as Crowley.

does it rhetorically suspend in a noncommittal way the Vergilian and Ovidian foundations upon which the ideological legacy of Troy stands. Rather, it consistently critiques the *Aeneid* and deploys Ovid for its unique parody of Vergil.”⁸ My rhetorical purpose is not exactly to refute Crowley’s, which on its own terms is effectively developed. But I wish to complicate his claim for an Ovidian interrogation of Virgil’s Aeneas by adding a further layer of analysis, a consideration of a Christian Marlowe to Crowley’s classical Marlowe; in doing so, I suggest a return to a more dialectical adjudication of the tone and morality of Marlowe’s play, in order to fully comprehend the reasons that early Marlowe held such a fascination for Shakespeare at the height of his career. Marlowe’s implicit recognition of Christianity’s, and in particular Calvinism’s, psychologically constricting, even traumatizing tendencies and an intensifying, more explicit recognition and subsequent amelioration by Shakespeare through the promotion of what I shall term “imaginative agency” represents, I contend, the real essence of the thematic and ideological link between the two plays.

Like previous commentators, Crowley must account for the surprisingly tenuous masculinity of Marlowe’s Aeneas, who “remains both aware of and controlled by the power of language. . . . Dido’s hold on Aeneas has less to do with erotic attraction than with rhetorical persuasion” (428). After his announcement of his dream from Hermes and his first attempt at departure in act 4, scene 3, Aeneas feebly resists Dido’s attempt in act 4, scene 4 to ensure his continuing commitment to Carthage by exclaiming:

How vain am I to wear this diadem
And bear this golden sceptre in my hand!
A burgonet [small helmet] of steel and not a crown,
A sword and not a sceptre fits Aeneas. (4.4.40–43)⁹

For Crowley “the play’s audience could not escape the impression that Aeneas simply regurgitates the soldier’s rhetoric impressed upon him in 4.3. The use of both first person and third person here conveys the paralysis Marlowe’s play has created for Aeneas: ‘I betrays his own tendency to bend with Dido’s every word; ‘*Aeneas*’ signals recitation of language she and others use to invoke ‘warlike Aeneas’” (428–29). But the “waver[ing] between first and third person” is also often observed by critics as a significant feature in Faustus’s self-constructions, and

8. Crowley, 409–10.

9. Christopher Marlowe, *Dido Queen of Carthage*, in “*Dido Queen of Carthage*” and “*The Massacre at Paris*,” ed. H. J. Oliver, *The Revel Plays* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1968). All subsequent references to *Dido, Queen of Carthage* are from this edition unless otherwise noted.

indeed occurs not infrequently in the drama of the 1580s.¹⁰ Crowley intimates a more general significance of this feature when he compares it with the “Tudor play of mind” (429) discussed by Joel Altman,¹¹ but we should here perhaps consider the tension between subjective and objective constructions of selfhood beyond the conscious employment, within Renaissance humanist education, of rhetorical arguments on both sides of an issue. Crowley eventually observes that “Marlowe’s Dido (and Marlowe as playwright) treats Aeneas like a blameless puppet” and cites Rick Bowers to assert that Aeneas’s “impetus for leaving Carthage is the same as that for staying: someone else is always ‘organiz[ing] his desire”’ (430). Thus, Crowley can conclude, “In this radically non-Vergilian fourth act, Marlowe’s pseudo-Ovidian Aeneas remains constant only in his impulse toward personal metamorphosis” (430).¹²

While Aeneas’s lack of genuine erotic attraction for Dido may certainly be relatable to a homoerotic displacement at work in the play and thus connected to the “high camp” that Bowers observes there, I suggest that Crowley’s “pseudo-Ovidian Aeneas” and his susceptibility to discursive construction needs to be reconsidered simultaneously as a “Calvinist Aeneas,” with a theological basis for his uncertain masculinity and his treatment as a “blameless puppet.”¹³ In Reformation England the Virgilian theme of Roman destiny with which Jupiter assures Venus—who in Marlowe has anxiously speculated that “religion hath no recompense” (1.1.81)—would certainly carry overtones of Calvinist predestination:

Content thee, Cytherea, in thy care,
 Since thy Aeneas’ wand’ring fate is firm,
 Whose weary limbs shall shortly make repose
 In those fair walls I promis’d him of yore. (1.1.82–85)

10. See, for example, Hieronimo’s speeches in Thomas Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy*, 2.5.4, 3.13.95, and 3.13.106.

11. Joel B. Altman, *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1978).

12. Crowley is citing Rick Bowers, “Hysterics, High Camp, and *Dido Queene of Carthage*,” in *Marlowe’s Empery: Expanding His Critical Contexts*, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002), 95–106, 98.

13. Mathew Martin also sees a Calvinist connection, asserting that *Dido, Queen of Carthage* “explores an experience analogous to the experience Calvin . . . claimed to be at the heart of Christian faith: responding to God’s call without mediation,” but proceeds to mount a Derridean analysis, arguing that “Calvin would not have completely agreed with Derrida’s description of faith.” Martin, “Pious Aeneas, False Aeneas: Marlowe’s *Dido Queen of Carthage* and the Gift of Death,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 16.1 (2012): ¶1, ¶3.

With respect to the Virgilian source Marlowe “actually increases Jupiter’s concern and involvement by having the god directly order Aeolus to stop the storms, whereas in the *Aeneid* Neptune performs this function even before the Venus–Jupiter confrontation.”¹⁴ The very Virgilian emphasis on “walls” in the above passage as the ultimate establishment of a new phase of civilization, and of masculine ego boundaries, finds in Marlowe the very un-Virgilian repetition of the image in the form of quasi-maternal protection in a female embrace,¹⁵ as Marlowe’s Aeneas (unlike Virgil’s) succumbs to Dido’s pleas and asserts, “This is the harbor that Aeneas seeks, / Let’s see what tempests can annoy me now” (4.4.59–60). As Crowley observes, Aeneas “now priz[es] her love as a ‘harbour’ that protects him from his ‘wayward’ destiny” (429). Thus Marlowe’s version combines, provocatively, the desire for masculine self-authorization and for feminine nurturance. On a theological level, such a combination may suggest Debora Shuger’s “intimation that [in the Renaissance] fathers, especially divine fathers, are deeply endowed with what we call maternal attributes.”¹⁶ Indeed, in the opening scene, Marlowe’s Aeneas laments the vanishing of his mother Venus in terms which echo Christ on the cross: “Stay, gentle Venus, fly not from thy son! / Too cruel, why wilt thou forsake me thus?” (1.1.242–43). The conflicting desire for divine authorization and divine nurturance evoked in Marlowe also recalls William Perkins’ surprising application of the doctrine of the trinity in *A Warning Against the Idolatrie of the last times* (1584), where the distinction between God-the-Father and God-the-Son staves off the apparent fantasy of an all-merciful God, framed according to that all-too-human desire for protection and nurturance, which Perkins apparently wishes to repress.¹⁷

14. Ian McAdam, *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1999), 64.

15. See McAdam, *The Irony of Identity* for a discussion of the ambiguity of the wall imagery in the play, 67–68.

16. Debora Kuller Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (1990; repr., Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997), 223n20. Shuger cites a “recent study in cross-cultural psychology [which] seems to corroborate the existence of maternal qualities in Christian symbolizations of the father and God” (223n20).

17. “God is to be conceived as he reveales himself unto us, and no otherwise: if otherwise, God is not conceived, but a fiction or idol of the braine. . . . And the unitie of the Godhead is to be adored in the Trinitie of persons. Here then behold the Idol god of the greatest nations of all the world; of Turkes, of Jewes; yea of many that pretend Christianitie, who upon ignorance, worship nothing but an absolute God, that is, God absolutely considered, without any relation to Father, Christ, or holy Spirit. Yea the multitude in all places set up unto themselves, a god that is all mercy, and no justice: because they content themselves with the

Shuger in *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance* (1990) considers whether “current notions of gender differentiation,” specifically ones that attribute to fathers more despotism and control and less tenderness and nurturance, “may post-date the Renaissance.”¹⁸ Perkins’ Calvinist position would in this sense seem to anticipate more modern, less affectionate conceptions of fatherhood.¹⁹ Certainly forms of feminine, and maternal, identification are crucial in a consideration of the intertextuality of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Hamlet*, and I will attempt, below, to come to terms with their function within the plays. Nevertheless both plays suggest that the absence or the uncertainty of a viable paternal identification, exacerbated by theologically inconsistent conceptions of divine fatherhood, constitutes a significant, seemingly pivotal source of trauma for the vexed process of masculine self-fashioning. In the context of the intensification of secular culture that concerns Marlowe and Shakespeare, “Virgil’s proclivity for building his theme around the loss of fathers and sons, thereby highlighting the problem of continuity,” would have constituted a powerful attraction; indeed, Anthony Dawson’s consideration of “memorial repetition” in the two playwrights essentially defines the Reformation as an Oedipal moment, an “historical shift” involving

the growing sense . . . of England’s global, Protestant destiny, combined with the nagging feelings of loss associated with the demise of Catholicism, . . . the disappearance of embodied comforts before the mastery of a more rigorously austere religious aesthetic. Thus Virgil’s sense of the inevitable mixture of triumph and loss, and the personal cost of destiny and city-building, strikes a chord . . . for Shakespeare and some of his fellows at this historical moment.²⁰

light of blinde nature, and frame God according to their owne desires and affections.” William Perkins, *A Warning Against the Idolatrie of the last times*, in *The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ . . . William Perkins*, vol. 1 (London: John Legatt, 1612), 669–716, 673; STC 19650.

18. Shuger, *Habits of Thought*, 222–23.

19. Interestingly, Shuger in *Habits of Thought* observes that “even Calvin’s *Institutes*, a work not known for its sentimental warmth, consistently associates fathers with pity and nurturing care” (222), but this position is not quite consistent with her reading of “the contrast between the harsh patriarch and the desolate child” in the English Calvinist passion narratives in Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1994), 111. It is an interesting historical question whether forms of English Calvinism promoted by Perkins and his contemporaries were fundamental in the progressive “hardening” of the patriarchal role in subsequent societies, at least those influenced by these particular developments in Calvinist theology.

20. Anthony B. Dawson, “Priamus Is Dead: Memorial Repetition in Marlowe and Shakespeare,” in *Shakespeare, Memory, and Performance*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge:

This general but powerful description of the period perhaps casts some doubt on Crowley's thesis of the "overall effect" of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* as a satire of "Marlowe's contemporaries' investment in the Troy legacy," although Crowley hedges his critical bet by asserting that "*Dido* parodies the convention of *imitatio* and thus complicates its own critical edge. Despite relentless theatrical parody produced by Marlowe's skeptical incursions upon Vergil by way of Ovid, his puny Aeneas character remains 'Aeneas' in Dido's mind and in our own, complete with the conflicting ideological baggage that name carries" (410–11). While this argument comes close to intimating a kind of transhistorical longing for an idealized masculine embodiment of heroic agency, Crowley is more careful in his concluding remarks to emphasize Marlowe's "characteristic touch of lively ethical ambiguity. . . . Marlowe imports [Ovid's] poetic strategies into his play, presumably to fuel a critique of contemporary investment in the *Aeneid*'s imperial theme—but *Dido, Queen of Carthage* also flaunts the fact that it cannot change the shared parameters of that source material upon which it feeds, thus remaining knowingly bound to Vergil's *Aeneid* as if to an antagonist" (438). Nevertheless the relation between Virgil and Marlowe, and the Virgil-Marlowe-Shakespeare configuration explored here, may be less purely antagonistic than this argument suggests. Crowley ends with an emphasis on Marlowe's "delightfully ruthless humor," and indeed the definitive study of humor in Marlowe, which recurs oddly and unexpectedly throughout the canon, probably remains to be written; but the relation of his humor to his "ethical ambiguity" will require, I contend, a thorough plumbing of unconscious meaning rather than simply a delineation of conscious satirical purpose (438).

Not that conscious satirical purpose can be deemed entirely absent in Marlowe. Crowley's most intriguing point involves the consideration of another Shakespearean text: "King Henry's threat to the Governor of Harfleur in *Henry V* amplifies violent details from *Dido, Queen of Carthage* (2.1.190–99): it provides a parallel image of old fathers' heads bashed in, changes the image of virgins skewered by pikes to that of virgins violated by soldiers, and intensifies that of infants bathing in their parents' blood to become 'naked infants spitted upon pikes' (3.3.38; see ll.27–41)" (436). To an extent Marlowe's parodic imitation of Virgil can be seen as a Renaissance critique of military aggression and martial *virtus*, since, "as in Marlowe's *Dido* and *Tamburlaine*, the anachronistic detail of pikes no

doubt would evoke an impression of contemporary militarism. The King's speech containing this threat marks a divergence from Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Shakespeare's main source, and it conveys the brutal nature of 'impious war' (3.3.15) to much the same theatrical effect as the description of Troy's fall in *Dido* 2.1" (436). Crowley's reading is undeniably attractive to the postmodern mind, filled to overflowing with the horrors and catastrophes of the history of modern warfare, and now more or less permanently cured of any kind of susceptibility to martial idealism in realistic contexts.

That Shakespeare would share or sympathize with this vision has been plausibly suggested by Robin Headlam Wells in his important study *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (2000), where he argues that Shakespeare himself "probably" shared the critic's own view that "the 'ethic of heroism' has no place in the modern world." Wells outlines two idealized poles of early modern masculinity represented mythologically by Hercules (the warrior) and Orpheus (the divinely inspired creative artist), and argues that through the Shakespeare canon as a whole the playwright gradually subsumes the former in the latter. Wells' doubts concerning the viability of the heroic ideal are based in part on a distinction between Aristotelian "moral virtue, which consists in a mean between extremes, and heroic virtue, which is a kind of greatness that defies description, an excess . . . of virtue." Thus "Tasso gets closer to the truth about the peculiar fascination of the epic hero when he admits that heroes defy conventional morality,"²¹ a claim that invariably brings to mind a figure like Tamburlaine. I have much sympathy with Wells' reasoning, and his preference for moral over heroic virtue (according to these definitions), but as I have expressed elsewhere in a discussion of *Macbeth* (1606),²² his thesis may in a sense oversimplify or too easily downplay Shakespeare's ambivalent admiration for the Herculean hero, which (at least in one case) is clearly reflected in the notorious ambiguity of his Henry V. While it may be easier for the postmodern reader to regard Marlowe as a cynical satirist of martial values, a consistent equation of Marlovian soldiers and martial motifs with an inevitably pathological masculinity is also critically problematic.²³ Antiwar commentary within *Dido* through anachronistic military allusions and

21. Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 207, 2.

22. See Ian McAdam, *Magic and Masculinity in Early Modern English Drama* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2009), 259.

23. See, for example, Ian McAdam, review of Marlowe's *Soldiers: Rhetorics of Masculinity in the Age of the Armada*, by Alan Shepard, *Renaissance and Reformation* 27.1 (2003): 121–24.

Shakespeare's subsequent imitation of this method are plausible as one aspect of the artistic intent in these dramatic texts, but inadequate as a blanket explanation for either or both playwrights' portrayal of, and obsession with, uncertain masculine self-construction. Moreover, an exposure of the brutal nature of "impious war," as Crowley's reading of *Henry V* (1599) intimates, does not preclude, perhaps tragically, the positive valuation of a potentially "pious" one. The Protestant clergyman George Gifford, in *A Treatise of True Fortitude* (1594), attempts to argue that the existence of men "both godly and valiant" does not constitute an ideological contradiction.²⁴ Indeed, the Virgilian source for both *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and the Player's scene in *Hamlet* includes the most famously ambiguous of epic heroes (prior to Satan in *Paradise Lost* [1667]), with Aeneas torn psychologically between the values of *pietas* and *furor*. Clearly the ideological effect of the classical sources on both early modern plays needs to be considered in deeper psychological and even religious terms.

Martial masculinity holds a powerful attraction for early modern writers, and in some contexts at least may in fact function, imaginatively or symbolically, as an expression of valid and necessary—that is, not gratuitously violent—masculine assertion.²⁵ Such artistic attraction needs to be read in the larger context of the dramatic portrayal of masculine self-fashioning within the theological and historical uncertainties of an emergent Protestant state, as described by Dawson. Hamlet unsurprisingly recalls from Marlowe's play the specific description of the fall of Troy—the climax of the war, which easily invites a reading as a symbolic expression of early modern psychological and political trauma. Yet the accounts of Marlowe and Shakespeare, as has been noted, contain significant variations. Ending any questions concerning Shakespeare's direct allusion to *Dido, Queen*

24. Gifford argues that, even in the case of the heathens, "as God in hys high providence, had before ordained the great Monarchies or kingdoms, so also hee prepared the instruments that should erect and uphold them. He put that skill for the warres, and that heroycall courage into them." Gifford subsequently refutes those Christians who claim that martial skill and piety are mutually exclusive. Gifford, *A Treatise of True Fortitude* (London: John Hardie, 1594), sig. B1v, B7r–B7v; STC 11870.

25. Imaginative or symbolic expression of idealized masculinity in martial form could explain the continuing high frequency of such motifs in popular film and fiction, especially fantasy fiction, in our postmodern age, in spite of the profound inscription of the horrors of twentieth-century warfare on our present cultural consciousness. This phenomenon seems particularly true for medieval chivalry (in Tolkienian and other manifestations), which was also revived significantly in an imaginative form—in literature and other forms of art, architecture, and social ritual—both in Elizabethan England and the Victorian age, probably in part due to what Shuger has aptly designated "the mystification of violence" (*The Renaissance Bible*, 120).

of *Carthage*, James Black observes that the Player's speech "uses details that are in *Dido* and not in the *Aeneid* (2:559–728): Priam's feeble attempt to struggle with Pyrrhus at close quarters; Priam being blown over by the wind of Pyrrhus' sword; Pyrrhus being interrupted—in *Dido* by Hecuba's attack on him, in *Hamlet* by the distraction of Troy crashing down in fire; the prolongation of the butchery of the old man; Pyrrhus standing like a statue (*Dido*) or a painting (*Hamlet*)."²⁶ Clearly the figure of the patriarch Priam, and his desecration by Pyrrhus, compels the artistic imagination of both Marlowe and Shakespeare. The element of ekphrasis—the description in literature of a visual work of art—in both playwrights probably derives from Virgil: the memorialization of human suffering, and martial competition, in art occurs significantly in the *Aeneid*, where the walls of Carthage's Temple of Juno are, oddly, already inscribed with the "historical" images of Trojan war (including the actions of Aeneas himself) when Aeneas and his men arrive. The close, tearful perusal of these scenes by the epic hero thus suggests a potential for narcissistic self-reflection even in the classical source.²⁷

Marlowe appears to replace this episode with simply a statue of Priam, although the exact nature of the image to which his characters allude has been debated by critics—Priam's figure is arguably meant to represent one aspect of an expanded frieze or relief sculpture in stone. Nevertheless Aeneas's response to Priam's image is highly significant:

Achates, though mine eyes say this is stone,
Yet thinks my mind that this is Priamus;
And when my grieved heart sighs and says no,
Then would it leap out to give Priam life.
O, were I not at all, so thou [Priam] mightst be! (2.1.24–28)

In *The Irony of Identity* (1999) I suggested that the scene involving Priam's statue "involves an attempt at 'transmuting internalization' of an idealized self-object by which Aeneas can fill in a missing psychic structure" and that Aeneas's retelling of the fall of Troy, with its secondhand reporting of Oedipal conflict and potential Oedipal guilt, could be illuminated through Heinz Kohut's psychology of the self, with its emphasis on the pre-Oedipal stages of psychic development.²⁸

26. James Black, "Hamlet Hears Marlowe; Shakespeare Reads Virgil," *Renaissance and Reformation* 18.4 (1994): 17–28, 18–19. Hereafter cited as Black.

27. Martin's reading suggests this potential is effectively contained: "Virgil's Aeneas turns trauma into a moral exemplum that substantiates rather than ruptures ethics and provides a continuity between past and present fully in keeping with the epic's . . . teleological perspective" ("Pious Aeneas, False Aeneas," 11).

28. McAdam, *The Irony of Identity*, 49–57.

I am concerned here to consider both the voyeuristic nature, and the struggle toward greater self-integration in Marlowe and Shakespeare's texts in more general psychological (and theological) terms. Aeneas's rhetoric obviously displays a deep and desperate need to recover a source of masculine identification in the form of the patriarch Priam, whom Dawson nicely terms the "ur-father."²⁹ The desperation and tenuous self-image reveal a kind of weakness that suggests narcissism, and the parallel to the psychological situation of the young Hamlet, who expresses suicidal urges consequent upon his father's death and mother's hasty remarriage even *before* the trauma of the Ghost's appearance, seems irresistible.³⁰ Hamlet expresses a highly similar binary of excessive, externalized idealization and striking personal inadequacy: "My father's brother, but no more like my father / Than I to Hercules" (1.2.152–53). Yet there is something about Aeneas's heroic self-surrender—the desire to revivify Priam through self-sacrifice—that is not quite consistent with the clinging dependency evoked through postmodern theories of narcissism. There are eucharistic overtones to Aeneas's response before the statue of Priam, recalling the gesture to self-sacrifice before the altar in the liturgy of the Communion: "And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee."³¹ That is, Aeneas's response suggests the vexed combination of personal inadequacy, desire for personal empowerment, and uncertain or shifting identification that characterizes masculine self-fashioning in a Reformation or Calvinist context, where the church has the duty "by bringing men into obedience of the Gospel, to offer them as it were in sacrifice unto God."³²

In fact the generally more theological character of Marlowe's account can be underlined by considering one detail he includes during the butchery of Priam that is found in neither Shakespeare nor Virgil. When the king falls to the floor, recites Aeneas painfully,

Then from the navel to the throat at once
[Pyrrhus] ripp'd old Priam; at whose latter gasp

29. Dawson, "Priamus Is Dead," 73

30. Perhaps not surprisingly, I have much sympathy with Avi Erlich's challenge to Freud's Oedipal reading of *Hamlet*: "Hamlet has a highly specific conflict deriving not so much from his desire to have killed his father but rather from his *lack* of a strong father." Erlich, *Hamlet's Absent Father* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1977), 23, emphasis in original.

31. Qtd. in R. Chris Hassel, Jr., "Frustrated Communion in *The Merchant of Venice*," *Cithara: Essays in the Judeo-Christian Tradition* 13.2 (1974): 18–33, 23.

32. John Calvin qtd. in Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible*, 107.

Jove's marble statue gan to bend the brow,
As loathing Pyrrhus for this wicked act. (2.1.255–58)

Priam's status as "ur-father" certainly renders this action on the part of Pyrrhus as nightmarishly Oedipal and patricidal, even while Pyrrhus completes the revenge for his own father Achilles's death. In Marlowe the assault magically affects the whole symbolic order as, in another brief ekphrasis, a statue of the father of the gods himself registers the abomination. In Shakespeare the violation is in a sense humanized. Not that the attack is not horrifying, or that Priam's body is not read symbolically. But rather than evoking a *higher* symbolic or metaphysical order, Shakespeare emphasizes the violation of Priam's own physical and political integrity. One of Black's key claims, a very crucial one for an understanding of *Hamlet*, is that the Ghost's story of his murder by Claudius becomes, through the play's repeated representation of "the individual as micro-fortress," "a precis of Troy's last hours" which "culminates in the brutal slaughter of Priam in his domestic and religious sanctuary": "the Ghost's description of how poison invaded his system is only one instance among many of a recurring figure—the individual as beleaguered and embattled in mind and body" (20). Black emphasizes that, while attention to imagery of warfare has long been central to readings of *Hamlet*, the *kind* of warfare, specifically siege campaigns, needs more critical attention, since "Hamlet's [psychological and political] struggle has the elements of a siege war" (23–24). In his most provocative claim, Black observes: "Coming as it does after a long passage of prose in this scene of *Hamlet*, the florid style of the Player's speech suggests that Hamlet's experience—including the Ghost's story—is 'real,' even though—in fact, because—the Ghost's story has the same *topos* as the account of Priam's murder" (21).

This coincidence of the "reality" of experience and heightened imaginative reception draws us into one of the most crucial questions regarding the text of *Hamlet*, and in a sense the function of Renaissance dramatic art. In relation to Marlowe's influence on Shakespeare, such coincidence also recalls a passage from Simon Shepherd's 1986 study which has longed lingered in my critical memory, in a chapter significantly entitled "Making Persons":

Dramatic characterisation in the 1580s is supposed to be a bit of a mess. The playtexts are seen to be caught between the didactic presentation of Moralities and the imitation of real psychology which Shakespeare invents. This argument is being put at the time I write by a series of television programmes by John Barton and RSC actors, in which extracts from pre-Shakespearean plays are read in silly voices to show how unreal they are,

and extracts from Shakespeare are read earnestly to show how 'natural' and real is the achievement of his blank verse.³³

Besides underlining the injustice of approaching early modern drama with preconceived critical judgments in mind, Shepherd's observation anticipates the present debate over Harold Bloom's controversial claim regarding Shakespeare's "invention of the human."³⁴ In the case of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, the question of psychological realism raises the apparent conflict between the supposedly burlesque nature of the play, or its failure in evoking a truly tragic pathos, and Hamlet's claim that the play he recalls was "honest," not given to excessive rhetorical ornamentation, with "no matter in the phrase that might indict the author of affectation" (*Hamlet*, 2.2.441–45). Indeed, rereading Marlowe's play never fails to surprise me in terms of its psychological interest and poetic intensity. In spite of the awkwardness of the triple suicide at the end, the speeches, especially Dido's, are frequently deeply moving and poetically powerful, persuasively delineating conflicting emotional responses, as when Dido cannot refrain from expressing a mixture of deep love and deep hate in her response to the desertion of Aeneas:

I hope that that which love forbids me do
The rocks and sea-gulfs will perform at large
And thou shalt perish in the billows' ways,
To whom poor Dido doth bequeath revenge.

.....

Why starest thou in my face? If thou wilt stay,
Leap in mine arms: mine arms are open wide.
If not, turn from me, and I'll turn from thee;
For though thou hast the heart to say farewell,
I have not power to stay thee. (5.1.170–73, 179–83)

If anything, Dido's responses—while set in a simpler register of characterization or psychological complexity—seem more genuine at times than the manipulative rhetoric with which Cleopatra plies Antony, in the tragedy which often features in critical analyses as, on one level, Shakespeare's response to *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.³⁵

33. Simon Shepherd, *Marlowe and the Politics of Elizabethan Theatre* (Brighton: Harvester, 1986), 72.

34. The idea is clearly explored in Bloom's study *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Penguin-Putnam, 1998), but nicely intimated earlier in his remark, "We are fools of time bound for the undiscovered country, more than we are children of God returning to heaven. The issue is not belief but our human nature, so intensified by Shakespeare as to be his re-invention" in *The Anxiety of Influence*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford UP, 1997), xxviii.

35. As in, impressively, Robert A. Logan, *Shakespeare's Marlowe: The Influence of Christopher*

That Marlowe's characterizations seem more innocent than Shakespeare's in *Antony and Cleopatra* (1607) may relate not only to the appearance of the play at the beginning of Marlowe's career but to its status as a production by child actors, and indeed the sense of not only pervasive immaturity—of a decidedly narcissistic intensity—but also the very theme of constrained maturation³⁶ may help explain why Aeneas stands out as the most disturbing, unnerving presence in the play. Of the correspondences between characters in Shakespeare and Marlowe (and Virgil), Black focuses on the most important, highlighting “word-play,” which as far as I am aware, has occurred to no one else: “In the Player's speech from the old play, Hamlet, by speaking the first thirteen lines, casts himself as the tale-teller Aeneas, the looker-on who saw Priam killed and did not intervene (it is tempting to hear word-play on ‘Aeneas’ in his soliloquy just afterwards when he rages at himself for silence and inaction and says ‘Why, what an ass am I!’ . . .)” (25). Marlowe's version of Troy's destruction heightens the observer status of Aeneas in a way that suggests the voyeurism associated with narcissistic disorders: “The narrative voice is not recounting a history of its own Oedipal conflicts and (potential) adaptations, but the voyeuristic enjoyment of another's heightened aggression, and there thus emerges at moments in the rhetoric and imagery a sadism, a savage glee, in this fantasy of Oedipal triumph, which is heightened by the incongruity of Aeneas's otherwise deferential manner.”³⁷ Such voyeurism develops full-blown in the dramaturgy of Marlowe's subsequent creation, which replaces the tentative and oddly detached Aeneas with the cruelly rapacious conqueror Tamburlaine.

Shakespeare in *Hamlet* responds to the sense of psychological paralysis in Marlowe's Aeneas. Black, among many other critics, draws some significant parallels: “Lucianus [more word-play?] in ‘The Murder of Gonzago’ is both Claudius and Hamlet, poisoner and avenger, just as Pyrrhus in the Player's speech was murderer of Priam and avenger of his father Achilles. [Harold] Jenkins and others note

Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2007). Logan observes that “if Marlowe is interested in capturing the intense power of Dido's love, Shakespeare is interested in conveying the elusive sources of Cleopatra's ability to captivate” (172).

36. The title page of the 1594 edition of the play states that it was acted by the Children of Her Majesty's Chapel. The production of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre in 2003, directed by Tim Carroll, rather fittingly set the action in a children's playground, which suggested not only that the human actors were playthings of the God, but more importantly emphasized the narcissistic motivations of the tragic heroes themselves.

37. McAdam, *The Irony of Identity*, 50–51.

that Pyrrhus is also imaged in Hamlet standing over Claudius and “[doing] nothing” (Black, 25). But that notorious phrase “Did nothing” from the Player’s description of Pyrrhus “as a painted tyrant” (*Hamlet*, 2.2.480–82) also echoes Marlowe’s lines, where Aeneas describes Pyrrhus’ response after the slaughter of Priam: “So, leaning on his sword, he stood stone still, / Viewing the fire wherewith rich Ilion burnt” (2.1.263–64). Richard Wilson has beaten me to the punch here in a characteristically dense, knotty, and tortuous discussion—it reads at times like an extended crossword puzzle clue—that is nevertheless full of important observations. He observes that “Marlowe’s murdering idol ‘stood stone still’ . . . *after* the massacre, contemplating [the effected] genocide with the pitilessness that excites Hamlet” (emphasis mine). But *Hamlet*’s Pyrrhus pauses before the act of patricide, “extending the life-saving interim ‘Between the acting of a dreadful thing / And the first motion’ ([*Julius Caesar*] 2.1.63–64) into the eternal stasis of a picture.” Thus “Pyrrhus’ hesitation opens space for the *aesthetic*, as a hiatus within which a reckoning is endlessly deferred. Its caesura is not . . . just a signal for the prince of indecision, but a template for art itself.”³⁸

I propose to build on the difference in the moment of stasis in Marlowe and Shakespeare to make a case for what, as indicated at the outset, I term the production of imaginative agency in Shakespeare, which, as it emphasizes a sense of artistic responsibility, will question Richard Wilson’s postmodern assertion of an “endlessly deferred” artistic reckoning, as well as “pitilessness” as the source of Hamlet’s excitement in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Like many recent critics, Richard Wilson ultimately suggests Shakespeare’s refusal or surrender of “Marlowe’s pact with power” (as exemplified most obviously in *Faustus*) in his “final play”³⁹ but *The Tempest* (1611) is clearly not Shakespeare’s final artistic statement, and in fact is less grandly comprehensive of Shakespeare’s ideological development than has often been assumed.⁴⁰ Though hardly a postmodernist, Bloom as well misreads the nature of the influence here: “Shakespeare clearly is not an exalter of power: even Henry V is presented equivocally, and it is not sentimentalism to affirm that Falstaff, both in his glory and when

38. Richard Wilson, “‘The Words of Mercury’: Shakespeare and Marlowe,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare and Contemporary Dramatists*, ed. Ton Hoenselaars (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012), 34–53, 51, emphasis in original.

39. Richard Wilson, “The Words of Mercury,” 51.

40. For one example of the reconsideration of the limitations of *The Tempest*, see Ian McAdam, “Magic and Gender in Late Shakespeare,” in *Late Shakespeare: 1608–1613*, ed. Andrew J. Power and Rory Loughnane (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013), 243–61.

he is rejected, meant more to Shakespeare and his audience than did England's hero-king."⁴¹ There seems to me indeed a kind of sentimentalism at work in Bloom's unending admiration for Falstaff, whom Shakespeare, as early as the latter stages of *1 Henry IV* (1596), casts in a decidedly chilling light: "Tut, tut, good enough to toss; food for powder, food for powder. They'll fill a pit as well as better" (4.2.64–66). It is unclear to me how any post-Holocaust reader can ever really recover from these lines from the mouth of the supposedly greatest comic creation in English literature. Bloom does add, significantly, "Yet without Marlowe, Shakespeare would not have learned how to acquire immense power over an audience." Because Bloom believes Shakespeare's art is "beyond political ideology," he fails to perceive how the artistic responsibility to which he alludes is but one facet of the larger networks of responsibility within human social interaction.⁴² In the course of his career, Shakespeare revises, not surrenders, Marlowe's vision of imaginative control and domination through analogies suggesting progressively less narcissistic and more productive forms of psychological and political influence.

Wells' theory of a gradual replacement of Herculean with Orpheus-like ideals of masculinity, as it elevates the artistic over the presumably coarser, violent temperament, remains therefore highly attractive, but even still may represent an oversimplification. The first necessary stage in the process of masculine individuation remains the development of the will toward heroic commitment of action, of some kind, even the risky or potentially violent kind.⁴³ That Shakespeare qualifies the "pitilessness," the odd but undeniable sadistic quality that recurs in Marlowe's writing, can be seen even in Crowley's consideration of the amplification of violent details from *Dido, Queen of Carthage* in *Henry V* quoted on pages 106–107. Shakespeare "changes the image of virgins skewered by pikes to that of virgins violated by soldiers"; without in any way downplaying the savagery and brutality of rape, Shakespeare at least in this passage which correlates to the description in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* avoids the complete eradication of the

41. Harold Bloom, *The Anatomy of Influence: Literature as a Way of Life* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2011), 48.

42. Bloom, *Anatomy of Influence*, 49, 48.

43. *King John* (1595) seems to me a significant artistic expression or development of this principle. See Ian McAdam "Masculine Agency and Moral Stance in Shakespeare's *King John*," *Philology Quarterly* 86.1/2 (2007): 67–95, in which I argue that the play "transforms an exploration of the admittedly often treacherous capacity of role playing into a startling exposé of the uselessness of any 'moral' position, no matter how fine or correct, without individual agency and assertiveness to substantiate it in the context of pragmatic social interaction" (69).

female body that features in some of Marlowe's cruelest moments, such as Tamburlaine's nightmarish consignment of the Virgins of Damascus to excruciating and merciless execution in *1 Tamburlaine*: "there sits Death, there sits imperious Death, / Keeping his circuit by the slicing edge" (5.1.111–12). Even less directly violent moments in Marlowe contain this unexpected eradication of femaleness, such as when Aeneas's lament before the statue of Priam in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* embellishes Virgil with Ovid through an allusion to the myth of Niobe, but in this exclusively male "elegy" the devastated mother weeps only for "her sons' death" (2.1.4) and not for her daughters', though she had seven of each slaughtered by Apollo and Diana.

While it is often observed that Marlowe has Aeneas fail to save three women (Creusa, Cassandra, and Polyxena) in a row—thus building on the martial inadequacy of Virgil's Aeneas, who stands "unmanned"⁴⁴ after witnessing the murder of the patriarch Priam—Marlowe significantly deletes the extremely moving encounter between Aeneas and the ghost of Creusa in Virgil. Whether this moment of pathos in any way anticipates the invention of heterosexual romantic love that C. S. Lewis famously dates to eleventh-century Provence,⁴⁵ it likely would not appeal to the more cynical reading of sexual passion which often characterizes Marlowe's work, with perhaps the most infamous example from *The Jew of Malta*: "Thou hast committed— / Fornication? But that was in another country: / And besides, the wench is dead" (4.1.40–42). But perhaps the most telling change that Crowley identifies in Shakespeare's modification of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*'s rhetoric of atrocity in *Henry V* is the rendering of Marlovian infants bathing (literally "swimming") in their parents' blood as "naked infants spitted upon pikes." While Shakespeare's deliberately horrific image may anticipate British propaganda during the World War One concerning German troops parading with babies on their bayonets, it nevertheless lacks the nightmarish lack of *affect* that characterizes Marlowe's indifferent offspring, which underlines the potentially psychopathic emotional paralysis that recurs in Marlowe's writing, as for example in Tamburlaine's repeated and unfeeling acts

44. Virgil, *Aeneid*, trans. Robert Fitzgerald (New York: Vintage Books, 1983), 2.731.

45. C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1936). Interestingly Virgil is one of the figures to whom Lewis imagines we would now have trouble explaining the doctrine of romantic love as an ennobling passion (3). In spite of the surprising depth of passion experienced between Aeneas and the shade of Creusa, she is conveniently evacuated from the plot of the *Aeneid* to make way for the purely dynastic connection with the cypher Lavinia in Italy.

of cruelty, or Lightborne's cool pretense of concern before the sadistically savage murder of Edward.

While an attribution of psychopathic tendencies to Shakespeare's Henry V himself would admittedly not be beyond the realms of critical credibility, the distinction remains that the king's ugly threat to the governor and the citizens of Harfleur effectively forecloses the imagined violence; it does not revel in its fulfilment like the rhetoric of Tamburlaine, or memorialize its horror in strangely unempathetic ways, as in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. We need to consider more closely, then, Richard Wilson's claim for Shakespeare's Pyrrhus, pausing before the slaughter, as emblematic of the opening of a "space for the aesthetic." As everyone knows, Laurence Olivier's film version of *Hamlet* (1948) attempts to cut the Gordian knot of centuries of critical debate and baldly identifies the play as "the tragedy of a man who could not make up his mind" still not a bad point with which to introduce the play to undergraduates. In the classroom the point frequently leads to a consideration of Aristotle's concept of *hamartia* in the *Poetics* (c. 335 BCE), often explicated as "tragic flaw" but more accurately translated as "error in judgment." Students may reflect that a character with a tragic flaw will eventually likely commit a serious error in judgment. But in *Hamlet* we may indeed see Shakespeare deliberately working through Aristotle's more "existential" emphasis on action and transforming it into a principle of self-reflexive contemplation—self-fashioning not just as external action but as intellectual organization and, in keeping with a the literary product of a Christian culture, spiritual reflection, as when Hamlet belatedly realizes, "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, / Rough-hew them how we will" (5.2.10–11).

Andrew Hiscock very helpfully reminds us of the combined classical and Christian impetus behind the early modern project of humanist self-fashioning through a carefully planned program of education:

if Roman theorists concentrated upon the oratorical experience requisite for success in the *civitas*, Christian theologians, at least as far back as St. Augustine, had recognized the significance of memory and the skills of public performance in coming to understand some of the mysteries of spiritual interiority. . . . From the perspective of this Church Father, memory is frequently linked to the gaining of self-knowledge and ethical understanding, and indeed to spiritual commitment. In *De Trinitate* . . . Augustine envisaged an analogue to the Holy Trinity in memory, understanding and will. . . . However, throughout the development of all

these various philosophical traditions, the stress returns regularly to the notion of translating learned knowledge into significant human action.⁴⁶

Hiscock links the emphasis on memory, both individual and cultural, in humanist education to the artistic interest in the story of Troy during the late sixteenth century. His most interesting critical suggestion, however, involves a reconsideration of what is in effect Hamlet's direct response to the Player's speech. In consequence of his famous reflection, "What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba" (2.2.559), Hamlet arrives at an idea—the staging of the Mousetrap—which is central, I suggest, to Shakespeare's art: We can paradoxically arrive closer to the truth of any aspect of experience by strategically adding to it one more layer of illusion.⁴⁷ As Polonius has already (unconsciously) made clear, "By indirections [we can] find directions out" (2.1.67). Hiscock identifies *The Murder of Gonzago*, since it constitutes "the *mimesis* of revenge," as a kind of displacement of Hamlet's apparently reluctant project of personal vengeance that, in terms of audience response to *Hamlet* itself, encourages us "to collapse the boundaries between *doing* and *telling* in order to diversify our understanding of cultural intervention." More than a test of Claudius' guilt, the Mousetrap "offers the prince the possibility of [ethically acceptable] empowerment."⁴⁸ That the ethical nature of Hamlet's actions and the stability of his identity remain, until the fifth act, highly questionable is part of the tragedy of the play; the further irony of the Mousetrap is that, while Hamlet comes to perceive more clearly the state of Claudius' conscience, the reverse is also true.

Though not explicitly stated, Hiscock's argument concerning the conflation of doing and telling, and Hamlet's "movements back and forth from biological to textual fathers" has, through its suggestions of the "talking cure," psychoanalytic implications—in this case ones to be read, I contend, in terms of the psychological disadvantages arising from the theological context which Shakespeare has inherited from Marlowe.⁴⁹ In the most obvious sense, the action of both *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Hamlet* recalls Nietzsche's admonition that "if

46. Andrew Hiscock, "What's Hecuba to Him . . . ? Trojan Heroes and Rhetorical Selves in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," in Shepard and Powell, *Fantasies of Troy*, 161–76, 163.

47. This idea is in essence the *raison d'être* of Renaissance dramatic art. Anne Barton offers a succinct formulation in her discussion of Ben Jonson: "Playing shapes reality, not because it is an agent of deceit and imposture . . . but because it is a way of uncovering and articulating hidden emotional truths." Barton, *Ben Jonson: Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 226.

48. Hiscock, "What's Hecuba to Him," 170.

49. Hiscock, "What's Hecuba to Him," 170.

one hasn't had a good father, then it is necessary to invent one."⁵⁰ This requirement should be considered both in more broadly cultural as well as directly familial or biological senses. Although in classical and later culture the Virgilian emblem of Aeneas bearing his father Anchises on his back as he escapes the ruins of Troy became a notable encapsulation of patriarchal dedication to patrilineal duty and inheritance, Aeneas's self-effacing and self-immobilizing gestures before the statue of Priam in Marlowe both shock his companions and underline a desperate psychological need, even abject weakness. In *Hamlet* there is a notorious incongruity between the hero's extreme idealization of the memory of his father—compared with Claudius, as "Hyperion to a satyr" (1.2.140)—and the Ghost's tale of excruciating suffering in purgatory as a result of "the foul crimes done in [his] days of nature" (1.5.13). More recent criticism has understandably wrestled with the Ghost's injunction to Hamlet, "Remember me" (1.5.92), and its echo of the liturgical function of the Protestant Eucharist, in essence a memorialization of Christ's sacrifice. What then is the exact meaning of Shakespeare's attribution to a deified father (from his son's perspective) of the agonies of purgatorial imprisonment, in the apparently Protestant context of the Danish royal court, to the certainly Protestant audience of late Elizabethan London?

The ostensibly anomalous allusions to purgatory in *Hamlet* have been a concern in Shakespeare scholarship since at least J. Dover Wilson's *What Happens in Hamlet* (1935), which still functions as a helpful introduction for readers interested in the question: While Hamlet and Horatio, as students of the university of Wittenberg, are clearly "Protestants," and while Hamlet never names purgatory and only hints at it once, the Ghost on the other hand is clearly "Catholic" and comes from purgatory. Because of these theological contradictions, J. Dover Wilson asserts, "the Ghost in *Hamlet* was a far more arresting and prominent figure to the Elizabethans than he can ever be to us."⁵¹ Of the more recent historicist attempts to reconstruct something of this peculiar perception, Stephen Greenblatt's *Hamlet in Purgatory* (2001) constitutes the most significant effort to come to terms with the "afterlife" of purgatory. According to Protestant polemic, the Catholic church invented, without any scriptural authority whatsoever, a "poet's fable" (as the title of Greenblatt's introductory chapter indicates) between heaven and hell—that is,

50. Qtd. in Harold Bloom, introduction to *The Victorian Novel*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 2004), 1–46, 8.

51. J. Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet* (1935; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962), 86.

between the irrevocable destination of the elect and the reprobate—as a means of psychological and political control, and with an enormous financial benefit to itself. But if such Protestant writers “charted the ways in which certain elemental human fears, longings, and fantasies were being shaped and exploited by an intellectual elite who carefully packaged fraudulent, profit-making innovations as if they were ancient traditions,”⁵² can the idea of imaginative agency which I have raised be employed to suggest that Shakespeare in *Hamlet* concerns himself with something more than a parody of purgatory, or even, as Greenblatt goes on to suggest, a lingering attachment to a mechanism for assuaging fears and longings associated with human mortality and grief? In spite of the fascinating and illuminating contexts explored in *Hamlet in Purgatory*, Greenblatt fails to push home a point about human *integrity* that seems implicit in much of his explorations.

I wish to highlight two crucial passages from Greenblatt’s first and second chapters in order to make Shakespeare’s ultimate artistic purpose, or at least motive, more explicit. At one point Greenblatt considers the emotional, even in a sense spiritual, paucity of the Protestant worldview concerning the life of the soul on earth, by focusing of John Donne’s *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (1624):

Donne began his work by imagining himself as his own ghost, an image he now immeasurably deepens. But where do these ghosts—all of us, in effect, or at least all of us who have heard the bells toll—reside? . . . In a special place set aside for purgation? No, here in this world, a world that is an enormous charnel house, where we await resurrection. “Where Lazarus had been four days,” Donne tells God, “I have been fifty years in this putrefaction; why dost thou not call me, as thou didst him, *with a loud voice*, since my soul is as dead as his body was?”⁵³

In the following chapter Greenblatt considers more closely, in some hair-raising detail, the horrific nature of purgatorial suffering—a horror nicely if briefly intimated by the Ghost in *Hamlet*—and begins his subsequent reflection with a fine sense of black humor:

This is, let us reiterate, the good news. These are souls destined for Heaven, but they cannot enter its sacred precincts with the burden of even relatively minor sins upon them. Why did God’s sacrifice of his own Son not suffice to clean the slate of each soul? Because that sacrifice did not erase individual moral responsibility. If all actions are significant, . . . if individuals are accountable for their own behavior, then the principle of

52. Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001), 45.

53. Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, 44, emphasis in original.

retributive justice absolutely required that each and every sin . . . be counted, weighed, and punished.⁵⁴

This passage highlights the profound challenge the “invention” of purgatory poses to the doctrine of the atonement: “Because that sacrifice did not erase individual moral responsibility.” If *Hamlet* presents a very odd incongruity between Hamlet’s intense idealization of his dead father, and his father’s purgatorial suffering, the play also intimates the necessity, indeed inescapability, of an earthly agent or role model for the young man’s self-constructions within the social community, by having his less than ideal father return from the grave with the still very human motive of a desire for personal revenge: Remember me, not to surrender your sense of personal agency, but remember me, in order to perpetuate my legacy of masculine control and authority. But such remembrance involves not only an assumption or questioning of moral responsibility but an assumption or an acceptance of paternal guilt and imperfection.

The confusing and conflicted religious allusiveness of the play does not so much parody purgatory as it parodies the lack of any sufficient or viable masculine role model in the Protestant scheme of salvation—the fact that the atoning Christ remains inimitable, for men’s agency in the world. In Marlowe, Aeneas’s voyeuristic participation in Pyrrhus’ assault on Priam, a gesture which conflates revenge on behalf of the personal father with the act of cultural patricide itself, recalls Shuger’s description of the experience of the reader of the Calvinist passion narratives, which “present violence (both acted and endured) as the site of self-division and subjective contradiction.” Shuger observes that while such texts “stress the trial of obedience, where, to use Erasmus’s terms, the Son must reject ‘mother nature’—the instinct of self-preservation—in order to drink from the Father’s cup . . . their emphasis on the Son’s meek submission to this economy of sacrificial suffering, which quantifies moral value in terms of pain, only partially conceals traces of filial aggression *against* the Father.” Shuger reminds us that in “Calvinist piety, as students of Herbert will recognize, self-control usually implies a covert resistance to the ‘Lord of Powre’; the attempt to withstand the torturer is itself a suspect assertion of inner autonomy.”⁵⁵ The cultural context of Calvinist devotion—“by bringing men into the obedience of the Gospel, to offer them as it were in sacrifice unto God,” in John Calvin’s own

54. Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, 66.

55. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible*, 110–11, emphasis in original.

words⁵⁶—therefore results in a reaction formation, an impetus toward a creative search for a major revision of the image of divine fatherhood. In order to avoid a facile participation in a cycle of violence for which personal responsibility is endlessly denied or deferred, the true Son needs a true Father who has himself, *in his own experience*, accepted the risks and the suffering of self-assertion and self-surrender, of human self-fashioning and the limits of self-fashioning—not an “ill-tempered, sanctimonious bore,” as Bloom fairly accurately describes the (Augustinian/Calvinist) God of *Paradise Lost*.⁵⁷ Shakespeare in *Hamlet* struggles to replace the voyeuristic, narcissistic paralysis of Aeneas—haunted by his own masculine inadequacy—with a subjectivity containing at least the potential for a more viable, creative agency. That Shakespeare’s Pyrrhus hesitates before the destruction of Priam emblemizes the playwright’s search for an “aesthetic space” which is really an acceptance of an imaginative, and imagined, self, one prepared to accept the responsibility for its triumphs and failures, not to blindly embrace, out of desperation or unthinking reaction, a purely narcissistic aggression against its own emotional being or the being of others.

The necessity of human agency and self-assertion undoubtedly remains. Perhaps this is why the text of *Hamlet* makes so much, in response to the Ghost’s initial appearances, of its war-like attire—a spectral image quite unusual for the Elizabethan stage, according to J. Dover Wilson, which manages “to lift the whole ghost-business on to a higher level, to transform a ranting roistering abstraction into a thing at once tender and majestical,” and quite “overwhelming in its realism.”⁵⁸ The play clearly still honors the manly, martial image, an essential aspect of the dead king’s nobility, but qualifies it as well. Every reader notes the apparent foils to the indecisive Hamlet, those other, more assertive sons—Pyrrhus, Laertes, and Fortinbras—who so energetically pursue revenge for their wronged fathers. But of course Shakespeare seldom uses foils so simply. For example, as the calculating Caesar in *Antony and Cleopatra* shows up Antony’s lack of “manly” control of his Dionysian, predominantly sexual passions, so also does Caesar underline the limits of such control, the cost of Apollonian self-mastery to one’s humanity; thus the tension between the two characters gradually reformulates, in essence renders more

56. See footnote 32.

57. Harold Bloom, *Ruin the Sacred Truths: Poetry and Belief from the Bible to the Present* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1989), 112.

58. J. Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, 57, 58.

urgent, the question of what should, or could, constitute real manliness in the play. Likewise, a figure like Fortinbras ironizes not only the purely martial image of masculine assertion but the whole meaning of the political resolution of *Hamlet*, with Hamlet's "prophecy" of Fortinbras's election. The play's complexity, indeed its centrality within the Shakespeare canon, is borne out by its careful inclusion, after the male-dominated political world of the second tetralogy, of the feminine perspective, not just as competing voices in the political context but as an artistic exploration of a more comprehensive psychological spectrum for the emergent secular self, incorporating both active and contemplative, "masculine" will and "feminine" emotional well-being.

Tanya Pollard, in a recent investigation of Hamlet's profound response to the Player's description of Hecuba, argues that "we have not yet acknowledged or understood the significance of the period's engagement with a predominantly female-centered canon of Greek tragedy," and suggests that "there is more than one ghostly parent haunting this play."⁵⁹ When Hamlet describes himself "Like John-a-dreams, unpregnant of my cause" (2.2.568), he is technically "comparing himself with the player, but Hamlet's curious indictment of himself as 'unpregnant' suggests that it is Hecuba herself against whom he fails to measure up" (1063). Pollard considers related passages in the play that associate Hamlet with the "brooding" state of pregnancy; such imagery certainly links the tragic hero with a feminine state that, as in the case of Marlowe's Barabas, could suggest a potential for narcissistic self-fixation.⁶⁰ But Hamlet presumably compares unfavorably to Hecuba not only for reasons of her astounding fertility—she is "identified by Euripides as a mother of fifty" (Pollard, 1063)—but because of her final assertiveness, and in describing Hecuba as "a bereaved mourner who seeks revenge" (1060), Pollard cites the action of the classical precedents she considers, specifically Euripides, where Hecuba manages to "transform her grief into violence" (1066). Considering collectively a series of Shakespearean allusions to Hecuba, Pollard argues that for the Renaissance playwright himself "Hecuba represents not . . . passive suffering . . . but active responses to wrongdoers, the possibility of transforming grief into the satisfaction of revenge" (1075). But the case is different in *Hamlet*, and Pollard fails to clarify the distinction: There the description of the barefoot Hecuba "threat'ning the

59. Tanya Pollard, "What's Hecuba to Shakespeare," *Renaissance Quarterly* 65.4 (2012): 1060–93, 1061, 1063. Hereafter cited as Pollard.

60. See McAdam, *The Irony of Identity*, 154.

flames / With bisson rheum” or blinding tears (2.2.505–6) seems meant, poetically and pathetically, to underline not her vengefulness but her overwhelming impotence and distress. It is surprising that, among Shakespeare’s sources, Pollard fails to consider *Dido, Queen of Carthage* at all, since she seems to confuse Shakespeare’s Hecuba in *Hamlet* with the “frantic Queen” in Marlowe who, after Pyrrhus strikes off Priam’s hands, “leap’d on [Pyrrhus] face, / And in his eyelids hanging by the nails, / A little while prolong’d her husband’s life” (2.1.244–46).

I thus wish to add an important qualification to Pollard’s historicization of Hamlet. In light of the “remarkable popularity” of Euripides’ *Hecuba* (c. 424 BCE) in the Renaissance, Pollard argues, “early modern English responses to Hecuba suggest that the play’s popularity derived especially from its combination of passionate grief and triumphant revenge, each of which embodied a crucial aspect of what the period’s writers found compelling in tragedy” (1065). While undoubtedly building on the popularity of this particular combination, Shakespeare at the same time explores his intimation that a coherent masculinity, and indeed a coherent *subjectivity*, needs to temper both; that is, he seeks a dialectical resolution of too much passive and too much aggressive emotion, in the containment and coherence of imaginative agency, and not—as Marlowe in his earlier work at times apparently offers his audiences—in the indulgence of narcissistic fantasy. Pollard does ultimately argue that *Hamlet* introduces innovations in the genre of tragedy that challenge tragedy’s previous, classical culmination in triumphant revenge: “Presented as audience and mirror to the play’s female figures, Hamlet takes the choral role from its characteristic position on the play’s margins and moves it to the center, reversing its relationship with the grieving women to whom it responds.” The artistic result is to refocus “the genre on the experience of the audiences who watch and respond to it” (1087–88). Thus Pollard’s reading aligns with Richard Wilson’s “opening up of an aesthetic space” and my idea of imaginative agency.⁶¹ But if Shakespeare “transforms women’s place in the genre,” as Pollard suggests, he does so by in fact reducing the agency of his female characters in comparison to their precursors in classical drama, whose grief led to active and satisfying revenge. Their own role in grieving or

61. Mathew Martin also at least anticipates this idea when he argues that the actor playing Aeneas in *Hamlet* 2.2 “seeks to translate trauma’s emotive force into a community of empathetic witnesses who along with him rail against Hecuba’s misfortune.” Martin, “*Translatio* and Trauma: *Oedipus*, *Hamlet*, and Marlowe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage*,” *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 23.4 (2012): 305–25, 319–20.

not grieving (in the case of Gertrude in response to her husband's death) is certainly highlighted, but in a sense tragically contained within the process of achieving a more integrated masculinity.

I suggest that Pollard's reading needs to consider more closely the differences between classical and Christian subjectivity, and not just in the sense that "revenge" is more morally problematic in a Christian context.⁶² Crucially, classical self-conception does not present a core of subjectivity internally riven by the moral contradictions of a Christian guilt culture, and the resulting shifts and complications of gender identification, which problematize not just (violent) revenge but *any* kind of agency and moral discipline. "Passionate grief" can now no longer issue directly in "satisfying revenge" but must undergo a vexed and apparently tortuous masculinization—in Pollard's terms the masculine appropriation of the choral role—that tempers suffering with a painful but inescapable moral objectification, achieved only by effectively challenging the terms of its own supposed inadequacy and dependency. That is, Shakespeare must establish a psychological and ideological context that interrogates the potential for narcissism in a theology of grace, its inherent inhibition of masculine self-integration, even while such theology paradoxically increases or at least complicates the spiritual burden of moral responsibility toward others.

This attempted transformation of narcissism may be related to classical and biblical mythological allusions involving the tragic objectification of female figures in the service of masculine self-idealization, for example Jephthah's daughter, beloved only child in Judges 11, tragically sacrificed by her father because he has promised God to offer up the first thing that emerges from his door in exchange for military victory over his enemies. Pollard notes that "between hearing of the players and watching them represent Hecuba, . . . Hamlet is . . . thinking about a female sacrifice linked to classical tragedy: his meditation of Jephthah's daughter [2.2.403] . . . foreshadows that Ophelia—who, like Iphigenia [Agamemnon's daughter], is sacrificed by her father for matters of state negotiated between men—will both mirror Hamlet and compete with him for the play's tragic center" (1087). This observation is linked in Pollard's argument with the claim that Hamlet's choric status, while effeminizing in terms of being "marginal, passive, and observing," nevertheless "strengthens him by giving him the leverage of an external vantage point" (1085). The reference to Jephthah, who in the Renaissance imagination was frequently linked to Iphigenia,

62. That consideration is certainly not insignificant, and unsurprisingly highlighted in Hieronimo's famous and self-conflicted "*Vindicta mihi!*" soliloquy in *The Spanish Tragedy* (3.13).

interestingly recalls Barabas' protestation of deep love for his daughter Abigail in *The Jew of Malta*: "one sole daughter, whom I hold as dear / As Agamemnon did his Iphigen: / And all I have is hers" (1.1.136–38, emphasis mine). Besides the obvious irony in the foreshadowing of Barabas' actual "sacrifice" of his daughter later in the play, the rhetoric here also directly echoes the love of God the father in the parable of the prodigal son, underlining the potential for a fatal narcissism in "divine" love, especially since Barabas later vows to sacrifice Abigail "on a pile of wood" (2.3.53), alluding to the story of Abraham and Isaac, which was read as a type or prefiguration of God's willing sacrifice of his only Son. The text of *Hamlet* engages in a careful reconsideration of the necessity and the nature of human "sacrifice," in psychic or subjective terms. The eucharistic potential I noted in Aeneas's self-effacement before the statue of Priam is in Shakespeare renegotiated by an implicit challenge to, or subtle correction of, the detrimental psychological effects of the doctrine of atonement, through the notorious but (as it turns out) not entirely illogical appearance of a Catholic ghost amidst a disordered Protestant state. In essence purgatory becomes an emblem of the psychic readjustments activated within the Shakespearean unconscious.

Hamlet's meditation on Jephthah certainly reflects Shakespeare's recurring concern with unusually close father-daughter relationships, with perhaps incestuous potential,⁶³ and also contributes to Hamlet's quasi-Oedipal, ongoing critique of Polonius. In spite of what many readers have found Hamlet's fairly appalling treatment of Ophelia, his final protestation of love for her after her death—ironically while fighting over and around her corpse—seems a significant attempt to recognize her as a cherished, but distinct "other," even while her personal and social agency has been tragically subsumed within the psychological trajectory of his own trauma. The whole rest of the Shakespeare canon in effect shows the playwright's continuing attempt to resolve the dilemma of the narcissistic possession of women by men, through a reconceptualization of a viable masculinity as a necessary prelude for, in effect, human psychic integrity in both male and female characters. Janet Adelman has pointedly observed that the

63. Relationships frequently considered in this light include Lear–Cordelia, Prospero–Miranda, and Pericles–Marina. Perhaps more unusually, Robert Darcy considers the potential for at least symbolic incest between Shylock and Jessica, and Portia and her dead father, in Darcy, "Freeing Daughters on Open Markets: The Incest Clause in *The Merchant of Venice*," in *Money and the Age of Shakespeare: Essays in New Economic Criticism*, ed. Linda Woodbridge (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 189–200. Here again the portrayal of quasi-incestuous passion between Barabas and Abigail in *The Jew of Malta*—particularly in the balcony scene (2.1) when Abigail restores her father's riches—may have served as a model.

mother figure “returns with a vengeance” in *Hamlet*,⁶⁴ and even those readers unsympathetic to psychoanalytic interpretation must admit that in this central work Shakespeare begins a serious renegotiation of the power and the nature of the feminine in his imaginative world. In light of Pollard’s argument concerning the secret affinities between Hamlet and Hecuba, it is probably significant that Marlowe, unlike either Virgil or Shakespeare, dares to depict if not the murder then the disposal of Hecuba at the fall of Troy—“At last, the soldiers pull’d her by the heels, / And swung her howling in the empty air” (2.1.247–48)—an image disturbing but consistent with Marlowe’s savage and sadistic eradication of femininity and the female (or feminized) body.

I have suggested that Marlowe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage* served as catalyst for the development of Shakespeare’s renegotiation of the feminine, but only by highlighting a failure and a lack of an integrated masculinity that the dead playwright underlined. Indeed it may seem a contradiction that the eponymous hero of Marlowe’s first play is, after all, a woman, and therefore the play could be said naturally to fulfill the expectation of heightened female emotion that characterizes classical, especially Greek, tragedy, the influence of which in the Renaissance has been underestimated (according to Pollard). But Marlowe’s Virgilian context highlights a disjuncture between an erotic desire and the “necessity” of political conquest; the Christianization of this context further complicates both the desire and the political subjectivity in ways that clearly emphasize challenges to early modern masculine self-authorization and self-coherence. The pathos of Dido in Marlowe is certainly moving, but what Hamlet significantly recalls is Aeneas’s speech about Priam’s slaughter. Indeed, Rick Bowers’ reading of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* as “high camp” might support, as I suggested earlier, the claim for a displacement of homoerotic desire, but the idea has I think more serious artistic and moral consequences than Bowers ultimately suggests, when he concludes that Marlowe turned the “cultural artifacts” of classical culture into “something newly reconstructed, something hilarious and outrageously off-kilter, and yet something immediately recognizable in terms of extreme emotional behavior. Perhaps only his hairdresser knew for sure.”⁶⁵ While perhaps not simply a projection of postmodern predilections, the aspects Bowers underlines are not, apparently, the “honest,”

64. Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origins in Shakespeare’s Plays, Hamlet to the Tempest* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 10.

65. Bowers, “Hysterics, High Camp,” 105.

“wholesome,” and “sweet” qualities that attracted Shakespeare to Marlowe’s play, as reflected in Hamlet’s speech to the players.

If the effective pathos of Dido’s speeches has something to do with a part of the consciousness of the playwright that shares both her desperation and her desire, it might be tempting to suggest that such a possible displacement also resembles a recurring pattern in Shakespeare’s art,⁶⁶ although this claim would constitute a separate, no doubt controversial, discussion. My main point here is to demonstrate that Shakespeare saw and remembered a moving human dilemma in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, one that related directly and deeply to crucial challenges facing self-conception in late Elizabethan England that were intensified by the theological and political upheaval of the Reformation,⁶⁷ and attempted in his own art to transform the trauma and paralysis he observed there into a more viable model of secular self-fashioning for his society and his age. That is, he saw the wonder, the wit, the brilliance, and indeed the humanity in Marlowe’s art, but sensed at the same time something irrefutably (from his perspective as well as our own) pathological.

I thus finally question Lucy Potter’s reading that *Dido, Queen of Carthage* successfully enacts a sixteenth-century version of Aristotle’s catharsis and that, after the telling of his tale of Troy, Aeneas “is entirely different.”⁶⁸ In support of her claim, Potter quotes one of the play’s most central artistic statements, Aeneas’s exclamation, when he reencounters the woods where he first landed destitute upon Carthage’s shores, “O, how these irksome labours now delight / And overjoy my thoughts with their escape! / Who would not undergo all kind of toil / To be well stor’d with such a winter’s tale?” (3.3.56–59). Rather than a true working through, a transformation of an emotional burden, the speech constitutes the infantilization of a necessary

66. In my reading experience, the most natural and persuasive (as opposed to factitious or ambivalent) heterosexual passion in Shakespeare is expressed by female for male characters: for example, Juliet for Romeo and Rosalind for Orlando.

67. The viability of political self-fashioning may carry in this case progressive, even revolutionary tendencies of early modern masculinity, the germ of which Shakespeare perceives in Marlowe. Patrick Cheney observes that “at the end of *Dido*, when the queen prophesies the ‘revenge’ of Hannibal against Rome, Marlowe re-routes republican discourse, using the anti-imperial general to critique not simply the imperial Virgil but also imperial England (with its myth of Roman origin) and finally Elizabethan England’s Virgilian epicist, Spenser.” Cheney, *Marlowe’s Republican Authorship: Lucan, Liberty, and the Sublime* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 96.

68. Lucy Potter, “Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the Fortunes of Catharsis,” in “*Rapt in Secret Studies*”: *Emerging Shakespeares*, ed. Darryl Chalk and Laurie Johnson (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2010), 287–304, 295.

reconstitution of experience, a reduction of the process of maturation to a child's fantasy, a delight in storytelling. Indeed, even its *intimation* of the challenges of individuation is enough to make Dido petulantly respond, "Aeneas, leave these dumps and let's away" (3.3.60), which emphasizes the narcissistic refusal of reality that characterizes the play as a whole. But Shakespeare keenly perceives, even while it fails here, the power of human imaginative production to facilitate a more practical and socially responsible self-fashioning as does, I believe, Marlowe himself, even while in his art he specializes in exploring what could justly be described as primarily negative exempla, tragic versions of cautionary tales.

At stake here is the crucial distinction between "real" or "true" and false or specious performances as acts of self-fashioning, a differentiation that certainly requires the consideration of the choices one makes, and the goals one pursues, as ethical or unethical, but depends in the first instance on whether legitimate choice is believed to be possible. Such judgment or assessment ultimately represents, in effect, an ideological challenge to Martin Luther's bound will and Calvin's doctrine of predestination. That so much theoretical emphasis in poststructuralist and postmodern criticism has ironically tended to dismiss the distinction between an essence-who-performs and the nature of the performance as bogus, as an ideological and oppressive (not liberating) fiction, means that the moral catalyst Shakespeare perceives in Marlowe needs in this case further clarification through an honest admission of personal cohesiveness or self-coherence as an historically legitimate goal for early modern writers, in terms of their own humanist endeavors.

*University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada*

BENJAMIN MIELE

Zenocrate's Power, the "Remorse of
Conscience," and Tamburlaine's Ovidian
Impotence in *1* and *2 Tamburlaine*

"Kings, but the conscience, all things can defend"¹

Why is "divine Zenocrate" Tamburlaine's favorite epithet for his beloved?² Derived from the Ancient Greek words Zeno or Ζηνο-, a combining form of Ζεὺς, meaning God, and kratos or κράτος, meaning power, Zenocrate means the power of God or divine power. Although Tamburlaine perceptively identifies her as "divine," "power" seems out of place. Recent scholarship has associated Zenocrate with "impotence,"³ "passivity and silence."⁴ Some feel Zenocrate acquiesces to Tamburlaine's barbarity,⁵ while others suggest that she masochistically desires being "subjected to the cruel

1. John Bodenham, *Bel-redère; Or, The Garden of the Muses* (London: Hugh Astley, 1600), 8 (sig. B4v).

2. Tamburlaine refers to her as "divine Zenocrate" at least nine times in both plays. See *1Tam*, 4.4.28, 5.1.135, 5.1.506; and *2Tam*, 2.4.21, 2.4.25, 2.4.29, 2.4.33, 2.4.111, and 3.2.27. Quotations from *Tamburlaine the Great, Part 1* and *Part 2* are from *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008), and are cited as *1Tam* and *2Tam* respectively.

3. Pam Whitfield discusses how Tamburlaine negates sexual desire, which renders Zenocrate voiceless and powerless in "'Divine Zenocrate,' 'Wretched Zenocrate': Female Speech and Disempowerment in *Tamburlaine I*," in *Renaissance Papers 2000* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000), 87–98, 87–90.

4. Sara Munson Deats, *Sex, Gender, and Desire in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1997), 148.

5. Joanna Gibbs, "Marlowe's Politic Women," in *Constructing Christopher Marlowe*, ed. J. T. Parnell and J. A. Downie (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 164–76, 164.

tyrant.”⁶ Indeed, her name could sarcastically indicate that Tamburlaine subdues even the power of God. She seems powerless when kidnapped, complaining, “I must be pleasde perforce, wretched Zenocrate” (1Tam, 1.2.258–59). Although she seems unwilling to aid Tamburlaine, she is foundational to the power he later wields. Facing “ods too great . . . to stand against” when Theridamas leads “a thousand horsemen” against his “five hundred foote,” Tamburlaine turns to her literal and figurative wealth (120–22). After flattering Theridamas, he flaunts Zenocrate’s jewels to show that “Jove himself”—that is, God—“raines down heaps of gold in showers,” while claiming that God sends Zenocrate “as a sure and grounded argument / That [Tamburlaine] shall be the Monark of the East” (180–86). He convinces Theridamas because of Zenocrate’s material wealth—she is “rich and brave”—and ability to build an empire by producing heirs as a “Queen and portly Emperesse” (186–87).⁷ In other words, he persuaded him that God is on his side, and Zenocrate’s name ironically supports that claim.

Tamburlaine’s desperate rhetoric thus has an ironic basis in Zenocrate’s name: he does possess divine power, having stolen it and upended the divine right of kingship. If he failed to win over Theridamas, Tamburlaine would have been helpless against future foes. The captive Zenocrate contributes mightily to his success. Zenocrate’s character changes over the course of the play, though, and her name is not only ironic. The fragility of the notion that her name is solely ironic will become apparent over the course of this article. She consents to her marriage and assumes an influence over Tamburlaine no other character possesses.

This influence has escaped critical observation. Scholars have mainly concluded, with M. L. Stapleton, that Zenocrate does not ameliorate Tamburlaine’s “barbarism in any significant way.”⁸ Yet, Zenocrate does change Tamburlaine’s behavior in one significant way.

6. Lisa Starks, “‘Won with thy words and conquered with thy looks’: Sadism, Masochism, and the Masochistic Gaze in *1 Tamburlaine*,” in *Marlowe, History, and Sexuality: New Critical Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Paul Whitfield White (New York: AMS, 1998), 179–94, 185.

7. Zenocrate’s virginity reinforces her divine power. In late-medieval and Renaissance England, chastity had the power to “transcend the corporeal,” mediating between human and divine. Her power in *2 Tamburlaine* lies in her maternity: she has produced the heirs that Tamburlaine needs but cannot create independently. See R. H. Bloch, “Chaucer’s Maiden Head: ‘The Physician’s Tale’ and the Poetics of Virginity,” *Representations* 28 [1989]: 113–34, 115, 120.

8. M. L. Stapleton, *Marlowe’s Ovid: The “Elegies” in the Marlowe Canon* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 74.

She forces him to spare her father, the Soldan of Egypt, after he swore the Soldan would die if he fought Tamburlaine. She does this by awakening in Tamburlaine something so foreign to him that he struggles to identify it, his “remorse of conscience,” to use Calyphas’s phrase (2*Tam*, 4.1.28). Zenocrate’s power thus merits reappraisal, especially since the full meaning of her name has never been factored into scholarly analysis, which has led scholars to overlook the full extent of her agency. She exercises a moral power over Tamburlaine, forcing him to feel what no martial tyrant should feel, pity.⁹ This contravenes the dominant scholarly opinion that Tamburlaine has “no moral restraint,” to quote Stephen Greenblatt.¹⁰

Although she somehow obliges Tamburlaine to feel pity, Zenocrate does not possess absolute power. The *Tamburlaine* plays support readings that mock Zenocrate and that take her seriously, and their treatment of her is seriocomic, a *spoudaiogeloion*. Any revaluation of Zenocrate also modifies scholarly perceptions of Tamburlaine, who is satirized when he feels that Zenocrate has made him uncharacteristically vulnerable. This article alters the scholarly conversation on Zenocrate and Tamburlaine’s relationship, and so changes how the plays themselves are interpreted. It also highlights specific scholarly debates in which this fuller understanding of Zenocrate’s name can intervene, such as religion, censorship, allegory, kingship, and the centrality of the *Elegies* to Marlowe’s poetic project.

To better understand Zenocrate’s name, we must know what the power of God meant to Tamburlaine, the audiences that packed the theaters to see Marlowe’s plays, and Marlowe himself. Tamburlaine believes *he* is the power of God, or the “Scourge and Wrath of God” (1*Tam*, 3.3.45). This title describes someone chosen by God to punish sinners for a brief time and be destroyed by God thereafter.¹¹ Yet, the virgins who beg Tamburlaine to stop invading Damascus did nothing wrong. Their deaths cannot be attributed to

9. Pace Roy Battenhouse, who argues that Tamburlaine is the voice of morality while Zenocrate is “devoid of religion or conscience” in *Marlowe’s “Tamburlaine”: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy* (Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1941), 167. Mistaking pity for humility and overlooking the meaning of her name, Roger Moore asserts that Zenocrate is “intimately connected to the earth and its inhabitants,” not associated with divinity and power in “The Spirit and the Letter: *Tamburlaine* and Elizabethan Religious Radicalism,” *Studies in Philology* 99.2 (2002): 123–51, 134.

10. Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2010), 190.

11. On the scourge of God, see Roy Battenhouse, “Tamburlaine, the ‘Scourge of God,’” *PMLA* 56.2 (1941): 337–48, 337. In keeping with his argument that Tamburlaine is a moral warrior, Battenhouse agrees with Tamburlaine.

divine vengeance. Tamburlaine's self-presentation as Scourge amounts to a whitewashing of bloodthirsty tendencies that are somehow curtailed by Zenocrate, the closest thing to divine power in Tamburlaine's universe.

Those who watched Tamburlaine understood the power of God within a Christian framework. Romans 1:16 explains that "the Gospel of Christ . . . is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Grecian."¹² In the absence of priestly mediation in post-Reformation England, the gospels or word of God assumed a greater force among Protestants as a means toward salvation. As a consequence, Protestants viewed it as the primary mechanism for spurring the conscience into action. Benjamin Kaplan notes that in the early modern period the conscience was not "an independent judge of right and wrong, as we think of it today, but a slate upon which God wrote his law. One could not violate that law without violating one's own conscience."¹³ God's law found expression in the gospels, which were seen as a divine force obliging the conscience to function.

In *Discourse of Conscience* (1596), William Perkins affirms that "gods [*sic*] word . . . binds the consciences of all men at all times."¹⁴ Perkins's views resonated with many among the faithful in Elizabethan England,¹⁵ as did this article's epigraph, "Kings, but the conscience, all things can defend," which comes from John Bodenham's *Bel-vedère*, a storehouse of Elizabethan conventional wisdom.¹⁶ This commonplace presents the conscience as a constraining power that cannot be opposed by even the most potent human—even Tamburlaine. Perkins writes that the word of God "binds" the consciences "euen of blind and ignorant persons that neither knowe the most of it nor care to know it."¹⁷ Far removed from European culture and reveling in war, Tamburlaine lacks any interest in the rhythms of his conscience and struggles to identify what it feels like. Zenocrate, though, pushes Tamburlaine to apprehend remorse. This does not mean she

12. *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition*, ed. Lloyd Berry and William Whittingham (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969), SS2v.

13. Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2010), 27.

14. William Perkins, *A Discourse of Conscience* (Cambridge: John Legate, 1596), A2v.

15. For an account of Perkins's life that has been foundational to later biographies, see Thomas Fuller, *The Holy State* (Cambridge: Roger Daniel, 1642), M8v.

16. Bodenham, *Bel-vedère*, B5r.

17. Perkins, *A Discourse of Conscience*, A2v.

allegorically figures the word of God. Rather, she is a force for good in Tamburlaine's life whose role in the play has its roots in Christian doctrine.

Although Perkins voiced the common perception of the conscience, Marlowe was not directly influenced by him. Instead, Marlowe got the idea to endow Tamburlaine with unaccustomed feelings of remorse from a surprising source, his translations of Ovid's *Amores* (c. 19 BCE). As Stapleton has cogently argued in his study of the Ovidian strata supporting Marlowe's dramatic work, the *Elegies* suffuse Marlovian drama with themes and preoccupations found in his translations of Ovid.¹⁸ It may seem counterintuitive to think that the *Amores*, elegies about a remorseless and abusive philanderer, could have given Marlowe ideas for Tamburlaine's remorse. But Marlowe's translations, through error and his own creative judgment, were not always faithful to the *Amores*.¹⁹ In fact, mistranslations in the infamous impotence elegy laid the groundwork for Marlowe's portrayal of a Tamburlaine impotent to defend against the remorse of conscience brought on by Zenocrate.

Tamburlaine's weakness before Zenocrate begins when he spies on her.²⁰ After employing scouts to defeat Mycetes (*1Tam*, 1.2.111, 2.3.49–50), Tamburlaine transfers his military surveillance tactics to an

18. For Stapleton's "literary archaeology," see *Marlowe's Ovid*, 7–34.

19. Roma Gill energetically enumerated his mistranslations in "Snakes Leap by Verse," in *Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Brian Morris (New York: Hill and Wang, 1969), 133–50, and she called the *Elegies* juvenile translations that suffer from Marlowe's inept attempts to make the lines rhyme in "Marlowe and the Art of Translation," in "*A Poet and a Filthy Playmaker*": *New Essays on Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Kenneth Friedenreich, Roma Gill, and Constance Kuriyama (New York: AMS, 1988), 327–42. Gill's scholarship is rigorous, if excessive. No one denies that Marlowe made mistakes. Still, he was a sensitive and imaginative translator who created the first version of the *Amores* in any vernacular, which is remarkable. Since he was first, he had almost no guidance. The little guidance he had came from the Dominicus Niger commentary in the edition of the *Amores* he used when translating. Some translating errors can be attributed to Niger. See Lee Percy, "Marlowe, Dominicus Niger, and Ovid's *Amores*," *Notes and Queries* 27.4 (1980): 315–18.

20. Although Marlowe worked in the state spy apparatus in some unspecified capacity, that has little bearing on this analysis. On the evidence linking Marlowe to government spying, see "[Meeting] .xxix^o Junij, 1587," in *Acts of the Privy Council*, ed. J. R. Dasent (London: HMSO, 1897), 6:146 (PC 2/14 f.382). For an insightful analysis of this, see Constance Kuriyama, *Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002), 70–73. For a study of Marlowe rooted in his state spying, see J. M. Archer, *Sovereignty and Intelligence: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance* (Stanford, Stanford UP: 1993), 67–94. More speculative is Charles Nicholl, *The Reckoning: The Murder of Christopher Marlowe* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1992). For a compelling and long-overdue reassessment of such biographicist readings, see Lukas Erne, "Biography, Mythography, and Criticism: The Life and Works of Christopher Marlowe," *Modern Philology* 103.1 (2005): 28–50.

amorous context to determine if Zenocrate truly loves him. It was hard to tell how she felt when he kidnapped her.²¹ To marry Zenocrate, Tamburlaine needs her consent, which cannot be forced. Katharine Maus notes that this need makes Tamburlaine “uncharacteristically vulnerable.”²² The source of the vulnerability is his desire to obtain honor by marrying a royal bride.²³ From the start, he betrays an obsession with honor, predicting that his “name and honour shall be spread / As far as Boreas claps his brazen wings” (*1Tam*, 1.2.200–1). He also coaxes Zenocrate and Agidas, “If you will willingly remaine with me / You shall have honors” (254–55). Honor is central to Tamburlaine’s identity, and because of it, he refuses to spare the virgins, informing them in front of his soldiers, “in vaine ye labour to prevent / That which mine honor sweares shal be perform’d” (5.1.107–8). Without Zenocrate’s consent, the low-born Tamburlaine could not ennoble himself through marriage.

So he sneaks onstage “*with Techelles and others*” to spy on her and Agidas (*1Tam*, 3.2.24 s.d.). Unaware of his presence, Zenocrate affirms she wants to “live and die with *Tamburlaine*” (24, 37–39, emphasis in original). He then “*goes to [Zenocrate], and takes her away lovingly by the hand*” (65 s.d.). Tamburlaine employs the logic of surveillance here, which is that, if something is hidden, it must be true. To Tamburlaine, her consent is legitimate only when expressed in private. He unwittingly gives her power by doing this. Because he thinks she is telling the truth when he spies on her, everything she says in private becomes irrefutable.²⁴ Zenocrate also stains her cheeks with “tears”

21. Mark Burnett sees the kidnapping as Tamburlaine’s way of aestheticizing and colonizing her through language, “marking out the extent of his empire” on her body. Burnett also curiously argues that Tamburlaine places her in “an environment of frosty inaccessibility” in “*Tamburlaine and the Body*,” *Criticism* 33.1 [1991]: 31–47, 34. Marlowe, in fact, “never actually envisages the sexual conquest or possession of Zenocrate,” writes C. L. Barber in “The Death of Zenocrate: ‘Conceiving and Subduing Both’ in Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*,” *Literature and Psychology* 16 (1966): 15–24, 18. Similarly, Jonathan Burton demonstrates how Marlowe distinguishes “the seduction of Zenocrate . . . from coercion” in *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579–1624* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005), 86.

22. Katharine E. Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995), 96.

23. On the Renaissance chivalric code of honor, see Giovanni Battista Possevino’s wide-ranging *Dialogo dell’honore* (Venice: Francesco Sansovino, 1568), Pp2v–4r.

24. Zenocrate’s agency flourishes in private and offstage. In “Tamburlaine’s Domestic Threat,” *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 211–24, 212–14, Mary Stripling argues that Zenocrate’s significant changes occur offstage: she transforms from a “silly maid” disdaining Tamburlaine to a sober-minded fiancée who truly loves him between acts 1 and 3 of *1 Tamburlaine*, then into a torrent of dissent between acts 4 and 5, and finally into a mother in

because she fears she is unworthy of “his love” (65). Tears also add rhetorical force to her words.

Marlowe has an ulterior motive for this surveillance: to show the audience that her love for Tamburlaine is authentic. Previously betrothed to Arabia, Zenocrate never admitted to loving him. This scene proves to those spying on Zenocrate behind the fourth wall that Zenocrate is not “fickle”: her actions are grounded in sincere love for Tamburlaine, not in faithless inconstancy.²⁵

Monitoring female desire seems to institute a gendered power dynamic in which Tamburlaine gains control over Zenocrate through a surveillant masculinity. However, this hierarchy is unstable. Tamburlaine cannot control Zenocrate’s consent, and he is nervous about how she feels throughout *1 Tamburlaine*. He doubts Zenocrate’s love again after she privately requests that Tamburlaine “have some pitie for [her] sake” and keep her father from “perish[ing] by” Tamburlaine’s sword (*1Tam*, 4.2.124–25). He responds, “Not for the world *Zenocrate*” (126). Nonetheless, he knows that she possesses an authentic concern for her father’s life since she expressed that concern in private, and Tamburlaine’s new knowledge will weigh on his mind later in the play. When she later asks publicly that Tamburlaine “take a friendly truce” with her father, he reiterates that her father and his followers “shall be safe” only if “with their lives they will be pleaste to yeeld, / Or . . . make [Tamburlaine] Emperour” (4.4.187–90).

Although this seems the peak of his unconscionable callousness, Tamburlaine later appears onstage “*all in blacke and verie melancholy*” (5.1.63 s.d.). He is not of a melancholic disposition. His gloominess is not caused by humoral imbalance but results from his “afflicted conscience,” which, as Timothy Bright defines it in his *Treatise of Melancholy* (1586), was often mistaken for melancholy.²⁶ Tamburlaine is troubled by the recent killing of the four virgins and by Zenocrate’s desire to see her father live. Tamburlaine unexpectedly calls the sight of the virgins’ “slaughtered carcases” “A sight as banefull to [the soldiers] soules I think / As are Thessalian drugs or Mithradate” (69–70). Tamburlaine conjectures that the memory gnaws at the soldiers’ “soules”—or consciences—like a poison, or “Mithradate.” This

²⁵ *2 Tamburlaine*.

²⁵ On “Zenocrate’s inconstancy,” see Battenhouse, “*Tamburlaine*”: *A Study*, 191.

²⁶ Timothy Bright, *A Treatise of Melancholy* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1586), N1r. On the different ways early moderns distinguished between melancholy and afflicted conscience, see Mary Ann Lund, *Melancholy, Medicine, and Religion in Early Modern England: Reading ‘The Anatomy of Melancholy’* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010), 53–57, 123–30.

contrasts with his earlier behavior toward the “turtles” when they begged him to spare the city (64). The play explicitly presents that decision as a show of remorselessness. The Governor of Damascus rationalizes sending the four virgins by saying that he hopes they “Will melt his furie into some remorse” (22). Tamburlaine’s capacity for remorse thus appears to be nonexistent. But there is a change after the fact, as indicated by his melancholy behavior and his uncertain tone in “I think,” which contrasts with his ceaseless, confident vaunts earlier in *1 Tamburlaine*.

Marlowe’s recollection of Ovid becomes strikingly apparent in this scene. Tamburlaine’s “Thessalian drugs” refers to *Amores* 3.6 (3.7 in modern editions), the elegy wherein the persona’s penis becomes flaccid before intercourse, “*ueluti gelida mea membra cicuta / segnia propositum destituere meum*” (It mocked me, hung down the head and suncke).²⁷ Seeking to understand the cause, he wonders if he was the victim of some “*ueneno*,” or drug/charm, “*Num mea Thessalico languent deuota ueneno / corpora?*” (*Amores*, 3.7.27–8) (What, wast my limbs through some *Thesalian* charms?, *AOE*, 3.6.27). Tamburlaine’s echo of “*Thesalian* charms” evokes the remorse that Marlowe invests in his persona in the *Elegies*.

In Ovid the “*Thessalico . . . ueneno*” does not relate to the conscience, but is exclusively physical. The Marlovian speaker, though, is concerned with his soul, “May spells and drugs do silly souls such harms?” (*AOE*, 3.6.28). This departs drastically from the original Latin, “*Num misero carmen et herba nocent*” (3.7.28), which does not mention “silly souls.” Another discrepancy exists as to what caused the detumescence. While in Ovid the origin is bodily, Marlowe imputes to the persona a “shame” or remorse that is rooted in a different cause,

huc pudor accessit: facti pudor ipse nocebat;
ille fuit uitii causa secunda mei” (3.7.37–38)

(To this ad shame: shame to performe it quaild me,
And was the second cause why vigour failde me, 3.7.37–38).

“*Facti pudor*” means shame aroused by the fact of the flaccidity. But in Marlowe the shame arises from the persona contemplating that he will “performe it,” or commit adultery. Likewise, “*causa secunda*” means a subsequent cause of shame, as in the shame following the detumescence. Because he changed “*facti pudor*” to a shame related to

27. Ovid, *Amores* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1963), 3.7.13–14. Hereafter cited as *Amores*. *Amores* translations come from Marlowe’s *All Ovids Elegies* (Middelburg [London], 1603), 3.6.13. Hereafter cited as *AOE*.

the remorse brought on by doing something immoral, Marlowe treats "*causa secunda*" as a simultaneous cause that supplements the drug and operates on the mind.²⁸ In the *Elegies* the shame moves from a physical to a spiritual cause.

In keeping with his unique concern for the persona's spiritual health, Marlowe translates "*forsitan inpatiens fit latus inde meum*" (3.7.36) as "And I grow faint as with some spirit haunted" (3.6.36). Literally translated, the phrase reads, "thence, perhaps, my flank became senseless," meaning the narrator guesses a drug caused his flaccidity. Although Marlowe does not specify what the "spirit" is, he clarifies in the following lines that it activates his "shame to performe it." Could this "spirit" be a force that awakens the Marlovian persona's conscience? Within the context of the poem, "haunted" suggests that the "spirit" is a demonic, malignant force. Then again, the conscience was tasked with observing and censuring all bad behavior. The afflicted conscience was liable to breed "false conceits of apparitions" and "frightfull dreames," or to create mental images that "haunted" those who felt remorse.²⁹

This elegy was on Marlowe's mind when writing Tamburlaine's soliloquy, as the echo of "*Thesalian charms*" demonstrates. Marlowe transfers his persona's focus on the spiritual consequences of philandering to Tamburlaine's newfound focus on his soldiers' "soules." His melancholic mood can be attributed to a sense of remorse for ordering the killing of innocents. Yet, there is a "*causa secunda*" here. Just as the sight of the dead virgins drained his soldiers of their metaphorical martial "vigour," another sight contributes to Tamburlaine's own depleted "vigour," the sight of Zenocrate crying.

Tamburlaine waits until he is alone to reveal he has been upset by seeing Zenocrate cry again (*1Tam*, 5.1.135–43). He thinks he can speak freely since unaccompanied, but exposes more than he would care to admit. His anxiety has two sources. On the one hand, Tamburlaine fears Zenocrate may not consent to their union now, jeopardizing his honor. On the other, he seems genuinely concerned, so much so that he uncharacteristically considers giving in to her demand to spare her father after he asserted he would spare no one and

28. Marlowe might have gotten this misconception from Niger, who writes in his annotated edition of Ovid's works, "*enim euenit, ut coeuitibus pudor obstet, quo minus penis arrigatur.*" See Ovid, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Poetae Sylmonensis Opera Quae Vocantur Amatoria*, ed. and trans. Dominicus Niger (Basil: Jakob Micyllus, 1549), Yy1v.

29. See Bright, *Treatise of Melancholy*, N2v. Well-known examples of a guilty conscience breeding ghosts in the mind occur in Shakespeare's *Richard III* (1593), *Julius Caesar* (1599), and *Macbeth* (1606), examples more relevant to Tamburlaine than to the persona.

would not “buy [her] Fathers love / With such a losse” (4.4.83–84). Acquiescing to Zenocrate is a defeat, or “foile,” for Tamburlaine. When alone he admits that “neither Perseans Sovereign, nor the Turk / Troubled my senses with conceit of foile, / So much by much, as dooth *Zenocrate*” (5.1.157–59). His contemplation of defeat recalls the commonplace from *Bel-vedère*, “Kings, but the conscience, all things can defend.” Zenocrate possesses a power that not even the mightiest armies of Asia had. Tamburlaine admits that her “sorrows lay more siege unto my soule / Than all my Army to *Damascus* walles” (155–56). His reflection on his soldiers’ “soules” and afflicted consciences becomes a worry over his own “soule” and conscience.

To be clear, Tamburlaine fears not that he is in love, which he admits to Techelles when he meets Zenocrate, “this is she with whom I am in love” (1*Tam*, 1.2.108). What he does fear is letting Zenocrate make him look weak and letting her “change [his] Martiall observations” (5.1.122).³⁰ After commanding the four virgins be killed, he claims publicly that he will not deviate from his plan to attack Damascus and kill Zenocrate’s father even “for the love of *Venus*” (124). During the soliloquy, though, Zenocrate has gotten inside his head, where “Angels in their christal armours fight / A doubtful battell with [his] tempted thoughtes / For *Egypt*s freedom and the Souldans life” (151–53). In Marlowe’s time “tempted” could mean “tempted to do evil.”³¹ Living outside of a Christian context, Tamburlaine has no concept of sin and cannot articulate feelings of remorse, but he still recognizes that his “thoughtes” are “tempted” and immoral, thanks to Zenocrate.

Stapleton has written that in the *Elegies* Marlowe yokes Ovid’s troubled and volatile persona “to the *psychomachia* paradigm of late medieval morality plays, replete with *angelus bonus* and *angelus malus* that . . . comprise an abstraction of the soul troubled by its warring conscience.”³² Although Stapleton does not apply this model to Tamburlaine’s soliloquy, it is appropriate. Tamburlaine’s “doubtfull battell” occurs in his “soule,” where “Angels in their christal armours” fight against his immoral, “tempted” thoughts. These “Angels” recall the “*angelus bonus* and *angelus malus*,” those figures for the conscience in

30. Compare with *Othello* 2.1.74 for a similar moment in which a military leader’s beloved potentially undermines his authority and honor.

31. Oxford English Dictionary Online, s.v. “tempted,” accessed June 16, 2013, <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/198973?redirectedFrom=tempted#eid18886879>.

32. Stapleton, *Marlowe’s Ovid*, 55.

early English drama.³³ Tamburlaine's "soule" is losing his battle with a "warring conscience."

For Tamburlaine, contemplating defeat is defeat. It signifies a lack of manliness, amounting to "thoughts effeminate and faint" (*1Tam*, 5.1.180–82). The Ovidian subtext from *Amores* 3.6 continues to contribute to Tamburlaine's fear of emasculation throughout this soliloquy. Ovid's persona blames a "*saga*" or witch for his impotence, "*sagaue poenicea defixit nomina cera / et medium tenuis in iecur egit acus*?" (29–30). In the commentary Marlowe used, Dominicus Niger writes that a *saga* is an "*incantatrix & malefica, quae carminibus uel arcessere posuit mala hominibus, uel pellere*" (a malevolent enchantress who can with songs derive evil potions to use against men or who can affect their minds).³⁴ Marlowe incorporates this misogyny, describing the persona as "witch'd with blood of frogs new dead," (*AOE*, 3.6.79) which loosely translates Ovid's "*Aeaea uenefica*" or Circean potion (*Amores*, 3.7.79). Niger's "*pellere*" extends the influence of the charm/drug to the spiritual realm. Just as in the *Elegies* the persona's body and mind are affected, in *Tamburlaine* Zenocrate is able to "*pellere*" or compel Tamburlaine's thoughts, although she is no *saga* or Circe. Echoing the *Elegies*, Tamburlaine's newfound remorse and impotence against it trace back to a feminine source.

Striving to project his feelings of weakness onto others, Tamburlaine turns toward an easy target: poets. However, he unwittingly appropriates the language of the effeminate lover-poet when trying to change the subject:

What is beauty, saith my sufferings then?
 If all the pens that ever poets held
 Had fed the feeling of their maisters thoughts,
 And every sweetnes that inspir'd their harts,
 Their minds, and muses on admyred theames;
 If all the heavenly Quintessence they still
 From their immortall flowers of Poesy,
 Wherein, as in a myrrour, we perceive
 The highest reaches of a humaine wit;
 If these had made one Poems period,
 And all combin'd in Beauties worthinesse,
 Yet should ther hover in their restlesse heads
 One thought, one grace, one woonder, at the least,
 Which into words no vertue can digest. (*1Tam*, 5.1.160–73)

33. Marlowe continues his fascination with such figures of the conscience in *Doctor Faustus*, 2.1.15–21, 2.3.12–17.

34. Ovid, *P. Ovidii Nasonis*, Yy1v, translation mine.

Alexander Leggatt comments on these strange words, “We are used to thinking of Tamburlaine as acting, not suffering.”³⁵ The form of the fourteen lines is also unfamiliar. They comprise a Marlovian quasi-sonnet, rounded out with a concluding couplet, least being pronounced like *lest* in Elizabethan English.³⁶ In *his* play, whose “high astounding tearmes” are defined by their lack of and disdain for “jygging” rhymes, Tamburlaine becomes an effeminized, “riming mother wit” (prologue.1–5). The play is designed to satirize him when he rhymes. He earlier employed a pointedly “jygging” rhyme upon meeting Zenocrate, rhyming “me / . . . be / . . . slaverye” (1.2.254–56). These words even rhyme with Zenocrate (ze-NO-kruh-tee).³⁷ Earlier in this soliloquy he rhymes “night” with “light” and “fight,” deploying another triplet when he describes the “Angels” in his conscience forcing him to feel remorseful (5.1.149–51).

According to Roy Eriksen, Tamburlaine’s foray into sonneteering “closely parallels and develops ideas presented by Petrarch” when the lover-poet laments the impossibility of describing the beauty of the unattainable Laura.³⁸ Marlowe ironizes Tamburlaine in the very form of these fourteen lines by putting an adaptation of Petrarch, the effeminate poet par excellence, into Tamburlaine’s mouth.³⁹ Petrarch structured the *Canzoniere* (1374) around the inexpressibility topos, and Tamburlaine encounters a similar feeling of inadequacy because of Zenocrate’s powerful hold on him. The Petrarchan lover’s metaphorical impotence recalls the Ovidian persona’s detumescence, and so Marlowe links the lover-poet in the *Amores* to both the Petrarchan lover-poet and the persona in the *Elegies*—and it is specifically at the moment when these poets are at their most enervated state. Marlowe satirizes Tamburlaine’s manly ethos when Tamburlaine unwittingly refers to such “effeminate and faint” figures.

Interpretations of this fourteen-line quasi-sonnet generally read it as Tamburlaine’s successful projection of his feelings of insecurity onto

35. Alexander Leggatt, “Tamburlaine’s Sufferings,” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 3 (1973): 28–38, 28.

36. Paul Kocher, “A Marlowe Sonnet,” *Philological Quarterly* 24 (1945): 39–45, 42n5. Compare with William Shakespeare, “Sonnet 55,” in *The Complete Sonnets and Poems* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002).

37. Tamburlaine also rhymes with Zenocrate in 2*Tam*, 2.4.29–30, 36–37.

38. Roy Eriksen, “Marlowe’s Petrarch: In *Morte di Madonna Laura*,” *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 29 (1986): 13–25, 19. The entire soliloquy evokes Petrarch’s Sonnet 158. Eriksen also observes another Petrarchan echo in 2 *Tamburlaine*, in Zenocrate’s deathbed scene, appropriately.

39. On Petrarch’s reputation for effeminacy, see Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), 136.

“poets” unrelated to him. Alan Shepard argues that this soliloquy holds “no hint of self-recrimination, no threat to [Tamburlaine’s] masculinity.”⁴⁰ Tamburlaine reasons that the “poets,” even when reading “their immortall flowers of Poesy” like good humanistically trained versifiers, cannot use their hermeneutic “vertue” to “digest,” or read, that “One thought, one grace, one woonder” that is beauty (5.1.72–73).⁴¹ Tamburlaine’s reading involves “vertue,” that masculine power derived from the Latin for man, vir, and used in conquest. He sees the “poets” as failing in their quest for textual control since they cannot compose the perfect poem, while he subdues all in his path.

Yet, just because Tamburlaine contrasts himself with the poets does not mean that scholars should. Tamburlaine displays feelings of “self-recrimination” over his decisions to kill the virgins and Zenocrate’s father. Furthermore, by having Tamburlaine echo the effeminate Ovidian and Petrarchan poet-lovers, Marlowe joins Tamburlaine to the feeble poets. There is also the matter of Tamburlaine’s roving syntax. He jumps to the first person in “we perceive” when describing looking in the “myrrour” that is the “flowers of Poesy.” This “we” demonstrates that he fails in excluding himself from the poets’ impotence.⁴² Mirrors were slippery symbols at the time, representing either flattery or harsh truth.⁴³ In Tamburlaine’s mind, Zenocrate flatteringly reflects his divine prowess. But, when he looks into this

40. Alan Shepard, “Endless Sacks: Soldiers’ Desire in *Tamburlaine*,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 46.4 (1993): 734–53, 745.

41. Distillation and digestive metaphors commonly described Renaissance reading habits. In his *Defence of Poesy* (1595), Philip Sidney praises readers who “devour [their books] whole . . . by attentive translation,” or digestion (*The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones [Oxford: Clarendon, 2002], 246). Poetry was often gathered into books called *flores poetarum* or, in Tamburlaine’s words, “flowers of Poesy.” Humanists instructed readers to emulate bees and gather from these “*flores*” select phrases that would be then transformed through digestion into new compositions. On distilling and digesting, see Adam Hooks, “Commonplace Books,” *The Encyclopedia of English Renaissance Literature*, ed. Alan Stewart and Garrett A. Sullivan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 1:206–9.

42. Although he seemingly redirects his sense of inadequacy onto poets, he earlier promised “to trace” new “regions” with his “pen” or sword (*1Tam*, 4.4.74–76), using a metaphor that links him back to these impotent poets since his dying words are “shall I die and this unconquered?” (*2Tam*, 5.3.150).

43. Although the mirror-metaphor in early modern England was deployed in complicated ways, scholars agree that it was widely used by authors to describe texts and that reading was imagined as looking in a mirror. See Herbert Grabes, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in the Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*, trans. Gordon Collier (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982), 4, 30–37. On the “flatt’ring-glass,” see Peter Ure, “The Looking-Glass of *Richard II*,” *Philological Quarterly* 34.2 (1955), 219–25, 220n3. See also Janette Dillon, *Shakespeare and the Solitary Man* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1981), 70–73.

mirror, it is not the “flatt’ring-glass” he wants. He sees a woman who forces him to face his crippling remorse.⁴⁴ When he asserts that poets can never use their “vertue” to “digest” that “One thought, one grace, one wonder,” Tamburlaine means no human “vertue.” In this play another “vertue” exists, one that supersedes even Tamburlaine’s. Zenocrate can also mean divine virtue. Her “vertue” is moral excellency and that “one grace” that was a divine power so central to Protestant thought. “Grace” was known to instigate the pangs of an afflicted conscience, and for Tamburlaine that “grace” is Zenocrate.⁴⁵ Like the poets failing to capture beauty, he cannot contain her with his verbal strength. She is that “woonder” that overpowers Tamburlaine’s human “vertue,” making his head feel “restlesse” with remorse.

At the end of this soliloquy Tamburlaine fails to resecure his masculinity. His claim, “Vertue solely is the sum of glorie, / And fashions men with true nobility” ironically renders “nobility” dependent “solely” on a “vertue” that he earlier acknowledged was ineffectual (5.1.189–90). His unusually convoluted syntax makes it unclear if virtue gives “men . . . true nobility” or just “fashions,” or presents the form of men who already have “true nobility.” Noted for consistently deploying end-stopped lines, Tamburlaine also surprisingly enjambes “love” when he insists that every “warriour that is rapt with love / Of fame, of valour, and of victory / Must needs have beauty beat on his conceits” (180–82).⁴⁶ Tamburlaine is wrestling with that “One thought” that escapes metrical containment, the remorse his “love” Zenocrate has forced him to feel. These lines are often cited to demonstrate his reasserted masculinity, but “love” is his captor: he is “rapt.” Beauty is an army laying siege to his mind, “beat[ing] on his conceits” like Zenocrate’s “sorowes” conquering his “soule.”

Significantly, Tamburlaine concedes to Zenocrate and spares her father. Although he does not admit defeat to beauty, by comparing it to Zenocrate he implies that beauty ultimately conquers. The assertion that he “conceiv[ed] and subdu[ed]” the passion that “hath stooped the topmost of the Gods, . . . To feel the lovely warmth of Shepherds

44. Although this soliloquy does not support the claims of scholars who endeavor to see Marlowe in Tamburlaine, it does suggest that there is an inherent tension between the creative impetus of “poets” and between the ethical imperative of “grace” and “wonder.” Marlowe intimates that imagination struggles under the burden of conscience.

45. Perkins, *Discourse*, K3v.

46. Russ McDonald writes, “For all Marlowe’s reputation as an overreacher, only rarely did he overreach the poetic line” in “Marlowe and Style,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Patrick Cheney (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 55–69, 63.

flames” is contradicted by his initial appearance onstage (183–87). Impelled by desire, Jove seized women when disguised. So did Tamburlaine, who “masked” himself as a shepherd, kidnapped Zenocrate, and professed his love.⁴⁷ Having also stooped to that amorous passion, he lies when reassuring himself that his masculinity has not been questioned. Again, scholars should not accept Tamburlaine at face value when interpreting this soliloquy. Even though no other characters are around, Tamburlaine still lies to and performs for himself. His masculinity is a performance, one that is undermined further when he spares the Soldan.

Marlowe lets Tamburlaine save face with his men, though. Fearful that Tamburlaine will kill Zenocrate’s father, Theridamas interrupts the soliloquy asking that Tamburlaine “save the reverend Soldan’s life / For fair Zenocrate that so laments his state.” Relieved, Tamburlaine assents, noting that Zenocrate “Deserves a conquest over every hart” (*1Tam*, 5.1.203–8). Exactly, “every hart” includes Tamburlaine’s, as shown in the soliloquy wherein Tamburlaine complained he could not stop her from making him feel remorseful. Even as Theridamas gives him what every political leader needs—plausible deniability—Tamburlaine intimates that Zenocrate’s divine power conquered his “hart.” Yet he continues his warlike pose. Readers should see it *as a pose*. Marlowe does not endorse or agree with Tamburlaine but ironizes him in his soliloquy, having Tamburlaine fret about being “unseemly” as he transforms from warrior to effete worrier (174).

Before he spares her father, Zenocrate becomes disillusioned and feels “Wretched” when recounting the demise of her “Fathers . . . countriment” (*1Tam*, 5.1.319–21). She feels “most accurst to see” the bodies of the four virgins (24). At this moment, she is anticipating that her father, too, will be killed, and she quickly changes from “wretched” to “joiful” when she sees her father alive, “O sight thrice welcome to my joiful soule / To see the King my Father issue safe / From dangerous battel of my conquering Love” (440–42). Zenocrate never asks Tamburlaine to spare the virgins. She *does* ask him to spare her father, and he complies, identifying the Soldan’s “princely daughter” as the one who “set [the Soldan] free” and “hath calmd the furie of [Tamburlaine’s] sword” (435–37). Tamburlaine gives Zenocrate “*Egypt*s freedom,” as she asked, telling the Soldan, “grieve not at your overthrow / Since I shall render all into your hands / And ad more strength to your dominions” (446–48).

47. Katherine Lever, “The Image of Man in *Tamburlaine*, Part I,” *Philological Quarterly* 35 (1956): 421–28, 422.

The first part of *Tamburlaine* concludes with the crowning of “Divine Zenocrate” and only Zenocrate (507). Her coronation emphatically puts the “crate” in Zenocrate because the audience’s final impression is her ascension to queenly sovereignty. Her perceived reticence when crowned suggests not disempowerment but empowerment, existence on a plane of being above Tamburlaine’s ceaseless stream of rhetoric like that “one grace” that cannot be captured in language.⁴⁸ Despite her coronation and lobbying to save her father, Zenocrate’s powers remain limited. Upon hearing that her father is attacking Tamburlaine, Zenocrate becomes strangely confident that Tamburlaine will do as she hopes, invoking the precedent of Aeneas’s war against Turnus:

as the gods, to end the Trojans toyl
 . . . fatally enriched Aeneas love,
 So . . . To pacifie my countrie and my love,
 Must Tamburlaine by their resistless powers,
 With vertue of a gentle victorie,
 Conclude a league of honor to my hope.
 Then as the powers devine have preordained,
 With happy safty of my fathers life
 Send like defence of faire Arabia. (*1Tam*, 5.1.395–402)

Immediately after this, Arabia stumbles onstage “wounded to the death” (407). Despite suggestively referring to the “gods” as “resistless powers” and “powers devine,” a phrase that almost perfectly translates Zenocrate, she fails spectacularly in her belated effort to save Arabia. One could speculate that Tamburlaine was so vulnerable before battle that he would have spared Arabia if she had asked, but the fact remains that Marlowe structures the play to emphasize her powerlessness, manipulating events to highlight the limits of Zenocrate’s divine strength. Dena Goldberg observes that the *Tamburlaine* plays continuously raise and dash hopes of divine intervention.⁴⁹ The disconnect between what Zenocrate says and what the audience sees intensifies the play’s undermining of special providence and confounds Zenocrate, the one person who miraculously saved someone from Tamburlaine’s wrath.

Even if Arabia is an afterthought, Zenocrate looks foolish. She invokes a narrative that famously ended when Aeneas murdered Turnus, and the narrative destiny of Arabia seems fatal even in the

48. On the ways “Grace inescapably evades language,” see Brian Cummings, *Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2007), 25–48.

49. Dena Goldberg, “Who’s God’s on First? Special Providence in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe,” *ELH* 60.3 (1993): 569–87, 574, 584–85.

attempt to forestall his fate. This mocking portrayal encourages viewers and readers to approach Zenocrate in a seriocomic way. She both represents divine power and is subjected to the ridicule that comes to each character who calls on the gods to intervene when personally convenient. Marlowe shows that there is no power of God that can suddenly and arbitrarily alter the affairs of man. Her failure to save Arabia can either move audience members to Zabina's atheism or strengthen their resolve. Either way, it makes them reexamine their orientation to divinity by refusing to side with a particular character.

In true Ovidian fashion Marlowe remains detached and satirical, refraining from endorsing even Zenocrate, who is most worthy of endorsement. Neither does he endorse Tamburlaine since he satirizes him when he compares him to the Ovidian persona at his most impotent and to the helpless Petrarchan lover-poet.⁵⁰ Tamburlaine shows concern for Zenocrate each time he sees her crying. His eulogy for her in 2 *Tamburlaine* not only terms her "divine Zenocrate" but also recalls how she swayed his "soule" by instilling remorse: "*Zenocrate* that . . . tempered every soule with lively heat" (2.4.8–10). Like a flame to wax, she alone was able to melt Tamburlaine's "furie into some remorse," and he evokes in this eulogy his words to her father, "she hath calmd the furie of my sword" (1*Tam*, 5.1.435–37). It is tempting to speculate that his fury's return at the end of 2 *Tamburlaine* is due to Zenocrate's absence. He kills his son, refuses to "pity" the Turkish concubines (4.3.83), and slaughters every inhabitant of Babylon (5.1.32).

50. J. R. Mulryne and Stephen Fender note how Marlowe cultivates ambivalent reactions to Tamburlaine in "Marlowe and the 'Comic Distance,'" in Morris, *Christopher Marlowe*, 48–64, 53. Johannes Birringer writes that in Tamburlaine's humiliation of Bajazeth (1*Tam*, 4.4), Marlowe presents "a near-parody of [Tamburlaine's] obsessive preoccupation" with conquest. See "Marlowe's Violent Stage: 'Mirrors' of Horror in *Tamburlaine*," *ELH* 51 (1984): 219–39, 230. One satirical moment Birringer overlooks occurs when Tamburlaine predicts, "The ages that shall talk of *Tamburlain* / Even from this day to *Platoes* wondrous yeare / Shall talke how I have handled *Bajazeth*" (4.4.94–96). He does not realize that such "talke" will not be positive and that he will be infamous, not glorified. In *Uncommon Tongues: Eloquence and Eccentricity in the English Renaissance* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2013), 142–45, Catherine Nicholson observes that Marlowe uses "self-conscious jokes" to connect his "literary innovation" to Tamburlaine's "imperial progress," but Nicholson overlooks the soliloquy in 1 *Tam* 5.1 that ironically signals the weakness of poets and Tamburlaine when she argues that Marlowe reimagines "the fourteenth-century Scythian warlord as a late sixteenth-century English poet-conqueror" (142). Mary Floyd-Wilson writes that *Tamburlaine's* "plot centers on the ironic representation of an eloquent barbarian," which amounts to Marlowe's "clever joke," in *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 99. Stapleton connects the satire in *Tamburlaine* to the *Amores* in *Marlowe's Ovid*, 68.

Calyphas's murder alludes to Tamburlaine's soliloquy. Calyphas is the son closest to and most influenced by Zenocrate. Tamburlaine bemoans that he accompanies his "gracious mother" too often (2*Tam*, 1.3.167). Perhaps that is why Calyphas clearly articulates his feelings of remorse, "I know, sir, what it is to kil a man, / It works remorse of conscience in me" (4.1.27–28). Zenocrate instilled remorse in Calyphas, and he identifies it easily, while Tamburlaine, raised in the language of war, remained frustrated in his attempts to name his confusing feelings because he was never taught the vocabulary of remorse.

After killing Calyphas, he refuses to let a single "Souldier . . . defile / His manly fingers with so faint a boy" by burying an "effeminate brat" (2*Tam*, 4.1.162–64). Tamburlaine uses the same words, "effeminate" and "faint," to designate his own feelings of remorse and impotence in his soliloquy, "But how unseemly it is for my Sex, / . . . My nature, and the terrour of my name / To harbour thoughts effeminate and faint" (1*Tam*, 5.1.174–77). Marlowe connects effeminacy to conscience in Calyphas and Tamburlaine, even though Tamburlaine never heard Calyphas explain that he felt "remorse of conscience." It makes sense that the Ovidian Calyphas—for all his indulging in cards, drinking, and sex—is the play's conscientious objector. In keeping with the link between the impotent Ovidian persona and the "remorse of conscience," Calyphas has a conscience because of his Ovidianism.

This article only scratches the surface of significances that proliferate from the full meaning of Zenocrate's name. Many questions arise from this that cannot be explored here due to space constraints. For instance, does Zenocrate's name alter the discussion of the plays' treatment of religion? It may pave a *via media* between Goldberg's astute but restricted study of how the religious discourse in *Tamburlaine* mirrors "the assumptions that actually underpin the actions of ordinary people" and Leila Watkins's intriguing but overstated notions that "failures to enforce divine justice produce resounding doubts in God's or the gods' power," which lets "evil consistently triumph."⁵¹ Marlowe's irreverence extends beyond ordinary people to the extraordinary Zenocrate, whose name indicates that Marlowe takes satiric aim at those like Zenocrate whose beliefs carry greater weight. Yet, while her name contributes to what Watkins calls "the skepticism of the *Tamburlaine* plays," I do not see the plays as endorsing the idea that "irreligion or unbelief [was] a viable

51. Goldberg, "Who's God's on First?," 574–75. Leila Watkins, "Justice Is a Mirage: Failures of Religious Order in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* Plays," *Comparative Drama* 46.2 (2012): 163–85, 165.

worldview.”⁵² These plays challenge religious belief, but refuse to endorse any one worldview. Zenocrate’s meaning may even impact that tired argument about Marlowe’s supposed atheism. Questions also arise about kingship in these plays. Although Tamburlaine appears to disregard “the contemporary Elizabethan discourse of divinely endorsed rule” in his unorthodox pursuit of an “earthly crown,” he does have divine sanction in the person of Zenocrate, who willingly marries him after he spared her father.⁵³ That a seemingly godless Scythian, a “base usurping vagabond” (*1Tam*, 4.3.23), can gain divine approval satirizes the hereditary and Christian underpinnings of divine-right theories.

What does Zenocrate say about censorship? Marlowe felt compelled to encrypt the meaning of Zenocrate’s name so deeply that it evaded the gaze of censors and critics until now.⁵⁴ Zenocrate is not the most blasphemous aspect of these plays, and the blasphemy in them is still a matter of critical controversy, which her name will nuance further. Never punctilious, Marlowe placed avoiding the censor’s ire low on his priority list. Perhaps this encoding relates to allegorical writing, which was associated with Edmund Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney.⁵⁵ Perhaps the seriocomic treatment of Zenocrate gestures at Marlowe’s satirical orientation toward general allegorical composition and interpretation. The sonority of Zenocrate suggests it over a baldly allegorical character named Godspower. It onomatopoeically buttresses her divine and mysterious nature by sounding alien and intriguing, and need not be allegorical at all since it fits with the overall aesthetic of these plays fascinated by foreign terms. Ovid was known for using allegorical figures and gently mocking them, and Marlowe may be accentuating that practice. Most importantly, this article demonstrates the significance of the *Elegies* in Marlowe’s canon and their importance to our understanding of his works. Studies of

52. Watkins, “Justice Is a Mirage,” 166.

53. C. K. Preedy, “(De)Valuing the Crown in *Tamburlaine*, *Dido Queen of Carthage*, and *Edward II*,” *SEL* 54.2 (2014): 259–77, 267.

54. Marlowe’s deep encryption may align with Annabel Patterson’s idea that censorship was a precondition for the encoding of secret meaning in early modern English imaginative writing. See *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, 2nd ed. (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1990), 6–12, 63.

55. Reading the *Tamburlaine* plays as Marlowe’s “attempt to overgo Spenser as England’s new national poet,” Patrick Cheney argues that Marlowe rewrites Spenser’s priorities through “many documented borrowings from Spenser” and inversions of Spenserian preoccupations. See *Marlowe’s Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: U of Toronto Press, 1997), 121.

Marlovian drama can only be bettered by gaining a greater understanding of the oft-neglected *Elegies*.

Zenocrate's name could signify that the power of God operates even within an uncivilized Scythian's troubled mind impotent against the force of remorse. It could also be marshaled in arguments about the impotence of divine intervention. Perhaps the real upshot is that the name forces readers to make interpretive decisions that reveal their own preconceptions, misconceptions, and biases toward divinity, interpretation, and the world they inhabit.

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CHLOE KATHERINE PREEDY

Fortune's Breath: Rewriting the Classical Storm in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare

Critics often identify Christopher Marlowe and Thomas Nashe's play *Dido, Queene of Carthage* as a significant precursor for William Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (c. 1606–7), as well as his more explicitly Virgilian drama *The Tempest* (1611). The narratives of these three plays are regularly linked back to the *Aeneid* (c. 30–19 BCE), and interpreted in terms of early modern colonial discourse. While the theme of empire-building is of central importance in these dramas, the emphasis that all three plays place on the staging of Virgilian storms suggests that the *Aeneid*'s prophetic and literary antecedents may be equally significant. Marlowe and Shakespeare's fictional tempests allow them to raise and pursue questions about the nature of theatrical authorship, the concept of a discrete imaginative sphere, and the charged issue of literary legacy or *fama*. Storms in these plays thus provide a medium through which to engage with and dispute standards of theatrical authority within the context of the purpose-dedicated playhouses, as this article investigates.

When the 1588 Spanish Armada encountered severe gales in the northern Atlantic, which destroyed nearly a third of the fleet, English Protestant commentators claimed the storm as a sign of God's care for England. As the pamphleteer I. L. reported in 1589, "the breath of the Lords mouth hath . . . scattered those proud shippes, whose masts seemed like Cedars to dare the Sunne."¹ Contemporary medallions struck to commemorate the English victory similarly declared that "*Flevit Deus et inimici dissiparunt*" (God breathed upon the waters and

1. I. L., *The birth, purpose, and mortall wound of the Romish holie League* . . . (London: printed by T. Orwin, 1589), A3v.

scattered his enemies).² Such claims gained additional resonance after a second Spanish invasion fleet was wrecked by gales in October 1596, this time without any intervention by the Elizabethan navy:³ God, English Protestants declared, was protecting his new chosen nation, his “little *Israel*.”⁴

Such allusions to storms, divine providence and England's destiny situate these discourses within a wider tradition of early modern meteorology. As Alexandra Walsham has shown, a whole range of celestial apparitions, from destructive tempests to visions in the clouds, were identified by contemporary pamphleteers, divines, and scholars as sermons inscribed by God in the sky.⁵ The apocalyptic framework through which these phenomena were read accords with a general tendency to look for omens of the future in heavenly and meteorological occurrences. Thus, as Gwilym Jones explores in *Shakespeare's Storms* (2015), contemporaries debated the significance of hearing thunder on a particular day: Thomas Hill, for example, notes in his *Contemplation of Mysteries* (1574) how “the learned *Beda* wryteth . . . that if thunder be first heard out of the South quarter, threatneth the death of many by shipwrack;” while according to Leonard Digges, “Some write (their ground I see not) that Sundayes thunder, should bring the death of learned men, Judges and others.”⁶ As in the case of the Spanish Armada, such prophetic interpretations (although denounced by many writers as false superstition) were often applied to meteorological events that were perceived to be politically significant. One instance is the “prodigious storm” that occurred in March 1599, as “the Earle of Essex parted from London to goe for Ireland”: according to biographer Alison Weir, Francis Bacon would subsequently remember the “furious” weather as an “ominous prodigy” foretelling Essex's predestined downfall.⁷

2. Wallace MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I* (London: Edward Arnold, 1993), 241.

3. Chris Fitter, “Historicising Shakespeare's Richard II: Current Events, Dating, and the Sabotage of Essex,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11.2 (2005): 1–47, 29.

4. I. L., *The birth, purpose*, A3r.

5. Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999), 329; and “Sermons in the Sky: Apparitions in Early Modern Europe,” *History Today* 51.4 (2001): 56–63, 58.

6. Thomas Hill, *A Contemplation of Mysteries* (London: Henry Denham, 1574[?]), H4r; and Leonard Digges, *A prognostication everlasting of right good effect* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1592), B4v. See also Gwilym Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2015), 44.

7. John Florio, *Queen Anna's new world of words* (London: printed by Melchior Bradwood, 1611), O4v; and Alison Weir, *Elizabeth, the Queen* (London: Pimlico, 1998), 441. See also Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 45–46.

In characterizing the 1599 storm as an omen of Essex's future, it is possible that some Elizabethan and Jacobean commentators may have recognized an intriguing literary parallel in Lucan's *De Bello Civili* (c. 61–65 CE). Edward Paleit has demonstrated the notoriety that comparisons between Essex and Lucan's Caesar, as drawn by Essex's supporter Henry Cuffe, acquired during the latter's 1601 trial for treason.⁸ In this context, it is interesting to note that Lucan's account of the cloudy skies that greet Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon posits a potential connection between the celestial phenomenon and Caesar's imperial destiny—although, in Essex's case, the outcome of his 1599 battle for England's Irish empire was inconclusive, and even disastrous.⁹ While the phrasing of Lucan's counter-epic suggests some skepticism about meteorological portents, as emphasized in the translation produced by the Elizabethan dramatist Marlowe,¹⁰ stormy atmospheric conditions are a striking and significant element in various classical epics, from Homer's *Odyssey* to Virgil's *Aeneid*.

In terms of the early modern literary tradition, the latter text is an especially important source. Virgil's high status in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe is well-known, as is his reputation as the poet of empire. Craig Kallendorf notes that: "the Virgil that emerges from the schools as part of the common classical heritage of the ruling élites of the early modern West, [is] a Virgil whose language and sentiments encoded power and privilege, [and] who provided the model for the imperial expansion that projected the power of Europe onto every continent of the newly expanded world."¹¹ Within Elizabethan and Jacobean England, the cultural authority of the *Aeneid* was regularly appropriated in support of English colonial ambitions, and literary critics have been alert to the epic's influence as an archetypal narrative of conquest.¹² Yet, as Margaret Tudeau-

8. Edward Paleit, "The 'Caesarist' Reader and Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, CA. 1590–1610," *Review of English Studies* 62 (2011): 212–40, 226–27.

9. Lucan, *The Civil War*, ed. and trans. J. D. Duff (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1928), 1.233–35.

10. Christopher Marlowe, *Lucans First Booke*, in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Roma Gill, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), vol. 1. See Chloe Kathleen Preedy, "False and Fraudulent Meanes? Representing the Miraculous in the Works of Christopher Marlowe," *Marlowe Studies* 2 (2012): 103–24.

11. Craig Kallendorf, *The Other Virgil: Pessimistic Readings of the "Aeneid" in Early Modern Culture* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 14.

12. See, for example, Donna B. Hamilton, "Re-Engineering Virgil: *The Tempest* and the Printed English *Aeneid*," in *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*, ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (London: Reaktion, 2000), 114–20, 114.

Clayton has persuasively demonstrated, a confused medieval reception history ensured that until the early seventeenth century, the poet Virgil was also considered to have been a mage, and the *Aeneid* was read as a prophetic text whose author had unique access to arcane knowledge.¹³ Virgil's reputation for elemental magic complements the prominence given to storm imagery within the *Aeneid*, in which tempests provide both an obstacle to and prophetic guarantor of Aeneas's imperial destiny: in early modern England, conjurors and witches were often credited with the power to summon storms.¹⁴

In the *Aeneid*, command over meteorological phenomena is reserved to the gods, as disturbances in the air play an explicitly functional role in bringing Aeneas's imperial destiny to fruition. Initially, the power of the storm belongs to Aeneas's enemies: bad weather is Ulysses' ally in the Greek invasion of Troy, rendering his wooden-horse trick plausible through the implied correlative that Neptune needs placating, while Juno instigates a storm that batters the surviving 'Trojans' ships as they flee the destruction of their city. Before long, however, these same violent winds give rise to Jove's resounding declaration of Aeneas's and Rome's destiny:

Thy kyngdome prosper shall, and eke the walles I thee behight:
Thou shalt see rise in *Laryne* land and grow ful great of might.
And thou thy sonne *Aeneas* stout to heauen shalt bryng at last,
Amonge the gods be sure of this, my mynd is fixed fast.

.....

Let it be so: let tyme roll on, and set furth their renowne.
Then shal be borne of Troian blood the emprour *Caesar* bright,
Whose empire through the seas shal stretch and fame to heaven
upright.¹⁵

The storms, stilled by divine intervention, inspire a prediction that will resonate across the course of the poem. Jove's commanding authority over the elements anticipates the control that Aeneas will subsequently acquire, when he fulfils his destiny as empire-builder; in the final line of this extract, Virgil asserts the marine and aerial

13. Margaret Tudeau-Clayton, *Jonson, Shakespeare and Early Modern Virgil* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 78.

14. Reginald Scot denounces such popular beliefs about "Witches power in meteors and elementarie bodies" in his *Discoverie of witchcraft* (London: printed by Henry Denham, 1584), C1r–1v. See Leslie Thomson, "The Meaning of Thunder and Lightning: Stage Directions and Audience Expectations," *Early Theatre* 2 (1999): 11–24, 11–12; and Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 10.

15. Virgil, *The whole xii bookes of the Aeneidos of Virgill*, trans. Thomas Phaer (London: printed by William How for Abraham Veale, 1573), A4v.

dimensions of Roman power. Such imperial fame is then carried on the wind: sometimes positively, when the divine messenger Mercury crosses the liminal space between earth and heaven to assist Aeneas, and sometimes in a more dangerous fashion by the goddess Fama or Rumour. Fama's presence, while threatening in her prospective distortion of Aeneas's fame (she spreads damaging rumors about his relationship with Dido), further reinforces the link between empire-building, individual renown and aerial power that Virgil creates: imperial success and future reputation rely on controlling the air, through which destiny is framed and fulfilled.

In her fascinating study of *Shakespeare's Troy* (1997), Heather James concludes that Shakespeare appropriated, and contested, the political and literary tradition derived from imperial Rome in order to legitimate the cultural place of the theater in late Elizabethan and early Stuart London.¹⁶ This claim offers a suggestive insight into how literary echoes of Virgil's *Aeneid* might function in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Although not a focus of James's argument, the motif of the Virgilian storm is especially noteworthy in this regard, encapsulating themes of prophecy, imperial conquest, an authoritative textual legacy, and future reputation.¹⁷ That success in these areas revolves around the ability to command the air within Virgil's epic adds further resonance to the dramatic significance of this motif, at a time when purpose-built playhouses were being newly constructed in the London suburbs, and indoor halls functioned predominantly, even exclusively, as dramatic venues: increasingly, the fictions staged at these locations could be conceived of as occupying a dedicated theatrical space. With actors and audience breathing the same air within the circumference of the building's wooden or wood-paneled walls, the atmospheric qualities of such theatrical space, arguably conceived of as an autonomous imaginative sphere,¹⁸

16. Heather James, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), 1. Hereafter cited parenthetically as James.

17. By "Virgilian storm," I mean a storm or atmospheric disturbance at sea that impacts upon an imperializing agenda and gives rise, either directly or indirectly, to a prophecy of enduring fame, as is the case in book 1 of the *Aeneid*.

18. The idea that the imagination occupied a specific and autonomous cognitive domain was theorized by Aristotle in *De Anima* (c. 350 BCE), and elaborated during the early modern period by Sir Philip Sidney, in his *Defence of Poesy* (1595). See Aristotle, *On the Soul; Parva Naturalia; On Breath*, trans. W. S. Hett (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2014), 155–57. See also Guido Giglioni, "Fantasy Islands: Utopia, The Tempest and New Atlantis as Places of Controlled Credulousness," in *World-Building and the Early Modern Imagination*, ed. Allison B. Kavey (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 91–118, 96; and Sir Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poetry*, in *Sidney's "The Defence of Poesy" and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed.

became significant to the ways in which early modern playwrights engaged with the concept of theater in their dramatic writings. In this sense, the fact that the *Aeneid* aligns control of the air with the prophetic promise of everlasting fame is intriguing, especially when the plays themselves fulfil this promise through their restaging of the Virgilian narrative. The children's drama *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, coauthored by Marlowe and Nashe,¹⁹ is one striking example of a play that combines a retelling of the *Aeneid* with a focus on questions of conquest and legacy, explored through ethereal imagery. Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, responding to this play,²⁰ offers an alternative perspective on the story of Dido and Aeneas, as Shakespeare's Cleopatra comes to symbolically embody the tempest that contests empire. Finally, in *The Tempest*, Shakespeare returns to these themes of controlling the air, imperial conquest, and the fashioning of personal and public legacies by staging the Virgilian storm as an explicitly theatrical event. Thus, in these works, Marlowe and Shakespeare utilize the motif of the Virgilian storm, which aligns aerial command with imperial destiny, to reflect upon the status of their own theatrical fiction—and to interrogate its future legacy.

Ruling Land and Sea in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*

Marlowe and Nashe's play *Dido, Queen of Carthage* provides an early example of such self-conscious reflection upon the atmospheric qualities of the purpose-dedicated playhouse, through a narrative focus that is explicitly indebted to Virgil's *Aeneid*. Performed by the Children of Her Majesty's Chapel, it was probably written for an indoor hall venue: it may have been staged at the first Blackfriars theater or, if completed after the Chapel Children's 1584 expulsion from that venue, either on tour or at court.²¹ The Revels editor H. J.

Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004), 1–54, 8–9. For the idea that those involved with the early modern theater may have identified it as a distinct imaginative sphere, see Paul Yachnin, *Stage-Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and the Making of Theatrical Value* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997), especially xiv.

19. While Nashe's contribution to the play has been much debated, this article follows the 1594 title page in crediting him with at least some involvement. See Christopher Marlowe, *Dido Queen of Carthage*, in "*Dido Queen of Carthage*" and "*The Massacre at Paris*," ed. H. J. Oliver, *The Revels Plays* (London: Methuen, 1968), 1–90, xix–xxvii. Hereafter cited parenthetically as *Dido*.

20. See for example Robert A. Logan, *Marlowe's Shakespeare: The Influence of Christopher Marlowe on Shakespeare's Artistry* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007), 169–96.

21. The evidence of the title page, and a potential allusion to this play in *Hamlet* (2.2.432–33), indicate that *Dido, Queen of Carthage* was probably performed at least once (William

Oliver, recently seconded by Andrew Duxfield, proposes that the play may have also been performed at one of the outdoor amphitheaters, and the textual allusions to commanding the air might have gained a powerful new resonance on an open-air stage.²² Either venue would however have facilitated this drama's intriguing engagement with and conceptualization of theatrical space as a distinct sphere to be manipulated and controlled by the actors (in the sense of both characters and players) in Marlowe and Nashe's fiction. Through this thematic interest in spatial conquest and an expansive theatrical vision, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* importantly anticipates and frames Marlowe's subsequent practice in the influential *Tamburlaine* plays and *Doctor Faustus*.

Written at a time when purpose-dedicated playhouses were still a comparatively new development, *Dido, Queen of Carthage* vaunts the power of theatrical illusion. In a short induction, which self-consciously parodies the popular reputation of the boys' companies, the power of the adult gods (represented by Jove) is surrendered to the child-actor Ganymede. Jove promises that "heaven and earth" will be "the bounds of thy delight" (1.1.29–31), implicitly asserting the boy-player's authority over the playing space by gesturing to the airy region between the stage platform and the painted "heavens" above: a promise that, in an open-air setting, might even have allowed the imagined sphere of illusion to figuratively expand beyond the limits of the playhouse by projecting theatrical authority beyond the stage canopy and into the sky overhead.²³ Jove's verbal commitment is reinforced visually as he plucks feathers from Hermes' wings (1.1.38–41), which, given the latter's mythological roles of divine herald and conductor of souls to the underworld, symbolize control over and

Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. Harold Jenkins, Arden Shakespeare [London: Methuen, 1982]). See H. J. Oliver, introduction to *Dido*, xxvi–xxx; Michael Shapiro, *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays* (New York: Columbia UP, 1977), 14–17. The play cannot be dated with any accuracy, but is usually presumed to precede *Tamburlaine* and therefore tentatively allotted to 1585–86, although it may be even earlier. For the alternative arguments for a post-1588 date, see Margo Hendricks, "Managing the Barbarian: The Tragedy of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*," *Renaissance Drama*, 23 (1992): 165–88; and Martin Wiggins, "When Did Marlowe Write *Dido, Queen of Carthage*?" *Review of English Studies*, 59.241 (2008): 521–41.

22. Oliver, introduction to *Dido*, xxxii–xxxiii; Andrew Duxfield, "'Where am I now?': The Articulation of Space in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage*," *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 88.1 (2015): 81–93.

23. Contemporary accounts indicate that some early modern theaters may have possessed a cloth or covering above the stage that was painted with celestial symbols and represented the heavens. Even if the performance space in question did not possess such decoration, a gesture by the actor to the sky or roof would have conveyed the point.

occupation of the liminal region between stage heavens and stage hell. Since this episode was most probably staged on a stage balcony, as in the National Theatre's 2009 production,²⁴ the visual picture could have complemented these verbal references to Ganymede's command of stage-space, with the actor surveying the audience from above. By connecting the gift of the feathers with Ganymede's "fancy" (1.1.39), the play-text seems in addition to reinforce the real-life theatrical connotations in linguistic terms. A few lines later, Venus identifies Jupiter as "playing" with "that wanton female boy" (1.1.51): a charge that again echoes contemporary charges made against the children's companies,²⁵ but which is countered by Jupiter's proclamation of the future to be shaped within Marlowe and Nashe's drama. At this point in the narrative, Ganymede's comprehensive authority over the fictional "world" of *Dido, Queen of Carthage* anticipates the predicted destiny of Aeneas's son Ascanius, of whom Jupiter promises that "no bounds but heaven shall bound his empery" (1.1.100). Possibly reinforced by the doubling of these two roles in performance, such linguistic echoes align control of the airy fictional sphere with imperial destiny, and foreshadow the Virgilian storm that follows.

This early storm scene is closely modeled upon book 1 of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Aeneas's mother Venus complains that "my Aeneas wanders on the seas / And rests a prey to every billow's pride" (1.1.52–53):

Poor Troy must now be sacked upon the sea,
 And Neptune's waves be envious men of war;
 Epeus' horse, to Etna's hill transformed,
 Prepared stands to wrack their wooden walls,
 And Aeolus, like Agamemnon, sounds
 The surges, his fierce soldiers, to the spoil. (1.1.64–69)

As the echoes of Troy indicate, the storm represents an obstacle to Aeneas's colonizing destiny: literally, in threatening his life, and indirectly, by shipwrecking him upon Carthage's shore, where Dido will challenge his Roman future. The potential cancellation of Aeneas's destiny is captured by Venus's metaphors, which by uniting past and present trauma effectively freeze the progression of the narrative. The theater thereby acquires command over the past, present, and future, as well as both geographical places. Conflating the Trojan horse with the "sounded" waves, this passage advertises the

24. Christopher Marlowe, *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, directed by James MacDonald, National Theatre, 2009.

25. See for example Phillip Stubbes, *The anatomie of abuses* (London: printed by John Kingston, 1583), L8r–8v.

versatility of the stage's wooden boards, which can be at once Troy and the Aeolian Sea, and celebrates the effects used to "sound" the storm's presence. Since the storm in question was probably signaled by acoustic effects such as the beating of drums, and possibly the rumbling of a rolled cannon ball,²⁶ the playhouse here appropriates a martial soundscape that might more typically be associated with imperial conquest in the service of its own theatrical vision. At the same time, however, the fact that this illusory storm threatens "to wrack their wooden walls" equally aligns the imagined ships with the physical confines of the playing space, threatening the very fabric of the playhouse.²⁷ As with Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, this ship-stage parallel would have been especially powerful within an outdoor amphitheater,²⁸ but still resonant in the wood-paneled environs of an indoor hall. Exploiting the reverberating sound effects, Marlowe and Nashe again hint that their illusion might expand beyond the bounds of stage-heaven and stage-earth, swelling past the wooden borders of theater-space into the world outside: in this fantasy of theatrical "empyry," freed from vertical and possibly horizontal limits, there are "no bounds but heaven"—a location that, in the classical form alluded to here, has already been brought within the parameters of the stage fiction in the drama's opening scene.²⁹

As the play continues, so do these associations between storms, imperial destiny, and the theater. In accordance with Virgil's *Aeneid*, the storms that "sack" Aeneas's ships in the opening scene's maritime restaging of the fall of Troy are characterized as the result of Juno's alliance with Aeolus.³⁰ Subsequently, Juno and Aeneas's mother

26. On the theatrical effects used to create storms onstage, see Thomson, "Meaning of Thunder and Lightning," 14; and Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 34. As Jones points out, it is less likely that fireworks would have been used in an indoor performance due to their sulfurous smell (128).

27. Marlowe would return to this notion of an assault on the playhouse fabric in *Tamburlaine, Part Two*, in which the protagonist orders his soldiers to "raise cavaleros higher than the clouds, / And with the cannon break the frame of heaven" (2.4.102–3). Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine the Great*, ed. J. S. Cunningham (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1981).

28. Brian Gibbons, "The Question of Place," *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 50 (1996): 33–43, 42; qtd. in Gabriel Egan, *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism* (London: Routledge, 2006), 152–53.

29. Marlowe's interest in extending spatial bounds has also been discussed by various critics including Stephen Greenblatt (*Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* [Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980], 193–222) and Emily C. Bartels (*Spectacles of Strangeness: Imperialism, Alienation, and Marlowe* [Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1993]), though with a less specific focus on the performative sphere.

30. Virgil, *Aeneidos of Virgill*, A2r.

Venus, now reconciled, agree upon a “match” between the Trojan prince and the Carthaginian queen Dido (3.2.77–80). In pursuit of this plan, Juno arranges another storm, as outlined to Venus:

This day they both a-hunting forth will ride
 Into these woods, adjoining to these walls;
 When, in the midst of all their gamesome sports,
 I'll make the clouds dissolve their wat'ry works,
 And drench Silvanus' dwellings with their showers.
 Then in one cave the queen and he shall meet. (3.2.87–92)³¹

That the emphasis is now on the enclosure rather than expansion of space, as the focus narrows from within encircling “walls” to the even smaller and contained place of the “cave,” suggests that the potential restriction of Aeneas's imperial destiny is anticipated within this exchange. Since a lasting relationship with Dido would halt Aeneas's geographical and colonial trajectory, as he concentrates upon entrenching rather than expanding Carthaginian space (5.1.1–17), this storm, like the previous tempest arranged by Juno, represents a threat to the promised foundation of Rome and, by extension, Virgil's *Aeneid*. While *Dido, Queen of Carthage* seems to deliberately mock Aeneas's heroic status at regular intervals, engaging in what Donald Stump terms the “persistent deflation of Virgilian high seriousness,”³² the spatial imagery confirms that a threat to the Trojan prince's prophesized future is equally a constraint upon the imaginative sphere envisioned by Marlowe and Nashe—it is through Aeneas's Roman and Virgilian legacy, mocked by and contained within their dramatic framework, that the Elizabethan dramatists will extend their own surpassing fiction.

The play's closing contest between Aeneas and Dido, as each character seeks control over the aerial imagery that represents imperial destiny, is especially significant in this regard. Here, Aeneas ostensibly surpasses the otherwise more convincing conqueror Tamburlaine. When the latter protagonist seeks to assault the heavens in *Tamburlaine Part Two*, his lieutenant Theridamis ruefully responds that “*if* words might serve, our voice hath rent the air”³³; in the earlier children's drama, however, Aeneas employs a very similar phrase successfully to repudiate Dido's claims as he departs for Italy: “In vain, my love, thou spend'st thy fainting breath, / If words might move me, I were

31. See Virgil, *Aeneidos of Virgill*, I3v.

32. Donald Stump, “Marlowe's Travesty of Virgil: Dido and Elizabethan Dreams of Empire,” *Comparative Drama* 34.1 (2000): 79–107, 94

33. Marlowe, *Tamburlaine, Part 2*, 2.4.121, emphasis mine.

overcome" (5.1.153–54). Since sighs were theorized in early modern medical texts as symptoms of a body that has, quite literally, forgotten to breathe, the admonition aptly figures Aeneas's assumed control over the ethereal realm associated in this play with both imperial prophecy and theatrical fiction, while also foreshadowing Dido's fate.³⁴

In *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, the death of the conqueror's "wife" is exposed as the cost of empire-building, with her fiery self-immolation and descent into the pit below the stage contrasting with Aeneas's advertised departure to claim his imperial destiny. In this contest for control of the elements that figure the performative sphere, Aeneas emerges victorious: Dido is left short of breath, and subsequently banished from the stage platform, while he commands the weather and the sea. Having acquired such authority during the play, Aeneas now defies Dido's efforts to contain his future within the bounds of Carthage, which he once imagined as a complete "world" (1.1.198).³⁵ Thanks to his possession of "silver whistles to control the winds" (4.4.10), gifted to him by Dido herself, Marlowe and Nashe's much-parodied Aeneas is able to partially regain his Virgilian stature:

Aboard, aboard, since Fates do bid aboard
 And slice the sea with sable-coloured ships,
 On whom the nimble winds may all day wait
 And follow them as footmen through the deep (4.3.21–24)

His power over the air and sea is explicitly characterized by Aeneas as the quality that will enable him to "ascend to fame's immortal house" (4.3.9), conflating his imperial destiny and literary legacy. Shortly afterwards, he leaves, and Dido is left to long like Marlowe's Faustus for a control of the air that is ultimately futile and self-destructive: "I'll frame me wings of wax like Icarus, / And o'er his ships will soar unto the sun" (5.1.243–44).³⁶

Aeneas, whose imperial destiny is familiar to Elizabethan spectators but left unfulfilled within the play's narrative, exceeds the "bounds" of the theatrical illusion in performative as well as figurative terms: his Virgilian legacy requires the audience to project his achievements

34. Carla Mazzio, "The History of Air: Hamlet and the Trouble with Instruments," *South Central Review* 26.1 (2009): 153–96, 179.

35. The term "world" was commonly used in early modern English to denote the object of cosmography, the study of the earth and the heavens. *Oxford English Dictionary* online, s.v. "world, n., 8," accessed December 14, 2015, <http://www.oed.com>.

36. Compare with Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-texts* (1604, 1616), ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993), prologue.21–22.

beyond the "world" of Carthage and the playhouse's fictional sphere. While Aeneas's trajectory is linear, however, the play also posits an alternative model of theatrical engagement through Dido's mourning speech. Thus, though she initially seeks to master the elements, enclosing sails "pack'd" with wind in her chamber, and so "drive" to Italy's shore (4.4.128–29), her ambitions increase until she hopes to bring all air within her own sphere: "I'll set the casement open, that the winds / May enter in and once again conspire / Against the life of me, poor Carthage queen" (4.4.130–32). When this suicidal effort to contain Aeneas's future by capturing the air fails, Dido then engages in a more inventive appropriation of the play's Virgilian storm imagery. Mirroring Venus' previous tactics, she retreats into a restaging of the past that simultaneously envisions an alternative, cyclical future:

See, see, the billows heave him up to heaven,
And now down falls the keels into the deep.

.....

Now he is come on shore, safe without hurt (5.1.251–57)

By rewriting Virgil's version of Aeneas's future, albeit through what the play-text implies is a vain fantasy, Dido's final speech arguably sees Marlowe and Nashe anticipate what James has termed "Shakespeare's iconoclastic translations of empire," whereby the playwright "contaminates" the imperial tradition of Trojan Britain with competing interpretations; in James' reading, such translation (a term with significant spatial overtones) "conversely empower[s] the theatre as an independent sphere of cultural authority" (James, 33).

While Dido's vision reflects her traumatized state, then, it also aptly captures the complex temporality of dramatic performance, which is both finite in its span and potentially endlessly iterable. If Aeneas's future relies upon linear projection in space, generating the conditions needed for the creation of Virgil's epic and the legacy that it establishes for him, Dido dreams of an alternative temporal model in which immortality is conferred through containment and repetition. Thus Marlowe and Nashe present two alternative frameworks for theatrical authority within *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. In one version, the protagonist expands beyond the containing boundaries of dramatic illusion, effectively invading audience-space to assert his destiny with their imaginative cooperation—a concept that Marlowe would subsequently develop within his *Tamburlaine* plays. From another perspective, however, the bounds of the fictional sphere also represent a kind of authority, although one that Dido herself is unable to master; the very iterability of performance offers a different form

of theatrical legacy, as Marlowe will consider again in *Doctor Faustus*. Both versions, however, offer a vision of dramatic performance that, in asserting the spatial and/or temporal power of the imagination, might implicitly contest the writings of contemporary antitheatricalists. Attacking the theater several years before, Stephen Gosson had employed the imagery of ships, unruly winds and shipwreck to signal modesty and restraint: "I will beare a lowe sayle, and rowe neere the shore, least I chaunce to bee carried beyonde my reache, or runne a grounde in those Coasts which I never knewe."³⁷ In Marlowe and Nashe's children's drama, however, such restrictions are no obstacle, even to the often bathetic protagonists: Aeneas turns his "wrack" on unknown coasts to advantage and pursues a journey "beyond . . . reach" of the play's limits, while Dido, anticipating Faustus, projects her imagination high into the heavens.

The New Augustan Empire: *Antony and Cleopatra*

For all Aeneas's flaws, the closing impression in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* is that his vision of spatial expansion has, at least within this play, secured a more powerful legacy than Dido, if not a more lasting. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, however, Shakespeare offers a revised comparison of dramatic practice in which the linear imperial legacy of Augustus (and by extension Virgil's Rome) is contrasted to the defeated Cleopatra's powerful act of self-commemoration: spatially confined by the end of the play, she adopts tactics similar to Dido's to fashion her legacy for early modern audiences and the future, apparently with greater success. Although Shakespeare utilizes the Virgilian storm motif in a range of plays, including *Julius Caesar* (1599) and *The Tempest*,³⁸ *Antony and Cleopatra* has an especially strong thematic affinity with *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. In common with the latter drama, Shakespeare's play interrogates the connection between controlling the air, imperial conquest, and the fashioning of personal and public legacies: for example, Antony's defeat at Actium conflates the threats to empire posed by foreign queens and storms in the *Aeneid* when Cleopatra, who has come to embody the Virgilian storm, draws his fleet away from battle. While the tone of this drama sometimes hovers uncertainly between bathos and tragedy, as in *Dido*,

37. Stephen Gosson, *The schoole of abuse* (London: Thomas Woodcocke, 1579), A6r–6v.

38. Robert S. Miola compares Cassius braving the storm in *Julius Caesar* 1.3 to *Aeneid* 5.685–96, and also suggests that the image of the storm that Cassius summons in 5.1 evokes the tempests of the *Aeneid*, indicating "the same grand workings of destiny." Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), 88, 111.

both plays nonetheless offer developed reflections upon the status of early modern theater and its legacy. Thus James notes a conscious and significant resistance to the imperializing legacy of Virgil's Roman epic, suggesting that Antony and Cleopatra are intensely aware of the need to promote or disrupt the stories in which their meanings will be recorded: as early modern readers were aware, Virgil's Dido was partially modelled on Roman versions of Cleopatra, and so the *Aeneid* could itself be termed a threat to her reputation.³⁹

For Shakespeare's Cleopatra, this revisioning project begins with her spectacular entrance in her barge of state, which is reported by Enobarbus in a staged act of storytelling. The episode is reminiscent of Marlowe and Nashe's earlier play: as Richard Wilson argues, Enobarbus' account of Cleopatra's vessel recalls not only Shakespeare's direct source, Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Lives* (1579), but also the equally impractical gallery of "rivell'd gold," with masts of silver, that Dido promises Aeneas (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 2.2.201–28; *Dido*, 3.1.113–33).⁴⁰ While Wilson reads this intertextual echo as Shakespeare's response to Marlowe's characterization of the Thames-side theater as a ship of fools,⁴¹ however, the ethereal imagery of both passages is at least equally important. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, the initial focus is on the barge itself, whose "purple" sails signify imperial authority and command of the elements. Yet such power comes from sensual invitation rather than martial force: it is the "perfumed" scent of these sails that makes the winds "lovesick with them" (2.2.203–4), anticipating how these same Nile winds will subsequently enhance the beauty of Cleopatra's complexion (2.2.211–15), and convey her "strange invisible perfume" to the senses of her audience (2.2.222–23). As Holly Dugan notes, Shakespeare's Egyptian queen is a master of multisensorial theatrical effects, with Enobarbus implying that Antony fell in love, not at first sight, but at first smell: "hinged to the power of her perfumes, her influence extends beyond her immediate realm and works in subtle ways."⁴²

39. James, 119; and Marilyn Desmond, *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality and the Medieval "Aeneid"* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994), 32.

40. Richard Wilson, *Free Will: Art and Power on Shakespeare's Stage* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2014), 347; William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. John Wilders, Arden Shakespeare (London: Routledge, 1995) (hereafter cited parenthetically as *Antony and Cleopatra*); and Plutarch, *The lives of the noble Grecians and Romanes*, trans. Thomas North (London: Thomas Vautroullier and John Wight, 1579), NNNN5r–5v.

41. Wilson, *Free Will*, 347.

42. Holly Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume: Scent and Sense in Early Modern England* (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 2011), 20–21.

Since such perfume disperses through the air to tease the senses, Dugan's insight further extends the play's consistent alignment of Cleopatra with the elements of water and air. While the Roman soldier Philo initially portrays this quality in a negative and belittling light, complaining that Antony's heart "is become the bellows and the fan / To cool a gipsy's lust" (1.1.2–10), Enobarbus soon corrects the impression. In Shakespeare's play, Cleopatra is not merely the target at which a commanding Antony directs the air, but rather its natural destination. Thus, while she sails the Nile, Antony

..... did sit alone,
Whistling to th'air, which, but for vacancy,
Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra, too,
And made a gap in nature. (2.2.225–28)

The air's movement implicitly directs the spectator's gaze, as Shakespeare exploits atmospheric imagery to delineate the dimensions and directionality of his theatrical illusion. The "gap" that is imaginatively projected upon the aerial sphere mirrors the way in which Cleopatra is curiously absent from the poetic blazon constructed by Enobarbus (James, 138–39), which refers to virtually everything but her body. Jonathan Gil Harris has persuasively shown that it is precisely this absence that makes her so desirable to the Romans; drawing a comparison with the Ovidian myth of Narcissus, he notes that Cleopatra possesses both an ineluctable power to "make hungry" and a frustrating insubstantiality.⁴³ Enobarbus's claim that "she makes hungry / Where most she satisfies" (2.2.237–38) also again invokes her airy qualities, in a possible echo of Hamlet's claim to "eat / the air, promise-crammed" (3.2.93–94).⁴⁴ Indeed, the Roman's report continues to stress Cleopatra's spectacular, otherworldly power; to see her, the air defies natural limitations and creates a vacuum that echoes her own quality of absent presence; in contrast to Marlowe and Nashe's Dido (*Dido*, 5.1.153–54), Cleopatra

43. Jonathan Gil Harris, "Narcissus in thy Face": Roman Desire and the Difference It Fakes in Antony and Cleopatra," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45.4 (1994): 408–25, 411–12.

44. For an account of how Hamlet's claim may also represent a response to contemporary antitheatricalism, by framing the play as "wholesome," see Carolyn Sale, "Eating Air, Feeling Smells: Hamlet's Theory of Performance," *Renaissance Drama* 35 (2006): 145–68, 146–47. Sale's claim that Shakespeare was countering contemporary charges that the theater was a site of contagion is especially intriguing in relation to *Antony and Cleopatra*, since perfume was regularly used during this period as a cure for infectious diseases, specifically the plague. See William Bullein, *The government of health* (London: Valentine Sims, 1595), C6v; Thomas Lodge, *A treatise of the plague* (London: Thomas Creede and Valentine Simmes for Edward White and N[icholas] L[ing], 1603), C4r; and Dugan, *Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 18.

herself is able to “breathless, pour breath forth” (2.2.242). Throughout, in fact, Shakespeare underscores Cleopatra’s airy and “breathing” qualities, which are contrasted with those of her Roman rival(s): thus Octavia, according to a messenger’s report, shows “a statue [rather] than a breather” (3.3.21).

The distinction between Octavia as a static object to be merely studied and Cleopatra’s immersive power, her “strange invisible perfume” (2.2.222), accords with what Mary Thomas Crane has identified as competing Roman and Egyptian modes of perception: while the Romans in this play understand their world primarily in visual terms, Egyptians inhabit the earth and engage with it through all of the senses.⁴⁵ It is such inhabitation of the elements that allows Shakespeare’s Cleopatra to embody the Virgilian storm that both impedes and validates Roman imperialism, and so contest its legacy. At first, Enobarbus draws this link between the Egyptian queen and the storm in tongue-in-cheek fashion, announcing that: “We cannot call her winds and waters sighs and tears; they are greater storms and tempests than almanacs can report . . . She makes a shower of rain as well as Jove” (1.2.153–58).⁴⁶ Yet such associations become serious at the Battle of Actium; here Cleopatra’s unsettling relationship with the winds of imperial destiny brings Antony’s fleet to grief as, unlike Dido, she fulfils the fantasy of having her lover carried to her on the wind:

She once being loofed,
The noble ruin of her magic, Antony,
Claps on his sea-wing and, like a doting mallard,
Leaving the fight in height, flies after her.
I never saw an action of such shame (3.10.18–22)

In this instance Cleopatra’s captivating qualities, which draw the air and hence the sail-driven ships after her, prove unhelpful to her cause. Wrecking Antony’s ambitions, she furthers those of their mutual enemy Octavius Caesar, who (in terms reminiscent of Virgil’s Fama) has already voiced his rival claim to command the airy environs of Shakespeare’s drama: “I have eyes upon him [Antony], / And his affairs come to me on the wind” (3.6.63–64). Thus the encounter between Antony and Caesar’s forces at Actium can from one

45. Mary Thomas Crane, “Roman World, Egyptian Earth: Cognitive Difference and Empire in Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra,” *Comparative Drama* 43.1 (2009): 1–17, 2.

46. Harris notes that critics have also interpreted such qualities as a sign of Cleopatra’s stereotypically “leaky” femininity, in accordance with early modern humeral theory (“Narcissus in thy Face,” 409). See Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993), especially 23–63.

perspective be read, like the closing scene of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, as a contest between two different models of commanding the theatrical sphere; here, Caesar's form of aerial coercion proves more effective in battle. As Canidius ruefully concludes, in another allusion to the threat of breathlessness, "Our fortune on the sea is out of breath" (3.10.25). Antony, his commander, is deeply disturbed by such implications, in line with the Virgilian notion that control of the air and sea frames imperial destiny: while not precisely a storm, Antony's defeat at Actium is attributed to misdirected air currents, a disruptive meteorological phenomenon that might foreshadow and "sheweth tempest[s]."⁴⁷ Ultimately, for Antony, surrendering his authority to Cleopatra's changeable lead threatens his very sense of self. After under-stage music subsequently symbolizes the departure of his guiding spirit Hercules, he perceives an unfixity in the air that reflects his own dissolving identity:

That which is now a horse, even with a thought
The rack dislimns, and makes it indistinct
As water is in water
My good knave Eros, now thy captain is
Even such a body. Here I am Antony,
Yet cannot hold this visible shape (4.14.9–11; 12–14)

As Wilson notes, Antony's reflection upon the subjective interpretations that one cloud might invite acknowledges that representation can "mock our eyes with air" (4.14.7), in a possible reflection on Shakespeare's own stage and story.⁴⁸ Recognizing that he has lost control of his own self-representation through naval and ethereal defeat, Antony experiences his failure as, in James's terms, a radical anamorphosis into empty "signs", which are indefinitely subject to refiguration (James, 128).

Cleopatra, conversely, finds in the very diffuseness of the air the quality that will enable her to fashion her theatrical legacy. First, she follows Marlowe and Nashe's Ganymede in imaginatively appropriating Hermes' command over the liminal spaces of the stage-world and its characters' afterlives; she dreams of the deceased Antony's bodily ascent, fixing his image aloft through her words. This passage's assertion of control over theatrical space might also have been realized physically, if Cleopatra's imaginative resurrection of Antony was accompanied by a ghostly tableau on the balcony:

47. See William Fulke, *A goodly gallerye* (London: William Griffith, 1563), G2v; and also Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 79–81.

48. Wilson, *Free Will*, 310–11. Compare with *Hamlet*, 3.2.367–73.

His face was as the heavens, and therein stuck
 A sun and moon which kept their course and lighted
 The little O, the earth . . .
 But when he meant to quail and shake the orb,
 He was as rattling thunder (5.2.78–85)

Seeking to deify her dead lover through supernatural allusions, and identifying him too as an embodiment of the “rattling” storm,⁴⁹ Cleopatra prepares for the culminating performance with which she will outface Caesar and captivity.

At this latter point, the ongoing narrative conflict between the divergent models of theatrical ownership and occupation espoused by Caesar and Cleopatra reaches its height. Railing against Caesar's desire to place her on show in a visible spectacle of his triumph, the Egyptian queen characterizes Roman space as a threat to her “air”:

. . . Mechanic slaves
 With greasy aprons, rules and hammers shall
 Uplift us to the view. In their thick breaths,
 Rank of gross diet, shall we be enclouded
 And forced to drink their vapour (5.2.208–12)

There may be an underlying metatheatrical playfulness, with the boy actor reminding his audience of the inevitable overlap between an elevated sphere of stage-illusion and audience-space; in one sense, this player's attempts to craft a new realm of the imagination is quite literally permeated by the “gross” breath of those standing immediately before the stage, as well as the sound of the windlass that would “uplift” Caesar's captive before the eyes of the crowd.⁵⁰ Since “thick” air was often identified as a cause of plague during this period, Shakespeare may also be implying a contrast between the perfumed healing power of Cleopatra's “sweet balm” and the diseased atmosphere of Rome (5.2.310). Yet the air was understood to be particularly “thick” around the bodies of the recently dead, and the allusion to “balm” might invoke funeral ritual: thus Cleopatra's vision of forced performance is woven through with the traces of her death.⁵¹

While such imagery is a reminder of the stage's permeability, exposing Cleopatra to the threat of contagion, Shakespeare's

49. Jones notes that “the two phenomena of the storm and the earthquake are fundamentally related in early modern writing” (*Shakespeare's Storms*, 87), with the earthquake identified by early modern thinkers as a type of storm: see 97–98.

50. For an alternative reading of the mechanical effects that Shakespeare is invoking, see Wilson, *Free Will*, 343.

51. Mazzio, “History of Air,” 175–76, 170.

protagonist transforms potential vulnerability into a source of strength. Because her power cannot be fully seen or known, Crane argues, it cannot be captured by sight, the Roman vehicle of mastery.⁵² In this sense Cleopatra, whose “immortal longings” drive her transformation into “fire and air” (5.2.280, 288), perhaps epitomizes the newly immersive experience of early modern theater. An audience would always have filled stage-space with their “thick breath,” but the early modern development of a dedicated performative sphere conversely enabled the theater’s own immersive potential. As for Marlowe and Nashe’s *Dido*, Cleopatra’s quest for command of her literary legacy is framed by an expansive relationship with temporal and spatial bounds: noting that Antony is termed the “demi-Atlas of this earth” (1.5.24), a symbol of global authority, while Cleopatra is the “day o’th’world” (4.8.13), Wilson persuasively suggests that “together they constitute a theatre of the world.” While in his interpretation “their defeat suggests the playhouse’s vulnerability,”⁵³ it seems that Shakespeare’s conclusion may carry a certain, if qualified, sense of hope: if in political terms it is Caesar’s vision that triumphs, the immersive theatrical model favored by Cleopatra continues to extend its influence over the closing moments of the play. Indeed, Dugan suggests that, in death, Cleopatra may even partially succeed at transforming her substance into the ether she resembles for much of the play, in the ultimate act of self-reinvention through dissolution.⁵⁴

Whereas Marlowe and Nashe’s imperialist conqueror Aeneas imagined the expansion of the theatrical sphere as an aggressive assault on the playhouse walls, Shakespeare here suggests a subtler yet perhaps more extensive diffusion of the performative illusion: a kind of theatrical osmosis, comparable to Cleopatra’s “strange invisible perfume” in its effect (2.2.222). Ultimately, even the new Augustus Caesar (real-life patron of Virgil) recognizes and elevates the imaginative power of Cleopatra’s fiction-making within the dramatic sphere of Shakespeare’s play, which sets the “breathing” legacy of Antony and Cleopatra alongside the static, statuesque strategies of Roman commemoration: while Cleopatra resembles Marlowe and Nashe’s *Dido* in prizing the iterability inherent to theatrical performance, her more adept establishment through “fire and air”

52. Crane, “Roman World, Egyptian Earth,” 11. See also Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare’s Plays, “Hamlet” to “The Tempest”* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 177.

53. Wilson, *Free Will*, 324–25.

54. Dugan, *Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 22.

(5.2.288) of her own legacy might be attributed to her prioritization of change, in contrast to the repetition that Dido favors. As Cleopatra earns her reputation for “infinite variety” (2.2.246), Caesar responds by literally raising her and her lover into the liminal region above the stage platform, in a striking closing spectacle: “Take up her bed . . . No grave upon the earth shall clip in it / A pair so famous” (5.2.355–58). Despite his attempt to impose an imperial Roman interpretation through tableau, however, the real victor of this contest for theatrical authority and commemorative control is Shakespeare’s drama, and the literary fame that it claims through the immersive capacity of his theatrical illusion.

Conclusion: Shakespeare’s “Brave New World”

Shakespeare would return to the motif of the Virgilian storm several times during his writing career, including most famously in *The Tempest*. In a play that both alludes to the *Aeneid* and, “in narrative and phrase, is constituted of its parts,”⁵⁵ Shakespeare engages in another striking and extended reflection on theatrical world-making. Roland Greene, exploring the “island logic” of the early modern period, notes that such world-building succeeds because *The Tempest* “is not only a function of insularity but a play of encounters”⁵⁶: it is Prospero’s command of the air, and specifically his ability to fashion his own version of the storm that opens the *Aeneid*, that enables such duality within the island world. In this sense, *The Tempest* restages the tension between enclosed space and expansive illusion that is so central to the contest for meaning within *Antony and Cleopatra*. Indeed, as Wilson notes, *The Tempest*’s self-conscious metatheatricality seems to closely echo the ethereal world of Shakespeare’s Egypt: Antony’s comparison of his “wreck” to the “rack” of a cloud machine (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 4.14.7–11) prefigures Prospero’s reference to the “insubstantial pageant” that fades and dissolves to “Leave not a rack behind.”⁵⁷

Shakespeare’s interest in the relationship between Virgil’s literary legacy, the “insubstantial” sphere of fictional illusion and theatrical power is evident from the opening scene of the play, which reverberates to the acoustic effects of a staged storm: “*A tempestuous*

55. Hamilton, “Re-Engineering Virgil,” 119.

56. Roland Greene, “Island Logic,” in Hulme and Sherman, “*The Tempest*” and *Its Travels*, 138–48, 138.

57. William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, Norton Critical Editions (London: W. W. Norton, 2004), 4.1.154 (hereafter cited parenthetically as *Tempest*); and Wilson, *Free Will*, 33.

noise of thunder and lightning heard" (start of 1.1 s.d.).⁵⁸ As many critics have noted, the audience are at first encouraged to recognize this gale as "real" within the fiction of the play: Jones, for example, notes Shakespeare's sustained engagement with nautical technicalities, as the scene works to diminish the intrusiveness of its own "aesthetic framework."⁵⁹ Yet this illusion is soon undone: having responded to the shipwreck in terms that evoke an Aristotelian theory of theatrical spectatorship,⁶⁰ Miranda learns from her father Prospero that the sight before her is simply that: a "spectacle," wrought by his "art" (1.2.25–32). Shakespeare's protagonist here subsumes the Virgilian storm within his own sphere of authority, perhaps implicitly gesturing, as in *Antony and Cleopatra*, to the fabricated nature of imperial legacy. Crucially, however, Prospero's ability to secure his own destiny through such manipulation of his island's atmosphere depends upon his command over Ariel, the personification of theatrical storms and embodiment of the air. In this sense, as Jerry Brotton notes, Prospero may recall Aeneas, tamer of the sea (and winds);⁶¹ yet the fact that both Prospero's art and Ariel's power is closely aligned with the insubstantial force of illusion suggests that Prospero the imperial colonizer is equally indebted to Cleopatra's model, utilizing the very diffuseness of the air to secure his legacy.

In *The Tempest*, Prospero's move from command of, to immersion in, the air of the island culminates in the epilogue, as he extends such immersion into the space of the audience themselves. Inviting the "gentle breath" of the spectators (epilogue.11–13), as produced by the wind of their applause, to fill his sails and so guide his subsequent trajectory, Shakespeare's protagonist offers an ostensibly more modest model of theatrical expansion than that found in the children's drama *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. Rather than project the trajectory of the illusion directly into and beyond the audience, like Marlowe and Nashe's Aeneas, Prospero instead invites the audience to share his stage-space, in a positive reworking of the mingling of breaths that Shakespeare's Cleopatra feared (*Antony and Cleopatra*, 5.2.208–12). Yet

58. As with *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, it is likely that this storm was created primarily or exclusively through sound effects, rather than through the use of fireworks: see Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 128.

59. Jones, *Shakespeare's Storms*, 127–28.

60. See also William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Stephen Orgel, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987), 102n; and Elizabeth Fowler, "The Ship Adrift," in Hulme and Sherman, *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*, 37–40, 38.

61. Jerry Brotton, "Carthage and Tunis, The Tempest and Tapestries," in Hulme and Sherman, *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*, 132–37, 136.

this pose of submission is arguably qualified by the fact that the audience's powers are allied with those of Ariel, spirit of the theatrical air and Prospero's former servant: gently, subtly, Shakespeare's illusion insinuates itself through the air of the playhouse. Prospero's plea for liberty from confinement belies the fact that the island fiction he inhabits has already slipped its spatial and temporal bounds: the epilogue, with its direct address to the contemporary audience, simultaneously affirms the play's power to shuttle "between the weft of the present and the warp of the past."⁶²

The prophetic associations of the Virgilian storm anticipate the temporal command assumed by Prospero's fiction, as the storm's ethereal and acoustic impact figures the associated expansiveness of the theatrical sphere. Thus, through a classical motif aligned with imperial legacy, Marlowe and Shakespeare interrogate the status of their purpose-dedicated theater, and the capacity of the drama to engage in illusory world-making. That such associations between meteorological phenomena, the space of the theater, and the drama's future meaning were recognized by contemporaries is suggested by the connection between false fortune telling, feigned storms and the playhouses that John Melton draws in his well-known denunciation of astrological superstition:

Another will fore-tell of Lightning and Thunder that shall happen such a day, when there are no such Inflamations seene, except men goe to the *Fortune* in *Golding-Lane*, to see the Tragedie of Doctor *Faustus*. There indeede a man may behold shagge-hayr'd Deuills runne roaring ouer the Stage with Squibs in their mouthes, while Drummers make Thunder in the Tying-house, and the twelue-penny Hirelings make artificiall Lightning in their Heauens.⁶³

This bathetic portrait of the early modern theater, although later in date, would have been familiar enough to Marlowe and Shakespeare. *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and (to a much lesser extent) *Antony and Cleopatra* belittle their protagonists even as the dramatic narrative constructs expansive spatial and temporal visions. While Marlowe's protagonists often assert their conquering power, such claims are rarely unambiguously endorsed; in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's characters seem to profit most from defeat, submission, and containment, which then leads to a subtler diffusion of the theatrical illusion. The explanation for this two-tiered approach

62. Brotton, "Carthage and Tunis," 132.

63. John Melton, *Astrologaster; or, The figure-caster* (London: printed by Barnard Alsop for Edward Blackmore, 1620), E4r.

may lie partly in their shared interest in alternative, competing models of theatrical authority, or perhaps in ongoing tensions between classical and medieval theatrical legacies. Yet the fact that *Dido, Antony and Cleopatra* and *The Tempest* embrace a sometimes deflationary unfixity, never fully committing to or elevating a singular model of theatrical authority, may paradoxically explain the imaginative force of these ethereal dramas. As the influential classical commentator Seneca wrote, the “*moving air is an unconquerable thing.*”⁶⁴ Thus a drama seeking its legacy through the Virgilian storm perhaps acquires the greatest spatial and temporal potential when characters, narrative and illusory sphere elude the grasp of playwright, players and audience alike, within the moving, “breathing” world of early modern theater.

University of Exeter
Exeter, United Kingdom

64. Seneca, *Natural Questions*, trans. Thomas H. Corcoran (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2014), 1:180-1, italics mine. See also Mazzio, “History of Air,” 159.

DAVID MCINNIS

The Year's Work in Marlowe Studies: 2014

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given that it was the 450th anniversary of Marlowe's birth, 2014 proved an immensely productive year for Marlowe scholars, with Daniel Cadman and Andrew Duxfield's guest-edited *Early Modern Literary Studies* special issue, "Christopher Marlowe: Identities, Traditions, Afterlives" and M. L. Stapleton's monograph, *Marlowe's Ovid: The "Elegies" in the Marlowe Canon*, plus around fifty other shorter publications on Marlowe's work being published.¹ (Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan's superb collection, *Christopher Marlowe at 450*, was held over until early 2015 and will be discussed in next year's "Year's Work" article).² From studies of Marlovian ambivalent attitude to "wit" (or poetic production), characterized by dissatisfaction, to a Badiou-inspired reading of the concept of "impasse" and the "the dismissal of the arch-metaphysical subject-object polarity" in Marlowe's works, the 2014 Marlowe-related publications were rich and provocative.³

Poetry and Mythology

In *Marlowe's Ovid*, Stapleton reads Marlowe's translations of the *Amores* (c. 19 BCE) (*All Ovids Elegies* and *Certaine of Ovids Elegies*)

1. Daniel Cadman and Andrew Duxfield, eds., *Christopher Marlowe: Identities, Traditions, Afterlives*, special issue, *Early Modern Literary Studies* 23 (2014), <https://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/journal/index.php/emls/issue/view/10> (hereafter cited as Cadman & Duxfield); and M. L. Stapleton, *Marlowe's Ovid: The "Elegies" in the Marlowe Canon* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014). Hereafter cited as *Marlowe's Ovid*.

2. Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan, eds., *Christopher Marlowe at 450* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2015).

3. Bryan Lowrance, "Marlowe's Wit: Power, Language, and the Literary in *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*," *Modern Philology* 111.4 (2014): 711–32, 713; Julián Jiménez Heffernan, "Impasse in Marlovian Drama: A Badiou Perspective," *Comparative Literature* 66.1 (2014): 71–94, 73.

against the critical grain, assuming neither that they were necessarily the work of juvenilia, nor that their technical errors are a sign of inferiority that should color our perception of the work. Seen as a work of imitation and emulation, sometimes refracted through the prism of Renaissance commentary texts, the *Elegies* can be profitably related to Marlowe's literary technique in significant ways, and Stapleton sets about "determining exactly how translating the *Amores* into the *Elegies* profited [Marlowe] as a writer" (7). Although the *Elegies* has traditionally not enjoyed the same level of attention from Renaissance scholars as the *Metamorphoses* (c. 8 CE), Stapleton resists the easy (but unfortunately not credible) supposition that it had a "notorious status as forbidden reading," demonstrating instead that even clergymen used this erotic writing "as support for Christian authority" (12). The *Elegies* was the Ovidian text with which Marlowe was demonstrably most familiar, and although the *Metamorphoses'* presence can be felt throughout the Marlowe canon, it is the act of translating the *Amores* that (Stapleton argues) assists Marlowe in the theatrically necessary act of "creating the illusion, in poetical form, of a human being speaking to others, and to himself or to an audience in soliloquy" (26). This is not an exercise in allusion-spotting or source study; it is a detailed exploration of "Marlowe's Ovidian poetics," supported by an extensive knowledge of classical writings and by close readings of the Ovidian / Marlovian *Elegies* and Marlowe's other literary works (31).

The first chapter, on the *Elegies*, explores how the *Amores* "predicts" the sonnet sequences of the 1580s and 90s and thus provides Marlowe with an alternative model of literary subjectivity (36). It offers a generous summary of the key elements of Ovid's work and their significance, briefly noting the features that Marlowe would subsequently embrace (the mocking of cuckolds, soliloquies describing unjustified duplicity, and declarations of fidelity, for example). It also observes that several of the elegies "resemble scenes with speakers and dialogue," hence the act of translating them offered Marlowe the opportunity to hone his craft as a playwright, and to refine the use of "dissimulation, overconfidence, and autoincrimination"—traits that his dramatic protagonists would come to embody (54, 56). Subsequent chapters analyze Marlowe's plays through the lens created in chapter 1. The sexual sublimations of the *Tamburlaine* plays are read as "a residual effect from translating the *Amores*," and the correspondences between the warrior and the lover "demonstrate the transference from the elegiac form into the dramatic" (57–58, 59). *Tamburlaine* is shown to owe a surprising debt to the techniques of the "desultor" or speaking-subject of the *Amores*, including a "nuanced

dramatic speech with a richly variegated emotional range” (78). Chapter 3 seeks to recuperate *Dido, Queen of Carthage* from any lingering accusations of triviality or immaturity, arguing instead that Marlowe “modulates his insensitive elegiac speaker” into his character of Dido; that (following the *Elegies*) he undermines his characters and revels in their humiliation through “a type of overarching authorial sabotage”; that he shares with Ovid a sense of the “corrosive effects” of love; and that he took from Ovid “a curious authorial indifference to human suffering” (85, 88, 97, 101).

Chapters 4 and 5 continue to trace Marlowe’s works in their order of first printing, focusing on *Edward II* and (following Carter Hailey’s dating of the paper stock) *The Massacre at Paris*.⁴ In *Edward II*, as Marlowe fashions his characters he persists with the “distancing principle” he learned through close study of Ovid’s irony, drawing on the desultor-figure’s “dissimulations, autoincrimination, disorderly sexuality, misogyny, and amorality” in his creation of Gaveston, Mortimer Junior, Isabella, and the rest (109). This chapter, perhaps more than the others, privileges formalist and philological approaches to texts, using a concordance-based analysis of the play’s correspondences to Ovid’s poetry to examine Marlowe’s handling of deceit, dissimulation, Machiavellianism and sexuality. In *The Massacre at Paris* by contrast, Marlowe’s chief Ovidianism is located not only in the play’s wit and humor, but also its inherent dualism—as observed in the “structural swerve between the two religious factions,” the form of which “implies a consciousness such as the desultor’s directing the action” (138).

Chapter 6 returns to Marlowe’s poetry to explore the Ovidian influence on *Hero and Leander* beyond the epyllion’s reliance on the *Metamorphoses*. Technical similarities such as the “pronounced narrative lacunae” associated with and defining both Corinna and Hero, the reliance on images of touch and sight, and “grossly sensual description” of erotic physicality are identified as significant here (157, 161). Stapleton’s attention to Marlowe climaxes in his rebuttal of earlier editors of the poem (namely C. F. Tucker Brooke) who transposed lines in the consummation scene, in which knowledge of Ovid vindicates the order as it appears in the first printing, by Edward Blount in 1598. Stapleton argues that the “rising yu’rie mount” that Leander scales, which so confused earlier editors, is Hero’s abdomen, not breast (a reading confirmed by John Donne’s imagery in his

4. On the dating of the undated *Massacre* edition, Stapleton defers to R. Carter Hailey, “The Publication Date of Marlowe’s *Massacre at Paris*, with a Note on the Collier Leaf,” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 1 (2011): 25–40.

rendition of the *Elegies*); that it belongs where it was initially printed in the sequence; and that Leander's "fresh alarme" signals "another merry bout" shortly after the first postcoital moment (thus confirming the 1598 printing's order of events, which Brooke thought required emendation) (182–83).

The final two chapters attend to the interplay of the erotic, the magical, and the poetical in *Doctor Faustus* (where it is suggested that "[t]he doctor was nascent in the desultory, and the complementarity of the Christian and the Ovidian informs the two figures, fusing them") and the role of Ovidian emulation (*aemulatio*) in *The Jew of Malta*, where Barabas embodies the "glib, delusional, and self-aggrandizing young lover" of the *Elegies* (187, 205). Stapleton suggests that the "wild mood swings, a kind of poetic bipolarity" that are found in the *Elegies* contribute to the generic hybridity of this latter play, at least partially accounting for the otherwise baffling swerve from revenge tragedy to farce after act 2 (207).

Stapleton's monograph was not the only sustained engagement with Marlowe's poetry this year. Corinna Box also turned to Marlowe's Ovid in her consideration of Marlowe's poetic technique in translating Latin verse and, more importantly, his scholarly approach in doing so, which results in Marlowe's development of "a new method of expression formulated specifically on the principles of Ovid's Latin elegiac verse."⁵ Through attention to such details as Marlowe's initial departure from Ovid's opening (in a manner consonant with Ovid's "intended effect" of surprise), or Marlowe's alteration of Ovid's line from hexameter to pentameter—which grants "the power to write a different line to the 'imagined' perfect translation," but requires carefully placed caesura to ensure the heroic couplets resemble Ovid's elegiac couplets—Box demonstrates how Marlowe's Latinate English embodies "a sophisticated sense of Ovid's poetic identity."⁶ Sheldon Brammall, in his *Review of English Studies* Essay Prize-winning article, focuses on Marlowe's direct translations of Virgil's *Aeneid* (c. 29–19 BCE), arguing that the choice of speeches to be translated in *Dido, Queen of Carthage* was influenced by the Renaissance commentary tradition and that they are "fundamental to the play's structure."⁷ Brammall argues that Marlowe was fascinated

5. Corinna Box, "The Power to Change a Line: Marlowe's Translation of Ovid's *Amores*," *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 109–28, 110.

6. Box, "The Power," 112, 114, 114.

7. Sheldon Brammall, "'Sound this Angrie Message in Thine Eares': Sympathy and the Translations of the *Aeneid* in Marlowe's *Dido, Queene of Carthage*," *Review of English Studies* 65 (2014): 383–402, 386. Hereafter cited parenthetically.

by “the sheer rhetorical power embodied in the speeches” by Virgil, and by the way “the different hermeneutic strands of the Renaissance reception of Virgil can be placed against each other” (391). Accordingly, the model of Virgilian engagement outlined by Patrick Cheney (for example)—one of “opposition or subversion”—is deemed inadequate by Brammall, who prefers to see *Dido, Queen of Carthage* offering a uniquely “pessimistic” reading of Virgil (391, 402).⁸ He observes that Marlowe significantly avoids including the sympathetic elements of the epic and argues that the “result is a play that dramatizes the ‘polycentric’ aspect of Virgil’s *Aeneid* more emphatically than any that had come before” (401).

Christine Edwards also examines Marlowe’s manipulation of Classical poetic sources in her consideration of competing Ovidian and Virgilian debts in Marlowe’s *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.⁹ She explains Marlowe’s continued reliance on both sources (despite their representing alternative traditions of the Dido story) in terms of a “bookish awareness” that represents “Dido and Aeneas always in relation to the tradition that they come from.”¹⁰ Much as Box argued for the sophistication of Marlowe’s translation, Edwards considers how Marlowe “reimagines imitation as an art form” in which the characters are intensely aware of their literary models and the audience is expected to have familiarity with the mythic traditions being manipulated by Marlowe.¹¹ Lisa Hopkins’ examination of Marlowe’s manipulation of mythology focuses on the yoking together of two characters, Aeneas and Actaeon, rather than on a single play or on the writer’s reliance on a single source.¹² In the post-Galfridian tradition, Aeneas is central to the justification of British empire through the *translatio imperii* trope (his descendant, Brutus, allegedly founding Britain and Troynovant, its capital); Actaeon’s status as emblematic of cuckoldry, by contrast, undermines patrilineal transmission.¹³ Actaeon, who appears in *Edward II* and in *Doctor*

8. Brammall is engaging with Patrick Cheney’s use of “opposition” and “subversion” in Cheney’s *Marlowe’s Counterfeit Profession* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997) and *Marlowe’s Republican Authorship* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

9. Christine Edwards, “Bookish Play: Imitation and Innovation in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*,” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 14 (2014): 29–48.

10. Edwards, “Bookish Play,” 30.

11. Edwards, “Bookish Play,” 31.

12. Lisa Hopkins, “What’s Actaeon to Aeneas? Marlowe’s Mythological Mischief,” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 49–62.

13. Hopkins, “What’s Actaeon to Aeneas?” 50.

Faustus, is thus “both an antitype of Aeneas and also a lens through which the cultural meanings of Aeneas can be negotiated.”¹⁴

The amplification of classical sources (primarily Musaeus) in Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander* is the subject of Bruce Brandt’s contribution to Cadman and Duxfield’s special issue.¹⁵ Brandt identifies five primary sites of amplification in Marlowe’s poem: “the role played by the narrator” (who becomes a character in Marlowe), “the possibility of choice in love” (amplified into an interrogation of free will in Marlowe), “the appearance and beauty of Hero and Leander” (constructed, as in Musaeus, through evocation rather than direct description, but elaborately and humorously so in Marlowe), “their sexual immaturity and Hero’s seduction” (Marlowe eschews mention of the couple as adults, as husband and wife, limning them as adolescent and emotional), and “the consummation of their affair” (portrayed comically by Marlowe).¹⁶ Taken together, they offer a consistent picture of Marlowe elaborating his source text, which leads Brandt to conclude that the “echo and amplification of Musaeus’s concluding use of dawn surely suggests that Marlowe knew where he wanted his poem to go and that it ended where he wanted it to,” rather than *Hero and Leander* being incomplete.¹⁷ Laetitia Sansonetti reads *Hero and Leander* in terms of its ostensible role in posthumous biographical construction.¹⁸ Citing Thomas Beard’s unfavourable use of Marlowe as an example of divinely punished authors (in *The theatre of Gods judgements*, 1597) and Frances Meres’ more ambivalent praise of Marlowe’s scholarship alongside condemnation of his epicurean and atheistic tendencies (in *Palladis Tamia*, 1598), Sansonetti conjecturally offers George Chapman’s 1598 continuation of *Hero and Leander* as “a counter-attack against such portrayals of Marlowe” (2–3). The style of Marlowe’s *Hero and Leander* is “not so much Musaeus or Ovid as himself translating and adapting Ovid,” that is, a distinctively Marlovian authorial tone achieved through “reverent parody” (7). Chapman’s continuation of the poem, therefore, is a variation of Marlowe’s own authorial construct: he similarly “submitted the main features of Marlowe’s poem to a form of reverent rewriting” (11).

14. Hopkins, “What’s Actaeon to Aeneas?” 58.

15. Bruce Brandt, “Marlowe’s Amplification of Musaeus in *Hero and Leander*,” in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–15.

16. Brandt, “Marlowe’s Amplification,” 2.

17. Brandt, “Marlowe’s Amplification,” 15.

18. Laetitia Sansonetti, “*Hero and Leander*: The Making of an Author,” in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–18. Hereafter cited parenthetically.

Marlowe's use of poetry—specifically Dante's *Divine Comedy* (c. 1307–21)—is the subject of Roy Eriksen's note in *Cahiers Elisabethains*.¹⁹ Following the identification of Marlowe's possible use of Italian sources first made by nineteenth-century Italian poet Giosué Carducci, Eriksen proposes Dante as an influence on the B-Text of *Doctor Faustus*. Carducci's Elegia XXXII (“Pe ’l Chiarone da Civitavecchia. Leggendo il Marlowe”; “Travelling from Civitavecchia to Chiarone. While Reading Marlowe”) associates Marlowe and Dante in terms of atmosphere, character, and specific allusions.²⁰ Eriksen consequently proposes that it is “a distinct possibility” that “Dante’s swift circling Geryon is the source of the similarly circling and fast-moving dragon that flies Faustus and Mephostophilis to Rome.”²¹

Religion in Marlowe's Works

Clearly, Marlowe scholars do not “count religion but a childish toy,” as 2014’s numerous critical inquiries into Marlowe’s engagement with religion testify.²² In his *Martyrs and Players in Early Modern England*, David K. Anderson extends his earlier analysis of Faustus’ place in a society he ostensibly opposes, likening Faustus to the Man of Despair in John Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678) as an admonitory lesson for the devout Christian to actively avoid choosing Faustus’ fate for themselves.²³ He argues that Marlowe “is neither preaching predestination nor preaching against it but rather is manipulating a population of theater-goers who are already wrestling with its doctrines in order to intensify their response to his protagonist.”²⁴ Karol Cooper, by contrast, approaches the staging of Faustus’ soul by way of its rhetorical construction, which “provides the individual with a cultural means for self-identification” and “by withholding the soul as a visual object . . . exemplifies how a sense of self is founded upon,

19. Roy Eriksen, “Carducci Reads Marlowe: Dante and *Doctor Faustus* (B-Text),” *Cahiers Elisabethains* 85 (2014): 57–66.

20. Eriksen, “Carducci Reads Marlowe,” 60.

21. Eriksen, “Carducci Reads Marlowe,” 62.

22. Christopher Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta*, ed. James R. Siemon (2001; repr., London: A & C Black, 1994), prologue.14.

23. David K. Anderson, “Tragic Complicity: Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*,” in *Martyrs and Players in Early Modern England: Tragedy, Religion and Violence on Stage* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 151–81. See also his earlier “The Theater of the Damned: Religion and the Audience in the Tragedy of Christopher Marlowe,” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 54.1 (2012): 79–109.

24. Anderson, “Tragic Complicity,” 176.

and continually recreated and tested through a series of self-dialogic, imaginative speech acts.”²⁵ Ultimately, for Cooper, Marlowe’s play breaks with the morality play tradition and suggests that “Faustus’s body *and* soul will suffer the same fate, because they are considered to be one and the same.”²⁶ Noting the “unresolved tensions concerning the devil’s nature, power, and purposes” in anecdotes about diabolical apparitions at early performances of *Doctor Faustus*, James Ross Macdonald investigates the diabolic roles distinctive to Protestant and Calvinist viewpoints, wherein the devil is figured (respectively) as independent and thus the cause of unmotivated evil, or limited (by God) in his autonomy and thus more an agent of temptation.²⁷ Macdonald attempts to clarify the confusion inherent in the playtext(s) by suggesting that “Calvinist concurrentism (in which divine, diabolic, and human wills are simultaneously implicated in the commission of action) creates coherence in the doctor’s experience of diabolic temptation.”²⁸ His argument places the tragic and comic plots of the A-text into close dialogue such that “the Calvinist conception of the devil as a mental tempter” is contrasted with “the ‘popular’ notion of him as a physical tormenter,” with theological dissonance governing the A-text as a result.²⁹ The B-text is thus seen as attempting to contain the dissonance of the A-text rather than simply offering an alternative to it.

John Guillory and William W. E. Slights each attend to reformation as a vital context for interpreting Marlowe’s drama.³⁰ Guillory examines both religious and ultimately philosophical reformation in the exchange between Petrus Ramus and the Duke of Guise just prior to Ramus’s murder in *The Massacre at Paris*, noting the peculiar intrusion of comic elements and concluding that the “entire movement of the scene vexes the question of the relation of philosophy to theology, a relation too unsettled in this instance to explain Ramus’s Protestantism, much less his sympathy for the

25. Karol Cooper, “The Modernisation of the Medieval Staging of Soul in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*,” in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–17, 3.

26. Cooper, “The Modernisation,” 17, emphasis in original.

27. James Ross Macdonald, “Calvinist Theology and ‘Country Divinity’ in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*,” *Studies in Philology* 111.4 (2014): 821–44.

28. Macdonald, “Calvinist Theology,” 823–24.

29. Macdonald, “Calvinist Theology,” 824.

30. John Guillory, “Marlowe, Ramus, and the Reformation of Philosophy,” *ELH* 81.3 (2014): 693–732; and William W. E. Slights, “The Reformed Conscience: Woodes, Marlowe, and Shakespeare,” in *Stages of Engagement: Drama and Religion in Post-Reformation England*, ed. James D. Mardock and Kathryn Read McPherson (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 2014), 21–39.

Huguenot cause” (698).³¹ Marlowe’s familiarity with Ramism from his days at Cambridge would, Guillory argues, create a perception of Ramus as a reformer, “but not exactly a Protestant reformer” (720). In this moment of religious disputation the Ramist model of “diagrams and manuals” clashes with “such dialogic rituals as recitation and disputation” with the potential for a very uncertain reformation of the transmission of knowledge (721). In the figure of Ramus, then, Marlowe recognized “a formidable enemy, even of the theater itself” (721). *Slights* also focuses on *The Massacre at Paris*, placing it alongside Shakespeare’s *Henry V* (1599) and Nathaniel Woodes’ *The Conflict of Conscience* (c. 1572) to consider the self-reflexive process of self-knowledge acquired through exercise of conscience, and how the individual process maps onto the collective conscience or “conscience of the realm” (23). Theater is instrumental in this process, since it uses conscience to “shape characterization, dramatic narratives, and a new sense of responsibility to the state, the church, and the self” (22). Marlowe’s play is seen to explore the impingement of “emerging national agendas” on “the relationship between the individual conscience and the prerogatives of the state” (29).

The neglected or misinterpreted representations of religious issues (particularly pertaining to Islam) in the *Tamburlaine* plays is the subject of Joel Elliot Slotkin’s investigation, in which he laments: “to treat the *Tamburlaine* plays and other plays dealing with the Muslim world primarily as allegories of trade risks obscuring some of the cultural work such plays performed.”³² *2 Tamburlaine* features heavily here on account of Slotkin’s perception of that play’s valuation of the “search for religious knowledge” (410). Slotkin appeals to the concept of “Pyrrhonian skepticism” (as opposed to Machiavellian religious skepticism), common in the early modern period and supportive of religious inquiry (though inclined to deny the possibility of definitive answers) to explicate *2 Tamburlaine*’s interest in religion (412). He posits the behavior of Orcanes and Tamburlaine as competing alternatives: the former entertains religious syncretism, the latter deems Islam and Christianity “equally contemptible,” and the result compels the playgoer to consider non-Christian perspectives (413). Finally, Jens Åklundh’s study of Jewish biological difference and

31. For another 2014 treatment of religious debate in *Massacre*, see Jeanne Mathieu, “Our quarrel is no more / But to defend their strange inventions” (IV.ii.7–8): The Art of Religious Dispute in Christopher Marlowe’s *The Massacre at Paris*,” *Arrêt Sur Scène / Scene Focus* 3 (2014): 137–45.

32. Joel Elliot Slotkin, “Seeke out another Godhead’: Religious Epistemology and Representations of Islam in *Tamburlaine*,” *Modern Philology* 111.3 (2014): 408–36, 409.

conversions to Christianity touches briefly on *The Jew of Malta*, attending to the association of “Jewishness with a beast-like inhumanity” in the character of Barabas, and arguing that (unlike Shakespeare), Marlowe “escapes notions of communal integration by martyrizing Abigail.”³³

Historicized Marlowe

The interest in early modern religion as a context is a particularly clear example of the broader trend to historicize Marlowe’s work, of course, and 2014 was no exception in this regard. Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean’s study of the Lord Strange’s Men offers a “group portrait” of the company that staged *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* at the Rose alongside numerous other “war for religion’s sake” plays in the early 1590s.³⁴ Mathew R. Martin, whose Broadview edition of the *Tamburlaine* plays also came out in 2014, draws on Jerome McGann’s notion of the “materiality” of the mediated literary text, to defend the 1597 octavo’s differences from the two earlier editions of *1 and 2 Tamburlaine* (1590 and 1593) as possessing a certain value of their own rather than being (as they are usually considered by editors) mere corruptions.³⁵ Martin collates and explicates the significances of the 1597 edition’s “errant, materialist tendencies” which consistently see the first printing’s use of the word “martial” revised as “material” in purportedly nonauthoritative (yet sometimes superior) ways.³⁶

Marina Tarlinskaja analyses the development of the iambic pentameter in English, devoting portions of two of her chapters to Marlowe’s mighty line.³⁷ In *Renaissance Drama on the Edge*, Lisa Hopkins returns to the productive concept of “the edge,” first explored solely in the context of Shakespeare in her earlier

33. Jens Åklundh, “Voices of Jewish Converts to Christianity in Late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England,” *The Seventeenth Century* 29.1 (2014): 45–71, 58. Other 2014 publications relevant but not summarized here include Mohamed Elaskary, “Jews and Muslims in Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* and Shakespeare’s *Othello*,” *Arabic Language and Literature* 18.2 (2014): 131–59; and Mathieu, “Our quarrel is no more.”

34. Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean, *Lord Strange’s Men and Their Plays* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2014), 8, 6.

35. Mathew R. Martin, “Inferior Readings: The Transmigration of ‘Material’ in *Tamburlaine the Great*,” *Early Theatre* 17.2 (2014): 57–75, 59.

36. Martin, “Inferior Readings,” 60.

37. Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561–1642* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014).

monograph, and now considers the fascination of Shakespeare's contemporaries, including Marlowe, with walls and psychology (what she calls "the Wall of the Self"); with Saint Paul as an emblematic, conceptual "edge" opposed to Saint Peter; and other instances in which edges and their adjacencies render categorical distinctions (including those of gender, race, and sexuality) altogether unstable.³⁸ Willy Maley and Patrick Murray are interested in the edges of Britain—what they call (following John Kerrigan) "a profoundly archipelagic inclination" in Marlowe's plays, rehearsing the pedagogical, cartographical, and bibliographical stimuli available to Marlowe when he imagined exotic shores.³⁹ Ralf Hertel's investigation of national identity formation provides a close reading of Marlowe's *Edward II* in the context of gender being an integral factor in this process (alongside "shared territory and history, . . . religion, [and] class").⁴⁰ Hertel insists that "the private *is* political and that the two spheres cannot be separated," hence juxtapositions of king and country should not be entertained, and the play should be regarded as being "about a king within a society . . . as a figure tragically related to his surroundings" rather than suffering a private tragedy.⁴¹ In this reading, the lack of providential framework to the play is the point, rather than a shortcoming; man, not God, steers history. Eric Griffin locates *The Jew of Malta* within the context of 1590s xenophobia and anti-Spanish sentiment in particular, situating it alongside the Dutch Libel and *The Book of Sir Thomas More* with their antagonism of stranger communities in London.⁴² He argues that "as in *The Jew of Malta*, or perhaps *because of The Jew of Malta*—which exploited nativist sentiments more completely than any previous Elizabethan drama—the Dutch Church Libel slides Machiavellianism and Jewishness one into the other in ways for which there seems no obvious precedent."⁴³

38. Lisa Hopkins, *Renaissance Drama on the Edge* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 20. See also her earlier *Shakespeare on the Edge: Border-crossing in the Tragedies and the Henriad* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2005).

39. Willy Maley and Patrick Murray, "'And thence as far as Archipelago': Mapping Marlowe's 'British shore,'" in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–24, 14.

40. Ralf Hertel, *Staging England in the Elizabethan History Play: Performing National Identity* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 28.

41. Hertel, *Staging England*, 213, 214, emphasis in original.

42. Eric Griffin, "Shakespeare, Marlowe, and the Stranger Crisis of the Early 1590s," in *Shakespeare and Immigration*, ed. Ruben Espinosa and David Ruiter (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 13–36.

43. Griffin, "Shakespeare, Marlowe," 23, emphasis in original.

In addition to the Manley and MacLean book, the field of theater history was represented by John Christopher Frongillo, Catherine Willits, and Ruth Lunney.⁴⁴ Frongillo attempts to recuperate the oft-dismissed Duke of Vanholt scene from the B-text of *Doctor Faustus* by reading it through the lenses of “mummery, parody, pageants, and presentations” and connecting it to the concerns of the play as a whole.⁴⁵ Willits considers Marlowe’s medieval dramatic inheritance in relation to Calymath’s invasion of Malta in *The Jew of Malta* and the theatrical tradition of staging Christ’s entry into Jerusalem (especially in the Chester, N-Town, and York Jerusalem plays): “Because this entry is performed by two racial outsiders (Barabas, a Jew and Calymath, a Turk), Marlowe inverts the typical mapping of the community by Christ as spiritual center, but like the medieval entry plays, deconstructs the hypothetical community of Malta, revealing it to be inexorably disparate and fragmented.”⁴⁶ Her argument about influence operates at the level of “type” (the entry play) rather than claiming a specific mystery play as Marlowe’s source, but the royal entry staged in the final act of *The Jew of Malta* can nevertheless be seen to conform to generic expectations of such dramatic processions. In “The Bell, the Bodies, and the Bonking: *The Massacre at Paris* and Its Early Playhouse Audiences,” Lunney, by contrast, seeks to explicate the influence of Marlowe’s *The Massacre at Paris* on subsequent playwrights rather than explore Marlowe’s own influences. Noting the play’s tremendous effect on the drama of the 1590s, Lunney isolates three connected sensorial facets of the play as contributing to its immediate affective legacy: the aural (as encapsulated by the dreadful ringing of the bells throughout the massacre), the visceral (the violent stabbings), and the licentiously sensual (sleeping with the enemy: the “bonking” of her title). Their distinctive features (respectively) are the collocation (rather than separation) of the sound effects and speech; the sheer number of bodies (despite their relative lack of spectacle); and the unusualness of lustful women and of Machiavellian rulers who lust after power rather than after women.

44. John Christopher Frongillo, “More Masques, Mummings, and Metadrama: The Duke of Vanholt Scene in Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* (B-text),” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 79–90; Catherine Willits, “The Dynamics and Staging of Community in Medieval ‘Entry into Jerusalem’ Plays: Dramatic Resources Influencing Marlowe’s *Jew of Malta*,” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 27 (2014): 78–109; Ruth Lunney, “The Bell, the Bodies, and the Bonking: *The Massacre at Paris* and Its Early Playhouse Audiences,” *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 91–108.

45. Frongillo, “More Masques,” 88.

46. Willits, “The Dynamics,” 79.

Bronwyn Johnston's chapter on *Doctor Faustus* focuses on contract law rather than theology, comparing Marlowe's magus to historical and stage magicians who successfully escape their diabolical pacts, and argues that "Faustus's contract is not valid in the first place . . . since Mephistopheles does not comply with most of the stipulations."⁴⁷ Mephistopheles' failures are attributable to the general understanding of the devil's limitations in the Renaissance: "The Renaissance devil knew how to manipulate or best use the laws of nature but was unable to break them. . . . Mephistopheles and his ilk is restricted to bending—but not breaking—the natural laws, demonstrating not supernatural but superhuman feats."⁴⁸ In theatrical tradition, questions of repentance are shown to be less significant than possessing sufficient guile to outsmart the devil through trickery. Marlowe's protagonist, despite his scholarship, ignores the terms of his own contract and lacks the presence of mind to outwit Mephistopheles, who in turn differs from most stage devils in being "cleverer and more skilful" than his human servant.⁴⁹

C. K. Preedy, whose monograph on Marlowe's literary skepticism has now been officially awarded the Roma Gill Prize for 2011–12, produced an article in 2014 on Marlowe's interrogation of monarchy through the pun of the crown as diadem and as coin. She observes that "the potential overlap between monetary and monarchical crowns persistently informs the way in which Marlowe's characters regard the royal diadem itself; hereditary monarchs and usurpers alike often treat the crown as a private commodity, an object that can be bought and sold."⁵⁰ Hence Tamburlaine treats crowns as "a material emblem of authority that can be stolen and exchanged," Dido uses it "as an object with literal trade value" in bribing Aeneas to stay, and Edward II "offers crowns to his favorites, commercializing his crown to the point where he endangers its sacral value."⁵¹ Marlowe's plays are thus seen to devalue the monarchy's metonymic symbol of the crown by punning on its alternative, exchange/commodity meaning.

47. Bronwyn Johnston, "Who the Devil is in Charge? Mastery and the Faustian Pact on the Early Modern Stage," in *Magical Transformations on the Early Modern English Stage*, ed. Lisa Hopkins and Helen Ostovich (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2014), 31–46, 32.

48. Johnston, "Who the Devil is in Charge?," 40.

49. Johnston, "Who the Devil is in Charge?," 46.

50. C. K. Preedy "(De)Valuing the Crown in *Tamburlaine*, *Dido Queen of Carthage*, and *Edward II*," *SEL: Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 54.2 (2014): 259–77, 261.

51. Preedy, "(De)Valuing the Crown," 263.

Edward II

Bucking the trend against single-text studies, *Edward II* stood out as the Marlowe text receiving the most sustained individual attention this year. Bethany Packard takes early modern gaming as the impetus for her analysis; specifically, Sir John of Hainault's reference to "Prisoner's Base."⁵² Noting that Marlowe conflates rather than equates the concepts of "stage play, game play, and war as a kind of game," Packard explains that "while the rhetoric of game play may isolate and deride father and son [that is, Edward II and Prince Edward], Marlowe also uses it to embroil most of his characters in a match prone to sudden reversals" between victim and aggressor, thus partially explicating the "changeable characterization" of Prince Edward in particular.⁵³ Christopher D. Foley, by contrast, attempts to historicize the play by aligning historical phenomenology with ecocritical concerns.⁵⁴ He links *Edward II* and the anonymous ballad, "The Woful Lamentation of Jane Shore" conceptually (through early modern waste-management) and geographically (in relation to Shoreditch, the likely performance location of Marlowe's play in the early 1590s and the subject of a false etymology in the anonymous Jane Shore ballad). In particular, Foley focuses on the "prominent staging of abject ditches and channels as sites appropriate for the punishment of disorderly individuals" in both ballad and play, reading these as symptomatic of a broader cultural concern over the detrimental effects of excess waste on the public health.⁵⁵

Christine Edwards is interested in oscillations and tensions within the play, at the level of its subversive treatment of extreme passion and reason; using the philosopher Tzachi Zamir's concept of "structures of experience," Edwards claims that the play "structures an experience of doubt, in which learning is not about identifying which faction is correct but in recognizing that sometimes it is impossible to do so."⁵⁶ Thomas P. Anderson returns to an equally old

52. Bethany Packard, "Playing Prisoner's Base in Marlowe's *Edward II*," *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 5–27.

53. Packard, "Playing Prisoner's Base," 7, 13, 26.

54. Christopher D. Foley, "Marlowe's *Edward II* and 'The Woful Lamentation of Jane Shore': Tactical Engagements with Sewers in Late-Elizabethan London," in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–30.

55. Foley, "Tactical Engagements," 9.

56. Christine Edwards, "In No Respect Can Contraries be True': Passion and Reason in Marlowe's *Edward II*," *Ceræ: An Australasian Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 1 (2014): 53–74, 58.

debate about dualities, with his investigation of the doctrine of the King's two bodies as it plays out in *Edward II*.⁵⁷ He considers the possibility that the play may have used a live actor to reproduce the distinctive historical detail of Edward's effigy appearing on his royal hearse, in which case embodying the proxy for perpetual sovereignty means that "staging the effigy becomes an expression of the limits of sovereign power even as the prosthetic function of the ceremonial ritual is to ensure its survival" (587). Although he openly acknowledges the conjectural nature of this reading, he draws support via analogy with the murder of Edward, where the historical account (the notorious anal rape by red hot poker) looms large in the audience's mind despite its actual absence in Marlowe's redaction (598). The degrading acts inflicted on the royal body demystify sovereignty and produce "the desire for its return as an effigy on the hearse" (601).

Three critics used the occasion of a special issue of *Shakespeare Bulletin* marking the twentieth anniversary of Derek Jarman's death to revisit his cinematic adaptation of *Edward II* (1991). Pascale Aebischer uses extensive archival research (including Jarman's workbooks and photo albums) to follow the development of his thinking on *Edward II* over the course of a career that includes his university education, his making of the film, and his penning of an unpublished screenplay musical ("Pansy") that constitutes a more optimistic adaptation of Marlowe's work than the *Edward II* film.⁵⁸ Aebischer's article is particularly useful in that she reproduces numerous illustrations from Jarman's unpublished notes (in higher definition and in color in the electronic version of the article). Lee Benjamin Huttner similarly begins with the Jarman archive—the notebook, published script, and the *Edward II* film as we have it—to consider the alternative endings to Jarman's film as "multiple possible representations of queer history, as multiple historiographic inscriptions onto the queer body," and how Jarman's "many acts of self-archivization" illustrate the "already undead" or "living in the afterlife" status of a gay man diagnosed with AIDS.⁵⁹ He uses these competing alternatives as the impetus for a study of productive anachronism and the "historiopoetics" of the "temporally-inflicted sexual subjectivities" in Jarman's *Edward II*.⁶⁰

57. Thomas P. Anderson, "Surpassing the King's Two Bodies: The Politics Of Staging the Royal Effigy in Marlowe's *Edward II*," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 32.4 (2014): 585–611.

58. Pascale Aebischer, "'To the future': Derek Jarman's *Edward II* in the Archive," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 32.3 (2014): 429–50.

59. Lee Benjamin Huttner, "Body Positive: The Vibrant Present of Derek Jarman's *Edward II* (1991)," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 32.3 (2014): 393–412, 394, 397.

60. Huttner, "Body Positive," 396.

Alexandra Parsons' article in the special issue looks at the *Queer Edward II* book published in 1991 to complement Jarman's film, as a response to the "Section 28" legislation prohibiting the promotion of homosexuality in the United Kingdom.⁶¹ Comparisons between the high-profile BBC-funded film and the lesser known British Film Institute-sponsored book, which were affected unequally by "Section 28" concerns, offers an important glimpse of how Jarman's political activism illuminates his creative work. Parsons examines Jarman's treatment of childhood sexuality, the role of autobiography and queer history in his work, and Jarman's use of queer activism (especially the direct action group OutRage!'s "Equality Now" campaign).⁶²

Marlowe's Legacy

Curiously, three critics engaged in what we might call Marlovian "myth-busting" when attending to his posthumous reception. M. L. Stapleton extends his interest in the Marlowe-Ovid relationship to reconsider Ben Jonson's satiric comedy, *Poetaster* (1601), where he finds in Jonson's figure of Ovid "a likely Marlovian presence" that deserves greater critical attention.⁶³ Unlike Jonson's more obvious satirical portraits of fellow writers, Stapleton argues that it would be "unwise" to think that Jonson would have used the figure of Ovid in his famously scathing play to "renounce" or "repudiate" Marlowe.⁶⁴ Rather, Ovid is seen by Stapleton as "a type of homage" or "tribute" to Marlovian poetics.⁶⁵ Annette Drew-Bear breaks the usual mold of Marlovian scholarship pertaining to the anonymously published *Lust's Dominion* (c. 1600) by avoiding the issue of the 1657 edition's titlepage ascription to Marlowe and instead focusing on the play's more meaningful Marlovian inheritance: "verbal echoes of passages and plot situations from Marlowe's plays" and "the depiction of Eleazar's overreaching histrionic villainy and . . . the portrayal of the queen's sensational villainy."⁶⁶ In Drew-Bear's reading, the play exhibits a

61. Alexandra Parsons, "History, Activism, and the Queer Child in Derek Jarman's *Queer Edward II* (1991)," *Shakespeare Bulletin* 32.3 (2014): 413–28.

62. Parsons, "History, Activism," 422.

63. M. L. Stapleton, "Marlovian Residue in Jonson's *Poetaster*," in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–26, 3.

64. Stapleton, "Marlovian Residue," 2.

65. Stapleton, "Marlovian Residue," 2, 26.

66. Annette Drew-Bear, "Marlovian Influences in *Lust's Dominion*; Or, *The Lascivious Queen*," *Marlowe Studies: An Annual* 4 (2014): 63–78, 65.

variety of Marlovian debts (*Dido, Queen of Carthage*, *The Jew of Malta*, *Doctor Faustus*, *The Massacre at Paris*, and *Tamburlaine*), providing a more complex example of Marlowe's legacy than the wave of post-*Tamburlaine* conqueror plays of the 1590s (for example). The primary focus here is the unexpected survival of the Queen Mother, which "defies conventions of both gender and genre" in the spirit of "a transgressive Marlovian villain," albeit tempered in her repentance by the likely contribution of Thomas Dekker's (and possibly John Marston's) hand in the play.⁶⁷ Similarly concerned with apocryphal stories of Marlowe's literary forays, though this time in the context of biography and his socializing with certain men of letters rather than with any ostensible authorship of dubiously attributed works, Lindsay Ann Reid provides a meticulous overview of how twentieth-century scholarship perpetuated a baseless story of Marlowe's membership of the "School of Night."⁶⁸ In a thorough piece of her own detective work, Reid tracks the rise in popularity of the now discredited theory that Marlowe, Walter Raleigh, George Chapman, and Thomas Hariot formed a secret society devoted to esoteric matters, before turning to a spate of recent detective stories in which the society becomes the subject of actual academic fiction.⁶⁹ In all three novels surveyed, Reid demonstrates that the "the promise of new insight into the Marlowe-Shakespeare relationship" provides the impetus, as it arguably did for the scholars a century or more ago who were first drawn to this elaborate theory.⁷⁰

Finally, Christopher Orchard turns to a multimedia novel, *Slow Chocolate Autopsy* (1997) produced by the writer Iain Sinclair and the graphic artists Dave McKean.⁷¹ The novel's time-travelling protagonist, Norton, is instrumental in Marlowe's murder. With the benefit of belonging to the future, Norton has a particular concern with Marlowe's posthumous representations, and is particularly keen to "muzzle" Anthony Burgess's account of Marlowe's death in his 1993 novel *A Dead Man in Deptford*.⁷² Orchard argues that this is so that

67. Drew-Bear, "Marlovian Influences," 75.

68. Lindsay Ann Reid, "The Spectre of the School of Night: Former Scholarly Fictions and the Stuff of Academic Fiction," in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–31.

69. The novels discussed are Alan Wall's *School of Night* (2001), Louis Bayard's *The School of Night* (2011), and Deborah Harkness' *Shadow of Night* (2012).

70. Reid, "The Spectre," 31.

71. Christopher Orchard, "'How to muzzle Anthony Burgess': Re-Staging Marlowe's Murder in Iain Sinclair and Dave McKean's *Slow Chocolate Autopsy*," in Cadman & Duxfield, 1–19.

72. Orchard, "How to muzzle," 1.

Sinclair “can reveal his own abilities at deconstructing the premises of Marlovian biographies” despite Burgess’s success at exposing the “weakness of biography through his biographical fiction.”⁷³

University of Melbourne
Melbourne, Australia

73. Orchard, “How to muzzle,” 4.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Roy Eriksen is Professor of English Renaissance Literature and Culture at University of Agder in Kristiansand, Norway. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Oslo in 1984. Eriksen mainly works in interdisciplinary Renaissance Studies, including architecture and urbanism, and has written extensively on Christopher Marlowe. Among his publications are “*The Forme of Faustus Fortunes*”: *A Study of The Tragedy of Doctor Faustus* (1987), *The Building in the Text: From Alberti to Shakespeare and Milton* (2001), *L’Edificio testuale* (2014), and numerous edited volumes, such as, *Form and the Arts* (2003), *Ashes to Ashes; Art in Rome between Humanism and Maniera* (2006), *Imitation, Representation and Printing in the Italian Renaissance* (2009), and *Approaches to the Text: From Pre-Gospel to Post-Baroque* (2014). Recent articles focus on Margery Kempe, Giorgio Vasari, Shakespeare, Dante, and Marlowe. Eriksen is preparing studies on Marlowe and on Leon Battista Alberti.

Paul Frazer is a lecturer in early modern English literature at Northumbria University, United Kingdom. His major research interests (and recent publications) relate to representations of physical, social, and spiritual movement/mobility in the works of Marlowe, Shakespeare, Dekker, and Webster. Frazer has particular interests in religious polemic, propaganda, and ways in which classical and biblical tropes relating to movement (such as Icarus, Theseus, Christ, pilgrimage, and exile) were used by these early modern dramatists to explore and contemplate cultural change.

Lisa Hopkins is Professor of English at Sheffield Hallam University and coeditor of *Shakespeare*, the journal of the British Shakespeare Association, and of the *Arden Early Modern Drama Guides*. She is the author of *Christopher Marlowe, Renaissance Dramatist* (2008), *A Christopher Marlowe Chronology* (2005), and *Christopher Marlowe: A Literary Life* (2000). Her recent publications include *Renaissance Drama on the Edge*

(2014), *Drama and the Succession to the Crown, 1561–1633* (2011), and *The Cultural Uses of the Caesars on the English Renaissance Stage* (2008).

Bronnie Johnston is a research fellow at the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies at the University of Toronto. Her research is focused on magic and science in early modern English literature and culture, and she has a longstanding interest in *Doctor Faustus* and the many incarnations of the Faust story. Johnston completed her doctorate on demonology and science in the Renaissance theatre at the University of Oxford in 2014 and is preparing her thesis for publication as a monograph. At Oxford, she was employed as a senior college lecturer in early modern literature at Keble College. She has also held teaching posts at the University of Otago, Oxford Brookes University, and Oxford's Department for Continuing Education.

Ian McAdam teaches courses in early modern literature at the University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada. He is the author of *The Irony of Identity: Self and Imagination in the Drama of Christopher Marlowe* (1999) and *Magic and Masculinity in Early Modern English Drama* (2009). He is working on a project entitled "Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Secular Christ."

David McInnis is the Gerry Higgins Lecturer in Shakespeare Studies in the English and Theatre Studies Program at the University of Melbourne in Australia. He is currently editing Thomas Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* (1599) for the Revels Plays series. In addition to his monograph, he has published *Mind-Travelling and Voyage Drama in Early Modern England* (2013) and the edited collection *Lost Plays in Shakespeare's England* (2014; coedited with Matthew Steggle). His essays have been published in the *Review of English Studies*; *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*; *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*; *Notes & Queries*; and elsewhere. With Roslyn L. Knutson and Matthew Steggle, he is founder and coeditor of the *Lost Plays Database*. He also created and maintains the *Marlowe Bibliography Online*.

Benjamin C. Miele is a visiting assistant professor of English at the University of Iowa. His research interests include early modern English literature and culture, the reception of Ovid and other classical writers in the Renaissance, the history of reading, book history, and surveillance studies. He has recently contributed a chapter on *Venus and Adonis* to the forthcoming *Greenwood Companion to Shakespeare* and is working on a monograph titled *Surveillance and*

Reading in a Time of Technological Change: A Narrative of Early Modern England's Lurker Culture.

Chloe Preedy is Lecturer in Shakespeare and Renaissance Literature at the University of Exeter, teaching mainly at the Penryn campus. Her first book, *Marlowe's Literary Scepticism: Politic Religion and Post-Reformation Polemic*, was published in 2013, and received the Marlowe Society of America's 2013 Roma Gill Prize for the best new work in Marlowe studies. Preedy's current book project focuses on ethereal imagery in early modern drama, exploring how sixteenth- and seventeenth-century dramatists used aerial concepts to reflect upon the nature and status of theater. She is also coediting Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* for the Arden Early Modern Drama series, with Bill Sherman.

Richard Wilson is Sir Peter Hall Professor of Shakespeare Studies at Kingston University in London, and author of *Worldly Shakespeare: The Theatre of Our Good Will* (2015), *Free Will: Art and Power on Shakespeare's Stage* (2013), *Shakespeare in French Theory: King of Shadows* (2007), *Secret Shakespeare: Essays on Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (2004), and *Will Power: Studies in Shakespearean Authority* (1993). He has also edited many books on Renaissance culture, including *Shakespeare and Continental Philosophy* (2014), *Shakespeare's Book* (2008), *Theatre and Religion* (2003), *Region, Religion and Patronage* (2003), *Christopher Marlowe* (1999), and *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama* (1992). He gave the 2001 British Academy Shakespeare lecture and was the 2006 Fellow at Shakespeare's Globe. His forthcoming book is a study of Shakespeare and totalitarianism, *Modern Friends: Shakespeare and Our Contemporaries*.