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Preface

This dissertation explores what it means to say that Marlowe's work is "political." How does power work in his plays? His drama does not conform very closely to the "Elizabethan world picture," nor is it as radically subversive as New Historicism critics would read it. Between Tillyard and Greenblatt, then, lies a political interpretation of Marlowe's theater as a challenge to authority. Tamburlaine, Faustus, and the other protagonists are not merely overaspiring villains, nor are they just Machiavellian politicians making it in a world of realpolitik.

Stephen Greenblatt's essay on Marlowe in Renaissance Self-Fashioning argues that Marlowe was radically challenging Tudor hegemony. Greenblatt was influenced by the theories of Michel Foucault, who suggested that power is a circulating function of politics. If, following Foucault's idea, power were flowing differently among the characters of these plays, then their playwright might be challenging the prevailing, Christian providentialist structure of Renaissance England as well as its pragmatic, even
subversive Italian-realist opposite. Foucault, who deliberately opposes humanism, is a connection from Greenblatt into political theory. Two other twentieth-century theorists, Hannah Arendt and Roberto Unger, also critique power but from within the same context of Western liberal-humanist tradition in which Marlowe wrote. They study the history of politics and sovereignty and the conceptualization of the human subject.

Throughout this dissertation, I am in a dialogue of theory and drama. The ways in which Foucault, Arendt, and Unger discuss politics have led me to formulate some ideas about political expression differently from the providentialist viewpoint of Tillyard and the paradoxically subversive view of Greenblatt. Marlovian heroes seem to create varying challenges to existing structures of religious and political authority. The combinations of self and power I find in Marlowe's theater represent a mode of dissent relevant to political life in Marlowe's time and in ours.
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Abstract

Christopher Marlowe created Renaissance drama as we think of it today. Marlowe's princely protagonists are studied here not as sovereigns responsible for the general well-being of their subjects, but as ambitious characters who use power to control their personal environment. Seen from this viewpoint, the dramatic function of the central characters is either to develop a new stance toward the idea of public authority or to refashion an old one. Instead of attending to governance, they attempt to encompass all existence within themselves: Tamburlaine the world conqueror; Edward and Dido, public rulers whose private relationships transform their public positions; the Guise and his hypocrisy of public religion and private vengeance; Barabas and the uses of power and wealth in The Jew of Malta; Faustus, whose supernatural aspirations contain both hell and (he thinks) heaven in its scope.

In creating a new politics (and new politicians), Marlowe's texts fuse private life and governing structures by personifying those structures. The ruler becomes the representative political "man" looking for a way to integrate the facets of his character into a
holistic human existence. The failure of central authority in these plays to be entirely orthodox or successfully hegemonic suggests that an inclusive politics of power could increase the ability of the characters to succeed by making their aspirations cooperative instead of competitive. Marlowe's drama emphasizes self-actualization (one could even say self-dramatization) without explicit moral judgments.

The work of three twentieth-century political thinkers provides the theoretical coherence for this view of politics as a possible means to self-actualization or humanization: Hannah Arendt, Michel Foucault, and Roberto Mangabeira Unger. Arendt surveys the deterioration of the Greek idea of the polis into a separation of the public and private realms of existence. Foucault's investigations support a view of the moral neutrality of power. Unger argues that domination is the one form of human action which does not increase human actualization. Because Marlovian protagonists are unconventional figures, ambitious for power, they offer various challenges to the traditional structure of authority.
Chapter 1
Political Marlowe

I

"There is a conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophical intelligence."¹ With these words Socrates, that famous questioner executed for subversive teaching, asserts the importance of politics in human activity. More than two thousand years later, German cultural critic Fredric Jameson argues in The Political Unconscious for "the priority of the political interpretation of literary texts" (17). This connection between politics and literature is particularly relevant to the dramatic works of Elizabethan playwright Christopher Marlowe.

Marlowe: "young Kit," the bad boy of early Renaissance literature, innovative master of the "mighty line"; performer of some secret service for Queen Elizabeth's government; accused by his friend Thomas Kyd and reported by others to have held unorthodox opinions. These biographical facts alert an audience to the possibility that the plays are not merely controversial;
they offer alternative depictions of Aristotle's "political animal." The word politics itself is problematic; its use will receive some attention in this reexamination of the six plays which scholars agree Marlowe wrote. The innovative presentation of domination and human relationships in those plays further supports the hypothesis that Marlowe's work is deliberately political, though not in the usual sense of "relating to government." This drama attempts the creation of a political self in the recreation of power roles.

The concept of the person as an autonomous, self-created subject is a major tenet of the philosophical theory of liberalism, developed in England by Hobbes and Locke in the seventeenth century. The people themselves (or a contract they agree to) are politically sovereign, and it is their pursuit of enlightened self-interest which occupies liberal writers from Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill to John Rawls and Thomas Nagel. But this theory has been rejected as an invalid description of human existence by many contemporary literary theorists as well as political scientists, who argue that the human "subject" is dependent on context and is neither autonomous nor self-fashioning. Stephen Greenblatt's conclusion to Renaissance Self-Fashioning delineates this
critical dichotomy:

I perceived that fashioning oneself and being fashioned by cultural institutions—family, religion, state—were inseparably intertwined. In all my texts and documents, there were, so far as I could tell, no moments of pure, unfettered subjectivity. ...[Yet] all the sixteenth-century Englishmen I have written about here do in fact cling to the human subject and to self-fashioning, even in suggesting the absorption or loss of the self. (256-257)

Marlowe is one of those Englishmen, and his characters are presented to the reader as Tamburlaine is to the audience, to "applaud his fortunes as you please" (Part I, Prologue 8). These dramatic protagonists belong more to a liberal humanist concept of the subject than to the radically contextual human construct of postmodernist thought. Each is a public, political self which acts in ambitious and unconventional self-determination instead of in acquiescence to external restrictions. This "self" is not necessarily, not yet in Marlowe anyway, an autonomous essence as it will be in eighteenth-century liberalism. It is the site of a mode of action which has begun to extend beyond the existing structures of family and government, past the belief in a Christian cosmological hierarchy of being and responsibility. But these existing traditional structures and beliefs do form the political settings and characters Marlowe adapts for
his theater. It questions the Tudor attitude of obedience to God, king, and family, and it opposes Renaissance assumptions about commonwealth, providentialist justice, and the roles of male and female. Marlowe's drama, with its focus on the aspiration to absolute power, is about self-fashioning and political refashioning. The playwright replaces the customary governmental or domestic context in order to illustrate the pleasures and pitfalls of absolute power. Specifically, this drama posits different, even antithetical notions of the ruler, of the household, and of public and private.

Christopher Marlowe, then, is interested in politics and manifests that interest in his drama. Yet the classical and medieval political theories accepted in the Renaissance were concerned mainly with sovereignty and obedience and thus not flexible enough to encompass the political interest of his work. Modern biographical and providential critical perspectives are similarly limited because they accept traditional assumptions and explanations. Marlowe is an experimental dramatist, whose heterodox presentation of political characters and situations requires a broader, more radical view of Western political thought in order to be fully understood. Tragic theory is an architectonic study,
usually more so than the tragedies themselves, which are often "not assimilable to theoretical models of centered structure," according to Michelle Gellrich's *Tragedy and Theory* (xii).

Nor can Marlovian theater be reduced to an orderly theoretical pattern. The political significance of Marlowe's dramatically ambiguous characters lies in their dissatisfaction with the conventional power they possess. In challenging traditional political structures, they shift the boundary between public and private in order to act in a realm of political equals, where they have no responsibility for others, only choices for themselves. Marlowe employs the ruler-protagonist and the genre of tragedy with enough ambiguity to prompt his audiences to wonder whether the protagonist's behavior is proper, how a sovereign ought to act, whether in fact a sovereign is the only possible wielder of power, and how power might be used in a communally beneficial manner. Such questioning itself, as it articulates a relationship between the individual and the state, is a political act. During the late sixteenth century when Marlowe was writing, "politics" in England was a complex negotiation between religion, history, and personality. Scripture-based belief, traditional dogma and philosophy, and the established Church's relations with princes and their
governments sometimes justified, sometimes limited the personal as well as dynastic ambitions of the royal and noble classes.

Although the critical tradition has documented these themes of religion and ambition in Marlowe's dramatic works, it has not, for the most part, connected them. Instead of exploring the political implications of these works, critics have concentrated either on the orthodoxy of Marlowe's religious expression or on his psychology of aspiration, romanticism, sexuality, and greed. These two aspects of the plays have generated much controversy, as has Marlowe's own life. Yet the political significance of this drama, indicated by its surface features, seems even more important to me. For example, five of six original quarto/octavo title pages use a form of the word tragedy, in apparent accord with the medieval tradition of de casibus illustrium virorum. In four of the six plays, the central figures are rulers. Of the other two, Barabas exercises control through his wealth, and Faustus aspires to supernatural power. Yet despite a few studies of the history play and the influence of Machiavelli, criticism has not pursued Marlowe's political lead. \(^3\)

If this does not seem odd to a literary scholar, the reason may be that the plays' surface political features are not regarded as significant investigations.
of the political world but rather as conventions. Renaissance dramatists often used a prince as a main character and tragedy as a genre to examine a personal flaw causing the fall of that princely protagonist. Marlowe's writing does develop such conventional situations—the usurper, the bad ruler, the doomed love, the father at odds with his daughter, the psychomachia. It is also true that Marlowe showcases imposing characters rather than contextualizing them as princes with their subjects. As a result, he is generally considered less a "political" writer than is Shakespeare, whose plays scrutinize such traditionally "political" topics as the good ruler, the nature of obedience, and issues of dynastic succession in such works as Measure for Measure and The Tempest as well as in histories and tragedies. Marlowe's own histories and tragedies are often viewed and read primarily as vehicles for an overambitious yet underdeveloped protagonist. Hence the interest in, for example, Tamburlaine's orthodoxy or Edward's sexuality instead of the political abilities of those characters. Much debate has focused on whether Marlowe's characters are admirable for trying to reach past the limits of humanity or morally doomed by their pride.

But few scholars assume that the Marlovian canon is
entirely conventional. A chief feature of modern Marlowe criticism is its inability to agree on how to interpret the plays or to judge their chief characters. Una Ellis-Fermor views them as romantic aspirers, Eugene Waith as admirable Herculean heroes, Harry Levin as iconoclastic overreachers, Willard Thorp as despicable yet mostly conventional villains. Several critics note the self-consciousness of these characters: M.C. Bradbrook calls them "self-determined"; Joel Altman refers to their "self-referential" nature; Stephen Greenblatt writes about their self-fashioning.

Many Marlowe studies begin by acknowledging the diversity of interpretations of the plays. The preface from Charles Masinton's *Christopher Marlowe's Tragic Vision*, for example, summarizes the twentieth-century movement in Marlowe criticism from biographical interpretations to concerns with poetic, dramaturgical, and rhetorical techniques. Yet the critical commentary is diverse only within narrow limits of what was "politically correct" in the sixteenth century. In the promisingly titled *Tudor Drama and Politics*, David Bevington shows that Tudor dramatists did treat controversial subjects, though rather carefully and usually generically. Yet his catalog of references, allusions, and allegories of contemporary situations
locates those treatments within an acceptable range of patriarchal, providential, monarchist thinking.

Another promisingly titled work, Christopher Marlowe and the Politics of Power, is the only previous book exclusively to examine Marlowe's political themes. Its author, Claude J. Summers, accepts the mid-twentieth century interpretation of Elizabethan England as a microcosm of universal order. His opening chapter, an assembly of extracts from sixteenth-century sermons and treatises supported by historical surveys of the thought of the times, is useful though uncritical; his evidence for this version of the relationship between religion and politics is only from public discourse. He makes much use of the official homilies, but little of popular literature and drama, and none of letters or diaries. Summers' interpretation is a traditional one.

Constance Kuriyama's study of homosexual tendencies in the characters and in Marlowe's psyche was one of the first to investigate what might be called subversive human relations. New Historicism, led by Stephen Greenblatt, investigates the radical in literature, including Marlowe. Sessions at recent MLA conventions continue the literary, biblio-textual, biographical, and theoretical enterprises which comprise the main pool of Marlowe studies, with a sprinkling of current political
interests such as feminist and materialist issues.

Despite the conservatism of most earlier criticism, I doubt that Marlowe was trying merely to put a distinctive spin on what remained an essentially conforming view of Tudor political hegemony. The purpose of this study is not to examine authorial intention, however, but to develop a politically coherent way of reading this author's work. The plays display too little coherence to be entirely orthodox and unobjectionable; they raise (but do not answer) questions about the modes of political thought and action current in Elizabethan England, very possibly with the end of altering them. T.S. Eliot attributes this incoherence to a sixteenth-century lack of dramatic realism, but a few radical critics, such as Greenblatt, Altman, and Jonathan Dollimore, view it as a sign of explorative or radical drama. From the recent, more radical view, it makes sense for Marlowe to have used the conventions of serious literature in order to evade the censor's notice. The classical literature he studied paid much attention to rulers (including the gods). Marlowe himself probably performed some clandestine political task for the government, resulting in the Privy Council's direction to Cambridge to award his degree despite his nonresidence. However, neither the choice of rulers as main characters...
nor the biographical background necessarily indicates more than a typical Tudor concern with the figure of the absolutist prince. To confront the apparent conventionalities in Marlowe's work, then, I want to begin my inquiry with two questions: What definition of the word politics would be historically valid as well as providing a coherent basis for understanding Marlowe's work and the critical debates surrounding it? What is the political significance of Marlowe's work?

II

The Western idea of politics originated from the polis, the people who govern themselves. The political thinking of Plato and Aristotle served to advance the concept of politics as an enabling condition of the good life, which was defined as maintaining a public community as well as protecting one's private virtue. Plato's early dialogue Crito uses the rhetorical figure of personification when Socrates imagines the laws upbraiding him for disobedience: "Did we not give you life in the first place? ... can you deny, in the first place, that you were our child and servant, both you and your ancestors?" (50 c and e). The presentation of the laws as parents is elaborated and refined in the later Republic. Socrates first describes the state as, in
Benjamin Jowett's famous phrase, "man writ large" (368 e) and then as a gathering of "many into one place of abode as associates and helpers, and to this dwelling together we give the name city or state .... Its real creator, as it appears, will be our needs" (369 c). Socrates' analogy between the state and human needs and faculties enacts the fusion of public and private which, I will argue, Marlowe's drama tries to reestablish.

Plato's view of the origins and functions of the state also appears in the work of his pupil Aristotle, whose thought was far more influential for Renaissance political thinking. The Politics contextualizes the state by first describing the family and service occupations, in which rules and directions are given for the benefit of children, slaves, clients, or patients. Similarly, the state exists to further the good of all its members. Aristotle's distinction between good and bad forms of government turns upon whether the rule benefits all citizens or only the king. The difference between public and private, then, is between the interest of the citizens as a whole and that of the individual person (Nicomachaean Ethics 1160 b 2-3). Such a differentiation emphasizes the primacy of public over private by condemning the tyrant as a bad king who uses power for personal ends, pursuing good only for himself.
(1160 b 8). However, neither Plato nor Aristotle would consider the "good for himself" to be a true good. Plato characterizes the tyrant as a wolf and a cannibal (Republic 565 d-566 a). For Aristotle, those forms of government "which regard only the interest of the rulers are all defective and perverted forms, for they are despotic, whereas a state is a community of freemen" (Politics 1279 a 20-21).³

Patristic and medieval Christianity developed Aristotle's analogy of state and household into a system in which a fatherly king governs his subjects as God rules his human children (Kantorowicz 93). According to the official Tudor version of this arrangement, a proper sovereign was a public figure who served both God and subjects by setting aside personal interests. The public virtue of the people was quiet obedience; they had neither a collective voice nor a means of entry into the polity. In that sense, they had no political life at all and appear rarely in Marlowe's plays.

Under Christianity, the Greek view of the good life becomes privatized, concerned more with the condition of one's soul and one's individual relationship to God instead of remaining attentive to Jesus' equal emphasis on social justice in the Gospels. The Church may be viewed as a sort of community, although hierarchic rather
than democratic, and certainly nothing like a Greek polis. With the development of the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and the polity of covenant churches, the importance of a broader, universal community lessened again. Both Martin Luther and John Calvin expected their followers to remain passive and to continue in the traditional obedience due to a secular ruler. But independent thinkers (such as Bible translator William Tyndale, Bishop of Worcester Hugh Latimer, and Bishop of Winchester John Ponet) were inventing doctrines to allow the development of political structures that could eliminate the sovereign as intermediary between the subject and public order. As the Elizabethan House of Commons became more Puritan, it began to challenge the sovereign's right to determine which matters could properly be debated in parliament. However, the Commons orators couched their dissent in terms of divine order, just as the Queen did. At least in official public discourse, speakers affirmed an orderly universe, created and maintained by God, which assured both ruler and ruled of the world's stability.

Early Tudor tragedy also tended to accept the worldview of providentialism by illustrating the results of human waywardness and evil. A heritage of religious drama had provided a model of decorous moral conformity
and corresponding warnings of the potential for dangerous secularity. The immediate sources of medieval Christian drama were the Roman Eucharistic liturgy, the church year (with its focus on the central character of Christ as "protagonist"), and the legends and veneration of saints. These influences show the drama's strong connections to public institutions that controlled the populace by means of edifying spectacle. Morality plays reinforce their audiences' sense of community by universalizing the varieties of human experience. The central character, such as Everyman or Mankind, is not an individual and often does not originate action but only responds to the behavior of supernatural forces or personalized vices and virtues. As Renaissance humanism comes to focus on "man as the measure of all things," the generalized medieval protagonist becomes a recognizable individual. However, a constraining social structure still emphasizes the importance of family and history, reinforcing the hierarchical structure of the world. The first English blank-verse tragedy, Gorboduc, portrays the political and familial disaster which befalls a disunited and disorderly ruling house.

But with the development of humanism in the Renaissance, the ideology of providentialism and human limitation was in danger of losing its hold on western
thought. The heretical philosophy of Giordano Bruno, the Florentine pragmatism of Niccolo Machiavelli and Francesco Guicciardini, even those northern Protestant reformers which advocated the priesthood of all believers with no hierarchical dogmatic mediators, all contributed to an expanded range of human experience in the cosmos. The new astronomy and philosophy, new social science, and new religion widened the hitherto restricted areas available to those who wished to extend the range of traditional authority or to act in a self-authorizing fashion. Bruno's assertion of infinite and changeable space and the Averroist belief in the eternity of the world, heretical though they were, opened the way for human aspiration to new roles, in new spaces and times. Because Marlowe studied at Cambridge in the 1580s, associated with the queen's councillors Sir Walter Ralegh and the Walsinghams, and traveled in Europe, it is very likely not only that he knew of the Italian realist thinkers but read them and perhaps even met Bruno. Like Marlowe himself, Bruno, Guicciardini, and Machiavelli were steeped in humanism but thought beyond it, sometimes finding themselves in opposition to its providentialist patterns of political action either in their writing or in their careers.

Bruno, an Italian metaphysician and magician, was
the most spectacular of those nonconformists, roaming Europe to challenge scholars and entertain royalty while fleeing the orthodoxy of Rome. His confessions and recantations before the Inquisition finally led him to the stake in 1600. It is reported that, in the fires, Bruno turned his head away from a crucifix offered to him. (This action recalls Faustus, for whom Bruno's earlier career could have served as a model. In calling for Christ's blood when confronted with the fires of Mephostophilis, Faustus shows weakness in his commitment to the elemental forces when, about a decade later in real life, Bruno would show none.) Irving L. Horowitz's description fits the Marlovian protagonist: "Bruno epitomizes the future bourgeois romantic individualist, defying all physical and spiritual odds for the purpose of presenting his principles irrespective of the consequences" (8-9). The principle most important for Bruno was the existence of an infinite number of solar systems with, presumably, other life forms. Bruno's treatise Of the Infinite Universe and the Worlds performs for anthropocentric religion what Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler do for geocentric astronomy, with similarly disastrous results both for the orthodoxy of the thinkers and for the unity of medieval Roman Catholic dogma. In Bruno's cosmology, God no longer has an exclusive concern
with the human inhabitants of earth; providentialist assumptions of history and social studies are replaced with those based in science. What appeared as a loss to the papal hierarchy, however, is viewed by Bruno as a sort of cosmic felix scientia. By locating God in the substance of an infinite universe, Bruno claims for God a cosmic, not merely a planetary, integrity. "Losing God from the world," Bruno "found him again in the rhythmic life of the universe" (J. H. Randall, quoted in Horowitz 64).

Although anthropocentric theology itself persisted long after the martyrdom of Bruno, his work seriously weakened its basis. The philosophy of a universe without limits also makes possible a transcendent literary hero. His metaphysics declares that the unity of Being subsumes all contradictions. What is impossible in the world of appearance and change becomes necessary in the abstract transcendental reality of the cosmos. In this revised universe, what appear to be limitations on human achievement become infinite actuality. Ultimately, everything is possible. (As later chapters will show, this Brunean insight has particular relevance to Marlowe's characterizations of Tamburlaine, Faustus, and Edward, and to the romantic view of these characters.)

Although the life of Florentine aristocrat
Francesco Guicciardini was very different from that of Bruno, the work of both men had significant intellectual influence. Historiography was Guicciardini's field of endeavor, one which fortunately did not come within the scope of the Inquisition. Guicciardini was trained in the classics and used ancient treatises as his models. Like any good humanist, he accepted Aristotle's dictum that man is a political animal, believed in ethical behavior, and acknowledged the human ability to shape institutions. But in writing his three histories (one of Italy, two of Florence), Guicciardini recognized the limited usefulness of humanist learning for describing or predicting political history; imitating classical models could not guarantee that a state would be good or just or even permanent. Nor do human intelligence, cunning, ingenuity, or virtue usually achieve those desirable political ends. The new histories of Guicciardini, like those of his friend Machiavelli, blend humanist methods with pragmatic considerations of the particular situation and material conditions within it--factors which most classical histories ignored (Gilbert 88-98).

Machiavelli, with Guicciardini and their friend Francesco Vettori, came to believe that all states thrived or failed by their use of force, not reason or law, and therefore moral evaluations of tyranny were
irrelevant to considerations of survival and efficiency (Gilbert 118-119). Because neither God's providence nor the irrational goddess Fortuna could be supplicated, they were relegated to the ornamental margins of the new politico-historical discourses.

Machiavelli prefaces his famous dictum that a prince must be a fox and a lion by saying that law is the human way of fighting whereas warfare is the "style of beasts," but since law and reason do not always prevail, a "prince must make use of the characteristics of beasts," especially the strength of the lion and the slyness of the fox (The Prince ch. 18). Most of The Prince's earlier historical chapters emphasize the necessity of using force to maintain a state. "All armed prophets have been successful and all the unarmed have come to ruin" (ch. 6). Later, Machiavelli cites Rome, Sparta, and Switzerland as armed states who retained their freedom for centuries (chs. 12 and 20). Force must be ultimate, "for it is to be noted that men must be either conciliated or annihilated" (ch. 3). In fact, according to chapter 14, "the principal study and care and the especial profession of a prince should be warfare and its attendant rules and discipline."

Much attention has been given by critics to the connection between Marlowe and Machiavelli. Irving
Ribner's mid-twentieth-century studies of Tudor history writing established that Marlowe used not only Machiavellian stereotypes but also Machiavelli's own ideas. Both writers have been regarded as advocates of the strong, ruthless, amoral sovereign; Marlowe's heroes and Machiavelli's instructions for aspiring princes have been termed "realist," as distinct from the providentially oriented teachings of Church and government. Marlowe and Machiavelli thus attempt the same educational tasks as do Erasmus, Thomas Elyot, and other writers of instructional manuals for Christian princes and courtiers, though from quite different premises and toward different ends (Lewis 274).

Jacob Burckhardt described Machiavelli's state as a carefully crafted work of art, an aesthetic rather than a moral object. Eric Vogelin reads Machiavelli's work as centered on "the evocation of the mythical hero [because] the Christian, transcendental order of existence had become a dead letter for Italian thinkers of the fifteenth century" (quoted in McDonald 194). These assessments also resonate with Marlowe's political thought and art. In creating a new politics, Marlowe's texts put the personal into structures which govern people--by personifying those structures. The ruler becomes the representative political "man" looking for a
way to integrate the facets of his character into a holistic humanity. But the failure of these characters--either from personal character flaws, shallowness of vision, ineptitude as rulers, or sheer human limits--reminds audiences of the difficulty of being good.

III

Marlowe's theater, although it uses the convention of the ruler, lacks the classical connection of politics and metaphysics with ethics, limiting itself instead to dramatizing possibilities for political action rather than evaluations. Most of his characters are already rulers; some have power given to them, others bargain for it. They all accept the idea of authority, but they struggle with it, thwarted in their desires or disappointed in their achievements. Marlowe presents this tension, by no means a new literary discovery, in such a way that it questions the usual sixteenth-century habit of perceiving political relations in terms of ruler and obedient subjects. According to Catherine Belsey, "the dramatization of absolutism gives birth, however tentatively, to the concept of the autonomous subject" (109). The tension between the existence (or even the possibility) of absolute rule and the desire for human
actualization produces political action. Rarely do Marlowe's "overreaching" protagonists succeed in rearranging the structure of political power to reflect their vision or their desire; only Tamburlaine can be said to have done so completely. What makes Tamburlaine and the other five plays a challenge to Renaissance politics is their rejection of hierarchy, which in the Renaissance takes the form of a Christian providentialist, patriarchal monarchy. Marlowe's sole depiction of an English monarch is Edward II, who would give away his entire kingdom except for one nook or corner in which to frolic with his Gaveston. Edward represents an alternative to the royal hierarchy of ceremony and violence. Greenblatt comments that "despite all the exoticism in Marlowe--Scythian shepherds, Maltese Jews, German magicians--it is his own countrymen that he broods upon and depicts" (Renaissance Self-Fashioning 194). In the efforts of Edward, Dido, and Faustus to redesign the conditions of their rule, this English drama attempts to break down and redraw the boundaries between public governance and private emotion.

Marlowe's plays continue to attract the interest of audiences, critics, and readers, as Ejner Jensen notices in his students' reactions to their study of the first great Elizabethan playwright: "Marlowe is relevant
because he deals with the real world in all its harshness and cruelty" (628) and because of "the affective force" of his drama (630). Who can deny the sheer titanic presence of Tamburlaine the Great, the hypocritical viciousness of Barabas or the Duke of Guise, the audacity of Faustus, the struggle of Queen Dido and the doomed effort of King Edward to keep their crowns?

Heroes and villains have always been with us, but the protagonists of the Marlovian theater are more than ambitious romantics or monodramatic overachievers who flash across the stage like Icarus across the sun. With their creation, Marlowe is signalling his resistance to the world as he saw it. Theater historian Karen Hermassi argues that theater always involves "relationships of the polity" (199). Marlowe's characters want to change the world by changing their own roles, but the attempts of several of his protagonists to fashion a more liveable, equal, human environment end in tragedy. The cities of Carthage and Damascus, the town of Larissa, the crowns of England and France, the wealth of Barabas and his family: all are destroyed, or lost, along with the very life of every protagonist and even the soul of Faustus.

These heroes often appear tyrannical, and Tamburlaine is called a tyrant for his rigid adherence to his own "argument of arms." One reason for the classical
abhorrence of tyranny is the tyrant's use of public power to further his own personal ends—exactly the privatization of politics which Fredric Jameson decries in modern society. Such a division, he says, alienates the individual by isolating private concerns from public discourse of political significance: "the tendential law of social life under capitalism" (20). Jameson rejects such tendencies.

Other key twentieth-century theorists have also examined the relation between public and private in order to rethink its place in the Western political tradition. Hannah Arendt, in The Human Condition, traces the development of a non-political social sphere through Western political history. With his historical "archaeology" and "genealogy," Michel Foucault discovers the deliberate fragmentation of community in institutional practices of control. Roberto Unger tries to repair the separation in his ambitious political model of "organic groups" who share communal ends. From this theoretical revisioning of private and communal human experience, Marlowe can be seen as subverting the tendency to separate those realms through his unconventional protagonists of power. His characters use the power attached to their positions of state in attempting to reform the role of ruler into a more
suitable environment for themselves. Carelessly dramatized, this reformation might appear to be another version of tyranny, but Marlowe's rebellious heroes at least occasionally look beyond their own selves.

Political historian Christopher Morris writes that in sixteenth-century England, "a strong king was wanted, but a king strong enough to do his public duty rather than his private will" (13). Marlowe dramatizes polity as a potential fusion of separated duty and desire, an alternative to this division of experience, in which power could circulate among peers of a domestic circle, a governing domus. The perennial political conflict of order and rebellion--domination versus self-determination--was intensified in Renaissance England because of the psychological strength of the Tudor monarchs, the reformers, and the Puritans. Although the autonomy of their throne was checked by dissenting factions as well as by the House of Commons, Henry VIII and Elizabeth wielded their powers with enough strength and more than enough rhetoric to make the problem of obedience to a tyrant into the central political question of the times (82). Because Marlovian rulers are unconventional figures, they expand the range of alternatives to the strong monarch. They are the focus of the playwright's attention, so governments as such are
barely acknowledged in Marlowe. One's social role (of leader or follower) does not determine political position, for in Marlowe's country everyone wants power—from the lowly shepherd Tamburlaine, Ithamore the slave, and Gaveston the baseborn foreigner, to the royal family of France, Dido of Carthage, and Edward Plantagenet. Alternatives appear when the ruler-protagonists achieve their version of power, whether it be in romance or friendship or family.

Marlowe's princely protagonists will be studied here, then, not as sovereigns responsible for the general well-being of their subjects, but as characters who want to transform power even as they gain more of it for themselves. Seen from this viewpoint, the dramatic function of the central characters is either to refashion an old stance toward the idea of public authority or to develop a new one. Although they pursue power, tyrannic power in some cases, none of the heroes rejects the concept of authority itself. Marlowe must invoke a structure of public order, for disaster and death result when it is threatened or defied. Although the exploration of a character's action in terms of the concept of authority informs the whole corpus, the particular acts which are described (and their connections with other facets of existence) are different
in each play. Marlowe's experiments in recreating public order take several forms. Tamburlaine and his lifelong friends and viceroys share the joys, rewards, and griefs of their lives; their ambitions are identical and identified with those of the others. Edward finds his peer, not among the barons, but in Gaveston; Dido finds hers not in Iarbas but in Aeneas. Faustus' personal relationship with God becomes a political struggle to participate in divine power as a peer. The unexpected occurs as Marlowe links the need to maintain emotional connection and the responsibility to be a steward of one's wealth (in The Jew of Malta) or to govern a realm (as in Tamburlaine, Dido, Edward II, and The Massacre at Paris).

Perhaps only the last of these forms sounds like the popular concept of political action. Broadening the definition of the term politics so much that it becomes useless as a critical tool would defeat the purpose of this study. Not all human relations are political, but this fact does not require using the term only to designate the operation of territorial governments. The entity which the late twentieth century understands by the term "state" was just beginning to evolve in Marlowe's time, in the transition from feudal organization to territorial nation-states (perhaps in
conjunction with centralized economic production and mercantilism). The empires and monarchies in Marlowe's work are earlier versions of political states, but even as such they appear only obliquely, when at all, in the drama. Instead, they are platforms or raw materials from which rulers form or perform their roles as political beings.

The modern terminology of politics is often vague and undifferentiated. Current usage includes a diverse range of experience under the rubric of "politics," and modern scholars of the subject have not lessened the confusion. In The Anatomy of Power, John Kenneth Galbraith analyzes the components and types of power yet uncritically accepts the everyday definition of the term. Simon Shepherd, a Marxist literary scholar, defines the "politics of Elizabethan theatre" as "the relationship between dominant ideologies and the questioning/affirming strategies of the individual text" (xvii-xviii). Such a definition allows cultural materialism and New Historicism to defamiliarize the popular notions of politics, which casually equate "power" and "authority," "power" and "control," "control" and "domination," "control" and "oppression." These usages describe power as a morally negative agency which always adversely affects the less powerful, who are frequently referred to
as victims. The negative qualities of that implied definition also dominate the Marlowe corpus; victims may be portrayed as brave or pathetic but always as suffering. Yet the power-wielders also suffer as they act. From Marlowe's six plays emerges a definition of politics as activity which circulates power among humans, a conscious awareness of human relations expressed through speech. Yet this activity is almost always doomed to painful failure.

The following chapters will show whether and how Marlowe's characters, in their various dramaturgical contexts, search for and create political means of self-actualization. The importance of language in Marlowe's plays does not blur their political focus; rather, it sharpens it. Rhetoric and logic, eloquence, and confessional speeches become means of connecting each character with his larger desires and creating the community each will act in. The source or impetus toward political action lies in a character's stance toward the idea of public authority. Included in the word politics are the concepts of self-determination (usually considered a private emphasis) and control of others (a public one). The division into public and private is not so automatic, however. When self-determination comes to contain control over others, as it
does spectacularly in the case of Tamburlaine, then private interaction is fused with public action.

This study will structure its investigation around three questions: How is the division between public and private existence depicted and bridged? How are the usual patterns of domination depicted and subverted? Finally, in what sense is this text "political"? I begin with Tamburlaine, as an extreme on a continuum of success in conventional usurping ambition.
Notes

1. I have extracted this shorter clause from Plato's original rather involved syntax, but I do not believe I have distorted his sense. The complete sentence reads

Unless, said I, either philosophers become kings in our states, or those whom we now call our kings and rulers take to the pursuit of philosophy seriously and adequately, and there is a conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophical intelligence, while the motley horde of the natives who at present pursue either apart from the other are compulsorily excluded, there can be no cessation of trouble, dear Glaucun, for our states, nor, I fancy, for the human race either. (Republic 473 d)

Aristotle also associates politics and philosophy; however, as is his wont, he draws a fine distinction among philosophic, practical, and political wisdom. Political wisdom "has to do with [public] action and deliberation." See Nicomachaean Ethics, Bk. VI Chs. 7-8, and Politics, especially Bks. 3 and 7.

2. 1 and 2 Tamburlaine are often discussed separately. Because they have the same protagonist, I here refer to them as one play, for convenience.

3. New Historicism is an exception to this general statement; I discuss it below.
4. Marlowe and his work suffer in most comparisons of the two playwrights. Irving Ribner's quadricentennial review, "Marlowe and Shakespeare," is typical.

5. Bevington, in *Tudor Drama and Politics*, suggests that some dramatists did intend this result, but he does not develop its implications.

6. According to Tucker Brooke, Marlowe received "a certainly unusual certificate of character from the Queen's Privy Council" on 29 June 1587 (Case, vol. 1, 37). On Marlowe's biography, see also Bakeless, *The Tragical History* vol. 1, esp. 76-85; Boas 13-27; Hotson; Bushnell; and, for a more sensational account, Henderson's biography.

7. Talbert 23. For some traces of Plato's analogy, see *Politics* Bk. III chs. 6 and 9-13 and Bk. VII.

8. Aristotle's version of the familial origin of the state is more patriarchal than Plato's (although Plato's suggestion of a community of wives is worded from the masculine point of view). The *Politics* assumes male ascendance in the political order as it quotes Hesiod: "First house and wife and an ox for the plow" (1252 b 11).

9. See Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* 12-14. Arendt's use of the word *political* is strictly Attic Greek; it is the adjective which describes the activity
of people who live in a polis.

10. Ernst Kantorowicz discusses the importance of a new view of time to the slow revolution in cosmology; see 275-84.

11. Sebastian de Grazia suggests that it was torture that established Machiavelli's respect for force as a governmental tool (36).
A Parade of Kings: 1 and 2 Tamburlaine

I

The prologue to 1 Tamburlaine announces that this play is both new and old. In leading the audience away from wits and clownage, the first two lines signal a departure from University drama, but the destination—the stately and tragic tent of war—is both classical and modern. Battles, of course, were plot and theme of classical epic and provided the background for Greek drama, which usually focused on the results of individual decisions. Military events figured less in the largely religious drama of the Middle Ages, but they remained prominent in medieval chivalric romances, in Italian Renaissance epics, and in Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene.

Marlowe uses the themes of exotic martial adventures and courtly love to transmute the reports and legends about Timur Khan the Lame (1336-1405), ruler of the second Mongolian Empire, into a heroically ambiguous portrayal of Tamburlaine the Great. Neither a Prince Arthur nor an Orlando Furioso, Marlowe's hero is an innovation in English drama and Renaissance politics,
supremely successful in his supreme aspirations. Because of his daring challenges to gods, rulers, battlefield enemies, and family, Tamburlaine anticipates both the autotelic, autonomous self of liberal political philosophy and the problems of domination and human actualization accompanying that philosophical construct. The first performance of Tamburlaine in 1587 inaugurates a theater of subtle political confrontation and requires a criticism which investigates and evaluates the significance of its challenge.2

This play dramatizes a prototype of the domus of equal rulers described in the first chapter of this study. The effects of domination and domus, public and private, and power and community are more evident in Dido and Edward II, more fractured in The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, and more extraterrestrial in Doctor Faustus. These plays and their protagonists explore an alternative to the ideal ruler as a single monarch of ultimate secular authority, with public duties and private emotions. The alternative is a pair of lovers, or a family, or some other group among whom power circulates equally. Marlowe's theater does not examine closely the relationship of ruler and people but focuses on the position of the ruler as transcending within itself the relations of domination necessary to
traditional monarchy. Greenblatt identifies the sign of power as "the ability to impose one's fictions upon the world" (Renaissance Self-Fashioning 13), and Tamburlaine possesses this ability in abundance. An analysis of his ruling role may explain the difficulties of classifying 1 and 2 Tamburlaine by genre: nontraditional texts often do not fit traditional categories. It should also help resolve the critical division over Marlowe's drama by offering a possibility for analyzing the plays in terms of how they realign public and private domains, reinterpret domination, and wrestle with human limits. Tamburlaine features a parade of rulers who are foils to the protagonist, a woman who broadens his view of himself, and a period of virtual madness in which the hero becomes an ugly parody of himself and his quest.

One major position in Tamburlaine criticism views the play as admirably dramatizing the individual quest to transcend human limitations. According to Una Ellis-Fermor, a chief proponent of this critical stance, the play without its poetic vision would be just another theatrical glorification of the will to power (Tamburlaine the Great 58). She views 1 Tamburlaine as "the study of the irresistible power of a mind concentrating on an end which it pursues with unsleeping singleness of purpose" (Christopher Marlowe 29). That
end is beauty, which is what keeps the first part from being another barbaric yet colorful war story (25), as Part 2 becomes without it (Tamburlaine 61).

Ellis-Fermor's interpretation is balanced by A. D. Hope's view of Tamburlaine's aspiration as realistic, not romantically superhuman, and the hero himself as the Aristotelian "great soul" who actualizes his humanity through dominating others. In developing Douglas Cole's assertion that "the law of strife, not harmony, is the foundation" of Tamburlaine's world (quoted in Friedenreich, "Directions" 349), Hope draws upon the ideas of Aristotle, Empedocles, and the Presocratic philosopher Heraclitus, who used the titles of Zeus to describe war: "father and king of all. ... War is universal and justice is strife" (Robinson 93).

Tamburlaine's weapons are words, symbols, and deeds; if anyone succeeds in conquering the world while remaining unconquered, in imposing his vision onto the world, it is he. As David Daiches writes, Tamburlaine's "use of this kind of language is a kind of action: to be able to talk that way is half the battle" (322). Assuming the ancient principle of strife as a world-constituting force, Hope's article asserts that the supreme human action is to rule over others. "There is of course nothing romantic in this, no yearning after an unrealizable perfection in the
principal actor" (51), for Tamburlaine does become perfectly successful in domination. Johannes H. Birringer, citing the challenge to Mahomet (in 2.V.i.183-90) as evidence, argues that Tamburlaine is a creator even of God as well as of self through speech and action ("Marlowe's Violent Stage" 234-35). Harold Bloom, in typical Old Testament-apocalyptic imagery, says that the Marlovian hero falls "only because [he] touch[es] the ultimate limits at the flaming ramparts of the world" (6).

Other critics have more or less shared this framework of Tamburlaine's failed aspiration while differing on how orthodox it was. Roy Battenhouse's detailed case for orthodoxy, Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy, is a notable exception to the interpretation of the play as the embodiment of Marlowe's ambitions. Battenhouse regards the two plays not as heroic aspiration but as the depiction of a cruel and blasphemous tyrant who gets what he deserves in a sudden death. (A variation of Battenhouse's view has Tamburlaine going unpunished, unaccountably living out his days and dying a natural death.)

Regardless of its various positions on orthodoxy, the romantic view dominates twentieth-century responses
to Renaissance and neoclassical judgments of Marlowe's atheism and immorality. Harry Levin, for example, is squarely in the Romantic camp of Ellis-Fermor, describing the Marlovian hero as "the overreacher whose tragedy is more of an action than a passion" (24). Bibliographer Kenneth Friedenreich concludes that most twentieth-century criticism either defends the romantic view or attacks it by stressing "the independence of the play as a work of art" (342), from perspectives of irony, rhetoric, dramaturgy, psychoanalytic theory, sources, or historicism both New and old.

More recently, Marxists, New Historicists, and other radical critics have begun to regard Marlowe's work as political instead of religious or moral subversion. Dollimore and Greenblatt exemplify this newest trend in Marlowe criticism. Kimberly Benston follows Greenblatt in seeing the self develop in "the conflictual aspect of rhetorical encounter" (208-209). Dollimore departs rather surprisingly from his antihumanist thesis that the Renaissance "conception of subjectivity [is] identified in terms of a materialist perspective rather than one of essentialist humanism" (249), seeing the play as a "transgressive text: it liberates from the Christian and ethical framework the humanist conception of man as essentially free, dynamic and aspiring" and "a fantasy on
Pico's theme of aspiring man" (112). Yet he judges Tamburlaine's goals to be secular, not transcendent.

Clifford Leech had already said that the play is "humanist but not Christian humanist" (Christopher Marlowe 79). Charles Masinton anticipates Dollimore's rejection of humanism (though not on the same theoretical grounds) in his argument that the loss of a religious framework, with its possibility of salvation, renders the aspiring humanist hero even more subject to damnation. Forced to create a new order to replace religion, an individualist hero "finds himself at the end of his tether when he recognizes the incredible paucity of his abilities to accomplish these goals" (10). Masinton may think so, but he offers no evidence of torment or sterility in the soul of Tamburlaine. On the contrary, the soliloquy on "What is beauty, saith my sufferings then" (1.V.i. 97-127) shows a self pondering the meaning of existence.

Joel Altman's The Tudor Play of Mind traces the rhetorical origins of Renaissance drama to argue that the plays are exploratory, not affirmative nor even subversively conclusive, but "a medium of liberal inquiry" (389). As such, "the aim of the play is discovering the most comprehensive truth, not proving the validity of one side or the other. This is why the
'answer' usually embraces both" (391). In tragedy, Altman concludes, "judgment is thrust almost wholly on the audience" (394). In the case of Marlowe's drama, the truth is neither evident nor implicit. The prologue to Tamburlaine intends no closure; Marlowe allows us not only to applaud Tamburlaine's fortunes as we please, but also to decide what Tamburlaine is doing and to reconcile as we may the scourge of God with the shepherd who follows the "better precedent" of mighty Jove (1.II. vii.17).

Despite these possibilities, critics have for the most part assumed that Tamburlaine exists only as a dominating public ruler with little or no private life, not as a person in search of his own way. After all, his stated motive is "the thirst of reign and sweetness of a crown" (1.II.vii. 12). Domination is the good and war its means; critics argue over how cruelly Tamburlaine conducts war and whether his pursuit of that "good" is admirable or damnable, but they do not see any other mode of behavior in the ambitious Scythian shepherd. Although a few have admitted to being disappointed in Tamburlaine's choice of kingship as the summum bonum, they analyze his actions and personality in his own terms. But as the mark of "aspiring minds" (1. 20) and inspired by God, Tamburlaine's ambition is a form of
worship by emulation, merging his private beliefs with his public career into a panoramic prototype of the self. The divine principle of Strife encourages Tamburlaine to actualize his human potential. As Marlowe's first, most spectacular protagonist to be presented on stage, Tamburlaine must fight to create his own space in the world of Elizabethan expectations where kings are anointed by God, everyone is born into a particular station in society, and salvation is a combination of faith and good works. With the self-made scourge of God and beloved of Jove, Marlowe constructs a stage for innovative characterization on which to place his later creations. The play's innovation is its successful combination of poetic language and military prowess against the world of existing forms of war, politics, religion, and family. Tamburlaine develops its own attitude toward beauty and cruelty; its hero attracts and retains loyal subordinates; he defeats those who oppose his quest to "chase the stars from heaven" (1.I.iii.23) and puts himself in their place.

As successful as he is in war, Tamburlaine is not a governor but a prince, in the Machiavellian sense of a ruler whose goal is to maintain and extend power. He does not engage in administration, legislation, or policy-making but delegates these duties to his viceroys.
Tamburlaine's politics are charismatic and necessarily creative in order to allow him to realize his ambition in a world of inferiors. His self-actualization and refashioning of the conventional role of world conqueror (the "alpha male" of science fiction) is dramatized by contrast with other characters.\(^8\) The Tamburlaine plays present a parade of warrior rulers of varying integrity but increasing challenge. Each is a foil to Tamburlaine, himself the most prominent, unorthodox, innovative, and successful leader.

II

The first ruler Marlowe presents in Tamburlaine is the legitimate but weak king of Persia. Mycetes shows that he knows a king should be forceful, fluent, and persuasive, and also that he himself does not possess these qualities. Instead of expressing a more noble "rage" or "offense," Mycetes whines his "conceived grief" to his advisor, Meander. While the king's tone is that of a spoiled adolescent, he is perceptive enough to detect his brother Cosroe's resentful attitude toward him (though it is only fair to say that Cosroe makes no attempt to hide it): "Brother, I see your meaning well enough/ ...I perceive you think/ I am not wise enough to be a king" (I.i. 18-20). Mycetes' allusions are also
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unwisely chosen for a warrior king. Damon and Pythias, Paris and Helen, and "peeping" Aurora connote softness and romance, not martial affection. Mycetes does value poetry, wisdom, and eloquence in others; his failure to acquire these qualities for himself strengthens his brother's case against him. Tamburlaine, though "a shepherd by [his] parentage" (I.ii.5), effortlessly demonstrates the kingly attributes lacking in his Persian foe.

Because of the structural connection between linguistic and military abilities established in this play, Mycetes' flawed grasp of language indicates that his ability to fight is also faulty. As a soldier, Mycetes himself is weak, with a streak of bloodlust lightened by pity yet darkened with cowardice. When he orders his troops out to conquer Tamburlaine, he envisions their return on

```
milk-white steeds of mine
All loaden with the heads of killed men,
And from their knees even to their hoofs below
Besmear'd with blood that makes a dainty show.
(I.i.77-80)
```

Dainty, indeed. (The motif of horses, blood, and body parts will be examined later in connection with the cruelty of Bajazeth and Tamburlaine.) Mycetes himself is a mixture of this appalling bloodthirst and a
squeamishness shown in his soliloquy "Accurs'd be he that first invented war" (II.iv.1-15). At first he pities those soldiers who, "hit by pelting cannon-shot/ Stand staggering like a quivering aspen-leaf" (3-4). However, the king goes on to display his cowardice by imagining his own "lamentable case.../ For kings are clouts that every man shoots at,/ Our crown the pin that thousands seek to cleave" (6, 8-9).

Mycetes knows his royal powers and the law as well as his own limitations, yet his behavior is directed only toward maintaining his own position. He consults Meander about prerogative after Cosroe's spoken disdain: "I might command you to be slain for this;/ Meander, might I not?" (I.i.23-24). Perhaps Mycetes knows that he cannot hold his kingdom by the force of his personality, so he appeals to law. But this legitimizing appeal is limited by Meander's advice, subverted by lords loyal to Cosroe, and finally tricked by an upstart Scythian shepherd. However, the faithful Meander cannot protect his king, and Tamburlaine's "argument of arms" will overwhelm law. Mycetes is aware of his public role and its demand for kingly domination, but he understands neither the relations of power nor its ends. The battlefield meeting of Mycetes and Tamburlaine contrasts the petulance of the king with the honor of the challenger:
Tam: What, fearful coward, straggling from the camp,  
    When kings themselves are present in the field!  
Myc: Thou liest.  
Tam: Base villain, darest thou give me the lie?  
Myc: Away! I am the king. Go, touch me not.  
    Thou break'st the law of arms, unless thou kneel,  
    And cry me "Mercy, noble king!"  

(II.iv.16-22)

In the rest of this scene, Tamburlaine gently mocks his  
opponent's pretensions to kingly manners, even offering  
to buy Mycetes' crown. When he reveals his own identity,  
Mycetes reveals his misjudgment of their meeting: "O  
gods, is this Tamburlaine the thief?" (40). No, it is  
Tamburlaine the great rhetorician and poet, who has  
displayed skills Mycetes cannot learn.

Cosroe seems more qualified to wear the Persian  
crown than does his brother, but the mirror of his  
limited ambition and misplaced trust will magnify the  
aspiration of Tamburlaine. Although Cosroe does want to  
improve Persia's reputation, his motive is envy. He  
speaks disrespectfully to Mycetes in this brief yet  
characteristic verbal exchange.

Myc: 'Unless they have a wiser king than you!'  
    These are his words, Meander; set them down.  
Cos: And add this to them,—that all Asia  
    Lament to see the folly of their king.  
Myc: Well, here I do swear by this my royal seat—  
    Cos: You may do well to kiss it, then.  
(I.i. 93-98)

This wrangle illustrates several characteristics of the  
two brothers and their relationship. Even in a fight
with his brother, Mycetes appeals to Meander for support, wanting things spelled out in bolder language than his own. Cosroe's language is usually more noble than his brother's, but when he addresses Mycetes his loftiness drops into vulgarity, and Mycetes' responses are shrill. Although they are discussing the proper governance of Persia, the two brothers talk like boys who share a bedroom and quarrel over toys, giving their public dispute a distinctly private, undignified tone.

Though concerned for the fate of his country and aware of its weakness under his brother's rule, Cosroe's politics are selfish rather than affirmative; he usurps the crown instead of working with its possessor to strengthen it. Correctly perceiving both Mycetes' weakness and Tamburlaine's ability, Cosroe nevertheless deludes himself in imagining that Tamburlaine will be content as his regent. Inadvertently, Cosroe affirms Tamburlaine's superior ability by sending him to perform the military dirty work of deposing Mycetes, a superiority which Tamburlaine acknowledges when he wryly proclaims Cosroe's success:

Think thee invested now as royally,  
Even by the mighty hand of Tamburlaine,  
As if many kings as could encompass thee  
With greatest pomp had crown'd thee emperor.  

(II.v. 2-5)

Cosroe has another flash of perception after he
discovers Tamburlaine's next step to "sweet fruition," when he describes "the loathsome circle of my dated life" (II.vi. 37). His dying words express his resentment toward his conqueror, as well as the "uncouth pain" which works his death. Cosroe values military valor and the respect of his royal peers, but he seems not to understand that he must display valor and the ability to dominate in his own person. Whereas Mycetes had Meander speak for him (though not quite successfully, as at II.ii. 72-76), Cosroe wants Tamburlaine to rule for him. But Tamburlaine is no administrator, and even as Mycetes is forced to second Meander's commanding words instead of speaking for himself, Cosroe learns at his death that he must fight his own battles. Functioning as foils, this pair of Persian rulers highlights Tamburlaine's eloquence, competence, integrity, and charisma. Although they are not strong opponents, their defeat is a proving ground for the aspiring Scythian conqueror.

The emperor of the Turks is a ruler of different mettle; Tamburlaine must add cruelty to his command of language and his charismatic leadership in order to subdue "the Turk and his mighty emperess." Like the Persians, Bajazeth knows his foe's abilities yet overestimates his own. As Cosroe did, he recognizes Tamburlaine's virtue: "I hear he bears a valiant mind"
(III.i. 31). Cosroe also used the adjective "valiant," and after hearing a physical description of Tamburlaine, the Persians acknowledge their adversary's worth (II.i. 2-60). But Bajazeth, a more formidable ruler than Mycetes or his brother, also thinks more highly of himself, almost bragging among his bassoes. His challenge to Tamburlaine (in III.i.) is condescending to his messenger as well as to his opponent, and its imperative mood is much more aggressive than Mycetes was with his mouthpiece Meander.

Hie thee fast, my basso, to Persia.
Tell him thy lord, the Turkish emperor, ...
Wills and commands, (for say not I entreat),

... Tell him I am content to take a truce,
... Say, I bid thee so.

(III. i. 21-22, 27, 31, 35)

Not content with vaunting himself to his servants, he also participates in self-flattery with his viceroys:

Arg: For all flesh quakes at your magnificence.
Baj: True, Argier; and trembles at my looks.
Mor: The spring is hinder'd by your smothering hosts
For neither rain can fall upon the earth,
Nor sun reflex his virtuous beams thereon,
The ground is mantled with such multitudes.

Baj: All this is true as holy Mahomet,
And all the trees are blasted with our breaths.

(48-55)

The sheer ego of the first two lines is comic, but as the compliments continue, humor becomes horror. Morocco's description of natural disaster resulting from the mantle
of battle-strewn corpses is chilling, recalling Mycetes' weaker but still vicious hopes for a dainty, blood-smeared victory. Tamburlaine's military reputation will be for fierceness in human battle, but the wars of the Turks waste even the earth itself. Bajazeth shows his casual destructiveness in his boasts of having blasted trees and smothered the spring. The Turkish emperor drips with a bloodlust which renders Mycetes' imaginary bloodletting pathetic and makes Tamburlaine's sieges look pale. His invitation to the battle explains the tactics of brutality: "Let thousands die; their slaughter'd carcasses/ Shall serve for walls and bulwarks to the rest" (III.i.138-139). Although Tamburlaine's response does mention horse-trampled bowels and a fondness for blood-red colors, it is nevertheless not vicious so much as it is intimidating: "My camp is like to Julius Caesar's host,/ That never fought but had the victory" (152-3).

Tamburlaine evaluates Bajazeth's language to emphasize the difference between the two rulers: "Tush, Turks are full of brags,/ And menace more than they can well perform" (III.iii. 3-4). Before their military battle, the warriors engage in stylized verbal sparring. Here Bajazeth initiates the dialogue and directs his entourage to continue the verbiage. Tamburlaine responds
in kind for sixty-two lines, until he decides to end the preliminaries: "But come, my lords, to weapons let us fall;/ The field is ours, the Turk, his wife, and all" (162-3). The outmaneuvered Bajazeth has no choice but to follow. He falls to the "valiant mind" of Tamburlaine in a short battle, but neither defeat nor captivity cures his bloodthirst. From his cage he screams gory threats at his captor:

Millions of men encompass thee about,
And gore thy body with as many wounds!
Sharp forked arrows light upon thy horse!
Furies from the black Cocytus' lake,
Break up the earth, and with their firebrands
Enforce thee run upon the baneful pikes!
Vollies of shot pierce through thy charmed skin,
And every bullet dipt in poison'd drugs!
Or roaring cannons sever all thy joints.

(V.ii. 152-60)

The four exclamation points emphasize Bajazeth's loss of linguistic control, as the cage indicates the martial superiority of his captor.

Even more than the captivity of Bajazeth and Zabina, Tamburlaine's policy of three-day siege, with its horribly successful results at Damascus, has become the emblem of Tamburlainean cruelty. It is described before the celebratory, taunting banquet, when Bajazeth is first taken out of his cage. The siege colors are pitched in front of the city and change from merciful white (IV.iii.111-112) to bloody red (IV.iv.1) to the black of total destruction (V.i.7-9). After the successful
conquest of Damascus, Bajazeth kills himself. He had previously witnessed Tamburlaine’s relentlessly cruel treatment of himself, his disrespectful comments about Zabina, and his first denial of Zenocrate’s pleas for mercy to Egypt and Arabia; his suicide is the final recognition of his opponent’s implacability and his own helplessness. "[T]his cruelty, which can be appalling, ...is simply a mode of action appropriate to a soaring ambition," as Daiches sees it (327). Richard Martin describes the killing day of the Damascus siege, with extreme idealism, as "part of a Neoplatonic quest for ideal beauty, and in these terms the imaginative appeal of the quest is itself a defense against the charges of cruelty that morality raises" ("Marlowe's Tamburlaine" 256). Martin goes even further in acknowledging "perhaps a 'typically Marlovian' strategy, forcing us to find beauty in sadism" (257).

The episode of the Damascene virgins is intertwined with Tamburlaine’s treatment of the Turk and his empress: "Hath Bajazeth been fed today?" (V.ii.129), in which the kingly parade dramatizes not beauty but the purposeless cruelty of rulers. Both Mycetes and Bajazeth gloated over excessive bloodshed, and Warren D. Smith has argued that they deserve their punishment. As Tamburlaine has exceeded them in eloquence and valor, so now does his
relentless destruction of Damascus overwhelm other witnesses. But by contrast with their own visions of cruelty, Tamburlaine's apparently gratuitous slaughter is a necessary result of the "argument of arms," admittedly terrible though tempered by a poetic regret over necessity. The gentle "alas, poor fools, must you be first shall feel/ The destruction of Damascus?" (V.ii.2-3) reveals emotion rarely seen elsewhere in the ten acts. The virgins acknowledge their besieger's position as "most happy king and emperor of the earth,/ Image of honour and nobility" (11-12). But despite his apparent regret, their plea for mercy and pity is vain; Tamburlaine has already made up his mind to enforce the death signified by his black flags on the third day of battle. He reaffirms the demands of absolute war in lines typical of his celestial aspirations and planetary sphere of operations:

I will not spare these proud Egyptians,  
Nor change my martial observations  
For all the wealth of Gihon's golden waves,  
Or for the love of Venus, would she leave  
The angry god of arms and lie with me.  
They have refused my offer of their lives,  
And know my customs are as peremptory  
As wrathful planets, death, or destiny.  
(58-65)

Throughout Part 1, Tamburlaine is determined to maintain his honor and virtue, whether it consists in
defeating generals and killing their soldiers, in
acknowledging Zenocrate's pleas for pity and mercy, in
humiliating the wanton destructiveness of Bajazeth, or in
implementing the warning of the black siege flags.
Although this mode of action has seemed cruel and
tyrannical to most readers of the play as well as to some
of its own characters, Tamburlaine's steadfast adherence
to his own code shows him exploring a life different from
that of his enemies. He merges the "sweet fruition of an
eythotly crown" (II.vii.29) into a higher pursuit of
honor, integrity, and Machiavellian virtu.

What Martin terms the beauty of the quest is the
austere face of Tamburlaine's drive to transform himself
into a person who encompasses all human experiences,
regretting only his unfinished business: "shall I die,
and this unconquered?" (2.V.iii. 151). Tamburlaine, like
every warrior that is rapt with love
Of fame, of valour, and of victory,
Must needs have beauty beat on his conceits.
(1.V.ii.117-119)

This beauty is a mystery which cannot be expressed fully
even in poetry, but Tamburlaine feels the need to "give
the world to note, for all [his] birth,/ That virtue
solely is the sum of glory" (125-127).

The opening scene of Part 2 recalls Tamburlaine's
first demonstration of virtue in Part 1:
Tam: Then shall we fight courageously with them?  
Or look you I should play the orator?  
Tec: No, cowards and faint-hearted runaways  
Look for orations when the foe is near:  
Our swords shall play the orators for us. ...  
Come, let us march.  
Tam: Stay, Techeles; ask a parley first.  
(I.ii.128-132, 136-137)

But Techeles is restrained by his superior, and they win their first contest without having to fight. Orcanes echoes Tamburlaine's words: "What, shall we parley with the Christian?/ Or cross the stream, and meet him in the field?" (2 I.i. 11-12). But where Tamburlaine is able to defeat others in the play of words, Orcanes is not so successful with language. His forces have been wearied with much fighting, and a new threat faces them: the Persian forces are marching on Orcanes' own empire. He recognizes the strategic need to make temporary peace with Sigismund and the Christians so both can defeat their common enemy. Although Orcanes is proud, he is no orator, so he challenges the Christian leader Sigismund rather than winning him over (as Tamburlaine was able to do with the Persian captain Theridamas). The Christians renege on their pact by finding a loophole, but Sigismund has another reason for distrust: "I confess the oaths they undertake/ Breed little strength to our security" (2 II.i. 42-3). Not persuaded by Orcanes' words, he finds it easier to be persuaded by proposals of treachery.
presented as self-protection and divine opportunity. As a result, Orcanes defeats Sigismund but falls before Tamburlaine.

This contrast of Orcanes and Sigismund also reflects that of Mycetes and Cosroe in Part 1. Tamburlaine dispatches the Persian brothers in two acts, while the stronger Orcanes-Sigismund threat takes most of four acts. In Part 1 Tamburlaine gains one crown, then several, by defeating Persia, Turkey, Egypt, Damascus, and Arabia; he then marries Zenocrate in triumphant conclusion to his war. Having thus accomplished his stated goals, his action is less focused in the sequel. Helen Gardner believes that the theme of Part 1 is the successful human will and that Part 2 is about the external frustrations of that will. Clifford Leech sees the same frustration in Part 2 but attributes it to an internal loss of control. While Part 1 easily stands alone, the careful parallel structure of significant images and situations in the second part is less evident when separated from the first. It may or may not have been written later, but Part 2 clearly is a sequel. Between the two parts occurs the marriage and family life of Tamburlaine and Zenocrate. The great conqueror has been invincible in combat; his next battle is with his own emotions.
III

In *Shakespeare, Politics and the State*, Robin Headlam Wells reminds his readers that "the idea that love is the basis of social order goes back at least as far as Plato (c. 427-348) and was central to the medieval and Renaissance view of the universe" (143). And as many Renaissance odes and hymns attest, Beauty offers a virtuous alternative to military domination. Manuals for would-be courtiers (the Renaissance equivalent of self-help books) recommend that their readers cultivate both martial and artistic abilities. Accordingly, Marlowe brackets Tamburlaine's story of cruel war with the romance of Zenocrate, who is not in the historical sources. With the addition of an appreciation of love and beauty to the ruthless force of arms and skill with language, the Scythian hero and his circle become a prototype of the community of rulers Marlowe will explore in his later plays. Tamburlaine is the center, because he commands love and loyalty. His original friends Techelles and Usumcasane, Theridamas the Persian captain, and Zenocrate form a group which enjoys power but does not contest Tamburlaine's possession of it.

Tamburlaine's first appearance is not in battle but as a surprisingly considerate bandit, self-confident yet
desirous of pleasing. At the end of Part 1 he "takes truce with all the world" (V. ii. 468) to get married. His three friends join with their lord in the coronation of Zenocrate, thus symbolically raising her to their peerage of love. Her influence has already changed her lord; immediately after the Damascus siege the victor returns to her in meditation on Beauty, which challenges the morality of conquest. Beauty both encourages the warrior to more exploits and tempers his triumphs with compassion, thus merging the concerns of Tamburlaine and Zenocrate. G.I. Duthie asserts that "the play [that is, Part 1] is throughout concerned with the relationship between these two characters" (225) and argues that what produces Zenocrate's change of heart is the fact that her own father will shortly feel Tamburlaine's martial wrath. But her compassion does not stop at the borders of her country. After the deaths of Bajazeth and Zabina, "she has come to realize that a conqueror should be merciful" (225); her merely filial concern expands to include Tamburlaine's other foes and then all humanity. A brief study of her speeches will delineate the role that Zenocrate creates for herself to help Tamburlaine realize his own.

After her capture by Tamburlaine, Zenocrate pleaded for pity. Love wins her to his cause, and she comes to
identify with and even participate in Tamburlaine's cruelty by taunting the Turkish empress Zabina. She continues to be concerned for the honor of her lord even as she returns to her original values of mercy and mutual respect: "Honour still wait on happy Tamburlaine!/ Yet give me leave to plead for him, my lord" (IV.iv.91-92). She is moved first for family, then for country as she next sees "Damascus' walls dyed with Egyptian blood,/ [My] father's subjects and [my] countrymen" (V.ii. 259-260), and finally by human pity for the dead Turks. When she discovers their bodies immediately after witnessing the Damascus slaughter, Zenocrate is remorseful, overcome with grief, and overwhelmed with guilt both for herself and for Tamburlaine. Part of this emotion is in Zenocrate's own self-interest; she does not want to see Tamburlaine and herself subject to some other ruthless conqueror or to divine retribution, but she is primarily moved by sincere pity, even praying to Jove and Mahomet "to pardon me that was not moved with ruth" (306). Yet she has not forgotten her primary allegiance to Tamburlaine: "Now shame and duty, love and fear presents/ A thousand sorrows to my martyred soul" (320-21). Her shame lies in her inability to acquiesce in Tamburlaine's theory of total war and in her opposite wish that he defeat her father's forces, whereas her duty
is to support both her father and her husband.

Viewing herself as the reconciliator of love and honor, family and war, Zenocrate asks herself what outcome could possibly satisfy her interest in both Tamburlaine and her father. She resolves her dilemma by deciding to accept as best "a league of honor to my hope" (336), which would allow Tamburlaine to defeat but not to kill her father or her first-betrothed. This resolve is shown by her last comment in Part 1, at her coronation:

Tam: What saith the noble Soldan and Zenocrate? 
Sol: I yield with thanks and protestations 
      Of endless honor to thee for her love. 
Tam: Then doubt I not but fair Zenocrate 
      Will soon consent to satisfy us both. 
Zen: Else I should much forget myself, my lord. (432-37)

Not entirely the demure reply one might expect to the lord and husband who doubly commands her loyalty, her response also confirms her self-fashioned role as reconciler. Ellis-Fermor has described Zenocrate as a "virtuous, God-fearing Elizabethan matron," whose speech "continues to obscure her identity" (CM 29). Duthie's characterization, on the other hand, shows that Zenocrate is more involved in Tamburlaine's career than Ellis-Fermor allows. Even more than Duthie recognizes, Zenocrate helps Tamburlaine find an alternative mode of action as a warrior tempered by beauty (an emergent ideal of such Renaissance writers as Spenser and Castiglione,
and embodied in Sidney).

Zenocrine is more a complementary character for Tamburlaine than are the rival kings and their followers whom Marlowe sets up for contrast. For all of Tamburlaine's conquered enemies, kingship is a limited spectrum of activity whose lack of flexibility brought them down. Tamburlaine alone explains his actions, thinking them through as an alternate mode of political action. As he does so, he keeps fighting against opponents who set off other aspects of his actions.

The weakness of the Soldan of Egypt is pride, which leads him to dismiss Tamburlaine carelessly, almost recklessly. When he hears about Tamburlaine's siege policy, he rages:

Merciless villain, peasant, ignorant
Of lawful arms or martial discipline!
Pillage and murder are his usual trades:
The slave usurps the glorious name of war.
(IV.i. 64-7)

Despite Tamburlaine's successful military experience, Egypt still thinks that his foe is just a rogue and a peasant slave. Perhaps the soldan's judgment is clouded because he is Zenocrine's father, but a prejudice against the low birth of his foe is more evident in the text:

It is a blemish to the majesty
And high estate of mighty emperors
That such a base usurping vagabond
Should brave a king, or wear a princely crown.
(IV.i. 19-23)
The king of Arabia is more respectful of Tamburlaine, though he also deplores his treatment of Bajazeth. Yet he is no less eager to defeat Tamburlaine. These two rulers fight "in revenge of fair Zenocrate" (IV.ii. 44), but they are also motivated by their extreme prejudice against his origins. Tamburlaine takes the opportunity provided by his victory over them to demonstrate his own superior mode of action, as he unites public valor and private feeling in his treatment of the soldan:

Zen: O sight thrice-welcome to my joyful soul,  
To see the king, my father, issue safe  
From dangerous battle of my conquering love!
Sol: Well met, my only dear Zenocrates,  
Though with the loss of Egypt and my crown!
Tam: 'Twas I, my lord, that gat the victory,  
And therefore grieve not at your overthrow,  
Since I shall render all into your hands,  
And add more strength to your dominions  
Than ever yet confirm'd th'Egyption crown.  
(V.ii. 379-88)

Tamburlaine does not even compel the soldan to be a contributory king (he does not appear in Part 2), but instead gives the Egyptian spoil back to its defeated ruler. In this magnanimity, made even brighter by contrast with Bajazeth's misery, Part 1 ends with the domestic joy of Zenocrates's investiture as Queen of Persia.
Gardner has pointed out that the conflict between Callapine and Tamburlaine forms the plot of Part 2. Last and most recalcitrant in the parade of kings, Callapine serves several purposes in Part 2 (as his father did in the first part). As heir to the proud Turkish destroyer, he represents a continuing threat to Tamburlaine's military domination as well as to his political project of self-creation through language. The initial success of this threat, combined with the decline and death of Zenocrate, drives Tamburlaine temporarily berserk, away from the festive community which existed at the close of Part 1. When Zenocrate dies, he burns an entire town as her mourning pyre and declares himself "raving, impatient, desperate and mad" (2.II.iv.112). His once-valiant mind "dies for want of her" (128). From now on Tamburlaine will give no quarter to the earth or its inhabitants, "letting [out] death and tyrannising War,/ To march with me under this bloody flag!" (115-116). The great and innovative conqueror has temporarily deserted the valiant necessity which keeps him honorable. He recovers some of his former ambition at his last battle, in which he is able to repel attackers merely by presenting himself on the battlefield. Afterwards, his
temporary madness clears, and his quest for a new status is over. He speaks last words to his eldest son and faithful friends, and he reasserts his unsurpassed dominance of the world map.

Callapine's success will depend more on others than does Tamburlaine's. Without the treason of his jailer and the support of his ally Orcanes, the Turkish heir would remain a captive. As it is, he escapes into his rank as Bajazeth's son and heir to the Turkish empire, relying more on its reputation and resources than on his own abilities to attract Almeda and Orcanes.

When he first appears, Callapine is endeavoring to persuade his jailer to assist his escape, thereby betraying his "sovereign lord, renowned Tamburlaine" (2.I.iii.6). The character of Almeda, which both links and differentiates Tamburlaine and Callapine, is formally connected to both Meander and Theridamas. Almeda was bribed to betray the ruler whom he respected for a lesser one; Meander remained loyal to the Persian throne, no matter who possessed it. Theridamas is seduced by Tamburlaine's physical appearance and bearing, his rhetorical virtuosity and appeals to divine necessity, and his offer of friendship. Overwhelmed by persuasions, Theridamas yields to Tamburlaine in terms suggestive of wedding vows: "To be partaker of thy good or ill,/ As
long as life maintains Theridamas" (230-31). His formal reception by Tamburlaine's loyal friends reinforces the impression that Theridamas was right to forsake his foolish Persian masters and cleave to Tamburlaine and his cause of love and dominion.

By contrast, Callapine's appeal to Almeda is based only on self-interest, which feeds Almeda's venality. The jailer appears loyal to his service for sixteen lines, refusing even to hear his prisoner's entreaties (and in a play where language often is action, refusing to listen is the best defense). But something happens:

Alm: No talk of running, I tell you, sir.
Cal: A little further, gentle Almeda.
Alm: Well, sir, what of this?

(2.I.iii. 16-18)

The verb "running," with Callapine's gentle urging of "a little further," implies that Almeda is, in fact, willing to listen. Perhaps Callapine offers a bribe which is not indicated in the stage directions, or perhaps others had been standing within earshot. Callapine does not profess his own worth or friendship for his keeper, as Tamburlaine did for Theridamas, but instead describes his escape plans and the wealth and rank he will give as a reward for this betrayal. Almeda agrees to the plan only after making sure that none will discover their stealth.

Callapine and Almeda show themselves greedy, cowardly, and base in this persuasion of wealth and
safety when it is compared to the friendship Theridamas both receives and gives. Unlike the Turkish father and son, Tamburlaine treats his wealth casually, scorning Bajazeth's offer of ransom with a scathing "What, think'st thou Tamburlaine esteems thy gold?" (1 IV.i. 262). Almeda accepts Callapine's bribe, confirming his own low rank and character by contrast with Theridamas, and Callapine's own inferiority to Tamburlaine is revealed in the preference of material to personal and spiritual bonds. This episode also exhibits the difference between the Turkish way of ruling and Tamburlaine's mode of political action, which fuses public policy and private emotion. Callapine is the scion of the old order; his foe represents a new way.

After Zenocrate's death, Tamburlaine breaks completely with the traditional bonds of family and loses whatever domestic values he learned from his wife. Having lost her and then been deserted by Almeda (and Callapine), Tamburlaine is left with the valiant Theridamas as his strongest link to his feelings, both gentle and noble.

Theridamas can only attempt to emulate his leader. Marlowe links Theridamas to Tamburlaine but separates him by his failure with the Captain and Olympia at Balsera. Theridamas follows the pattern, set by Tamburlaine with him (in 1 I.ii.) and repeated with Bajazeth and Orcanes,
of talking with one's enemy to gain dominance without battle. Echoing Tamburlaine's "Stay, Techelles; ask a parley first," Theridamas shows equal deliberation: "stay a while; summon a parle" (2.III.iii. 11). But unlike Tamburlaine, he and Techelles threaten their foe rather than entice or reconcile him. Losing the debate, they must defeat the enemy in battle.

Tamburlaine assimilates the beauty represented by Zenocrate to his own credo of war, but Theridamas fails in his attempt to win Olympia as Tamburlaine won. He announces his love rather abruptly and only after his glowing description of Tamburlaine fails to move her (as it did him in Part 1). The captain's wife has had enough of war and killing, so the vision of another conqueror, even one this glorious, does not persuade her. Nor is Theridamas' next try, a command, more effective: "Madam, I am so far in love with you,/ That you must go with us: no remedy" (III.iv. 78-9).

Because he attends more to his own wishes instead of perceiving her interests and personality (as even Callapine was able to do with Almeda, though perhaps only because he shared them), Theridamas again falls short of Tamburlaine's astounding political alternative to gross force.

Whereas Theridamas's imitation reflects the
unmatched strength of Tamburlaine, the treason of Almeda indicates Tamburlaine's growing weakness, evident in his faltering rhetorical control when Persian generals meet Turkish ones. Because the success of Callapine with his jailer parallels Tamburlaine's with the Persian captain, it confirms his status as an antagonist. Opening this scene, a messenger declares Callapine to be "God's great lieutenant over all the world" (III.v. 2), which recalls the divine protection claimed by Tamburlaine. Callapine has also learned some of his enemy's rhetorical methods, as he demonstrates during the interruption of the Turkish council of war. After some self-congratulatory remarks more reminiscent of Callapine's father than of his own early self-assurance, Tamburlaine defends his parentage and blusters vague threats and insults—until Callapine calmly intervenes: "Rail not, proud Scythian" (90).

Tamburlaine, clearly out of control, takes ten lines to recover; even then he can only manage colloquial prose indicative of his herdsman's past:

Sirrah Callapine, I'll hang a clog about your neck for running away again: you shall not trouble me thus to come and fetch you. But as for you, viceroy, you shall have bits, And, harness'd like my horses, draw my coach. I'll have you learn to feed on provender, And in a stable lie upon the planks.  

(III.v. 100-107)

These lines also recall Tamburlaine's former position as
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a keeper of animals, which he puts to ironic use when he harnesses the captive kings to his car. He calls his opponents peasants, slaves, dogs, curs, bulls, and jades. A reference to Tamburlaine's betrayer Almeda occasions another outburst of vituperation, which Callapine again interrupts: "Well, in despite of thee [Almeda] shall be king" (128). Tamburlaine regains some face when Almeda asks his permission to accept the offered crown, providing comic relief for his embarrassing lapse into fustian. The conqueror continues to address the Turks as an animal keeper to his animals, but Callapine has already shown an ability to outwit Tamburlaine--first with Almeda and then by causing his foe's linguistic regression--and will exhibit it again when he escapes from battle. This first defeat leads to Tamburlaine's second, more shocking reversal.

As one of Tamburlaine's sons, Calyphas has difficulty meeting his renowned father's expectations. Tamburlaine describes his ideal heir:

he shall wear the crown of Persia
Whose head hath deepest scars, whose breast most wounds,
Which, being wroth, sends lightning from his eyes,
And in the furrows of his frowning brows
Harbours revenge, war, death, and cruelty.
(I.iv. 74-78)

Even Zenocrate can admire the courage of her sons, her maternal pride mingled with fears for their safety. But
the only danger for Calyphases is from his father's displeasure at his domestic desires:

But while my brothers follow arms, my lord,  
Let me accompany my gracious mother.  
They are enough to conquer all the world,  
And you have won enough for me to keep.  
(65-68)

In order to achieve his personal refashioning, Tamburlaine needs Zenocrate to keep him in a human community. After she dies, the family's strengths, both warrior and domestic, are for a time exercised to excess. Tamburlaine temporarily loses his former ability to grant, even ironically, the dignity of his opponents. Instead, he reins in the "pampered jades" and "cankered curs of Asia"—unworthy spoils from his wars of self-affirmation. "Villain" is his new epithet of choice. Orcanes points to the difference when he says "Thou showest the difference 'twixt ourselves and thee/ In this thy barbarous damned tyranny" (138-39).

The pleasures of the strict father and the errant son coarsen. While Tamburlaine whips his chariot's human steeds, Calyphases gambles with his servant Perdicas (a companion from perdition, lost in hell). Calyphases is lazy, cowardly, lascivious, and parasitic; Marlowe compares him to Helen of Troy's abductor Paris, who dallied while his father and brothers fought the Greek attackers.
Calyphas also resembles Mycetes, though without having Mycetes' earnestness. The Persian weakling cursed the inventor of war and its wounds; Calyphas is disgusted by his father's bleeding arm: "I know not what I should make of it; methinks 'tis a pitiful sight" (III.ii. 130). Where Mycetes had imagined enjoying the bloodsmearred deeds of others, so Calyphas regards the gore of battle: "If any man will hold him, I will strike,/ And cleave him to the channel with my sword" (I.iv. 102-103). The contrast of father and son is ironic when Calyphas is mocking martial qualities, but more serious when he identifies with Zenocrate's way of life. In talking to his brothers before the battle with Orcanes, this cynical son again turns momentarily serious:

Amy: What, dar'st thou, then, be absent from the fight
Knowing my father hates thy cowardice
And oft hath warned thee to be still in field? . . .

Cal: I know, sir, what it is to kill a man;
It works remorse of conscience in me.
I take no pleasure to be murderous,
Nor care for blood when wine will quench my thirst.

(IV.i. 22-24, 27-30)

After this exchange of taunts, not unlike the verbal rituals before Tamburlaine's several battles with the Turks, Calyphas plays cards with Perdicas. His selfishness is as much a betrayal of Tamburlaine as is the treason of Almeda. These two characters rouse
Tamburlaine's anger as does nothing else in the play. The death of Zenocrate caused this loss of control; a reference to Almeda provoked the rush of invective after the verbal battle with Callapine. When Tamburlaine returns from an actual battle, he lashes out with a weapon of steel instead of words and stabs his son, delivering his judgment on the dead boy as both a justification of his own life and as a declaration of war with Jove:

By Mahomet, thy mighty friend, I swear,  
In sending to my issue such a soul, ...  
Thou hast procur'd a greater enemy  
Than he who darted mountains at thy head.  
(123-124, 129)

Calyphas is set in contrast with Callapine as well as with Tamburlaine's other, more pliable sons, and he is compared to a traitor and a coward king. But neither Bajazeth's son nor his own can finally defeat Tamburlaine:

In spite of [my impending] death, I will go show my face.  
Thus are the villains, cowards fled for fear,  
Like summer's vapours vanish'd by the sun;  
And could I but a while pursue the field,  
That Callapine should be my slave again.  
(V. iii. 115-20)

His mode of rule is not discredited by Callapine's meager and temporary successes. Were he and Tamburlaine's son Amyras to continue the war (in Tamburlaine Part III if Marlowe were in Hollywood today), they would be evenly
matched but lesser warriors than Tamburlaine was (and probably less wasteful of creation than Bajazeth). In medieval history, sibling quarrels did hasten the downfall of the Mongolian empire after Timur's death. Tamburlaine remains even at his death the only unconquered warrior, peerless and apotheosized as heaven's "choicest living fire" (2.V.iii.252).

V

In Part 1, Marlowe creates a unique, self-referential character who redefines the role of ruler as a successful, unmatched combination of poetry and war, beauty and cruelty. The continuation of the story explores the flaws inherent in any human effort to reconstitute the world. Several critics have objected to treating Tamburlaine as a human figure. Karen Cunningham asserts that "Marlowe's titular figures ... [are] always and insistently 'other,' monsters by desire and by dramatic designation" (214). Herbert B. Rothschild argues that "Tamburlaine is not presented as a human being" (63). It is true that the death toll in the play is appallingly high, yet war has victimized humanity throughout its history while remaining an exclusively human activity. Beasts do not fight battles (except in mock-epics), and for the wars of the gods and angels we
have only human testimony. Objections to Tamburlaine's militarism as inhumane, monstrous, or unhuman disregard the historical record. Similarly, the hero's desires for social status, earthly power, a beautiful wife and fine sons, and fame after death are all-too-human.

Tamburlaine's furious rant and the burning of the town where his wife died is a dramatic yet human response to loss, and it indicates that Tamburlaine has lost the absolute control over people and events he displayed in Part 1. Calyphas defies his father and is killed for it, thus calling forth Tamburlaine's desperate rejection of the family feeling Zenocrate had encouraged in him. In this temporary madness, the hero shows himself least bound by human feelings and ambitions. He recovers some human feeling in his mortal illness: "Shall sickness prove me to be a man,/ That have been term'd the terror of the world?" (2.V.iii.44-45). His dying actions prove him to be both man and terror. Although too ill to fight, he wins his last battle merely by appearing on the field. Back from the victory, he is surrounded with memories and friends; he reviews his career and hands the reins of command to his son (literally: "with these silken reins/ Bridle the steeled stomachs of these jades," the kings who draw his chariot [203-204]).

Tamburlaine is the only character in the play whose
words are actions. Rothschild and David Thurn suggest that this is a divine ability; it recalls the imperative mood of God's creation of the world in Genesis, Adam's naming the creatures, and the equation of logos and theos in John's gospel. Tamburlaine himself attributes it to his "smiling stars," to Jove, to "the chiepest god": not Mahomet or the Christian deity, but the Olympian pantheon. Culturally, Tamburlaine's context is medieval west Asia and the Moslem Ottoman empire. Yet after his penultimate victory, the conqueror displays what sixteenth-century Christendom might have viewed as laudable zeal:

   In vain, I see, men worship Mahomet.
   There is a God, full of revenging wrath
   From whom the thunder and the lightning breaks,
   Whose scourge I am, and him will I obey.
   (2.V.ii.177, 181-183)

This God of lightning and thunder sounds more like Jove than Jehovah. A few lines later, however, Tamburlaine reverts to a brief moment of uncertainty, rare for him but typically less than orthodox, concerning "the God that sits in heaven, if any god" (199), before he reasserts his own belief: "For he is God alone, and none but he" (199-200).

   While Tamburlaine may express the wish to "become immortal like the gods" (1.1.ii.201), he knows he is not divine even though he enjoys divine protection as the
scourge of God:

> these terrors and these tyrannies
> (If tyrannies war's justice ye repute),
> I execute, enjoin'd me from above,
> To scourge the pride of such as Heaven abhors;
> Nor am I made arch-monarch of the world,
> Crowned and invested by the hand of Jove,
> For deeds of bounty or nobility;
> But, since I exercise a greater name,
> the Scourge of God and terror of the world,
> I must apply myself to fit those terms,
> And plague such peasants as resist in me
> The power of Heaven's eternal majesty.

(2.IV.i.148-160)

Being the servant of God, however, is not greater than being a god himself. Tamburlaine exhibits heavenly power, but he dies of a fever. Consoled by his sons, his friends, and the embalmed body of his wife, he is resigned if not quite content: "Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, must die" (V.iii.249).

Tamburlaine is supremely human in the world of the play. The perverse holiness of separation implied in A.D. Hope's version of the law of strife both reinforces the need for domination and removes it from "the concept of rule, that is, the notion that men can lawfully live together only when some are entitled to command and the others forced to obey" (HC 222). In order to actualize his humanity in a universe of strife, Tamburlaine dominates his military foes. The relationship with family is a different sort of domination; Zenocrate is assimilated, Calyphas eliminated, and Amyras designated
the heir, in love, honor, and sorrow. Tamburlaine's murderous reaction to his son's rebellion shows another aspect of this alternative domination, its fusion of public and private. Everyone and everything around Tamburlaine must meet his standards for heroic virtue.

Tamburlaine's quest for ultimate power does not in itself constitute a political alternative to the traditional structure of rulership and obedience. The upstart shepherd uses a combination of love, friendship, and adherence to a strict code of personal nobility to weld his circle of family and friends into a domus with which to successfully challenge the accepted role of an absolute sovereign. At the end of Part 1, Tamburlaine urges his viceorys to

> Cast off your armor, put on scarlet robes,  
> Mount up your royal places of estate,  
> Environed with troops of noblemen,  
> And there make laws to rule your provinces.  
> (l.V.ii.463-466)

Legislative as well as military power circulates between this conquering hero and his circle, suggesting a different model of rule from that of providentialist and Italian realist views of political power. A.D. Hope captures the critical divisions over the play as he concludes that

Marlowe makes no comment. We are free to accept
the Argument of Arms and regard this [human] failure as the tragedy of man, or to reject it and take Tamburlaine's failure as evidence that it is unsound, a fatal flaw that makes the play the tragedy of Tamburlaine alone.

(53)\[1]

Rejecting the dichotomy of failure, we may interpret Tamburlaine's version of power politics as a successful challenge to the traditional structure of rulership and obedience.
1. Marlowe's reference to the "tent of war" (Prol. 3) is an allusion to the metaphor of life as a stage: bios he skene. Skene means "tent," a dwelling, but it may also signify a wooden stage for actors (as opposed to the thumelē where the chorus performed). A third meaning is an entertainment, usually a banquet, given in tents. Marlowe knew some Greek, as the on cai me on in Doctor Faustus indicates. But even if he did not know this particular proverb, the prevalence of such images as the theatrum mundi and the tragic glass suggests that the tent of war may also be a mirror or stage for new patterns of life, of acting, and of rule.

2. I will refer to the two parts of Tamburlaine as "the play" because the political challenge is developed through all ten acts. Structurally, this usage is an oversimplification; see page 57 below.

3. See Karen Cunningham's analysis of dramatized public torture and death which shows that Tamburlaine and other Marlovian protagonists are monsters and deviants. This judgment echoes that of Wilbur Sanders.

4. See Daiches, especially 327.

5. There are many studies of the Machiavellian sense of being a prince. See Ribner, "Marlowe and Machiavelli";
Battenhouse's chapter on "The Influence of Machiavelli"; Felix Raab, The English Face of Machiavelli; and Sebastian de Grazia.

6. In contrasting characters and incidents which structure this two-part play, Clifford Leech argues that those parallels show the increasing quality of Tamburlaine's opposition as well as distinguishing it from him. Part 2 traces the deterioration of Tamburlaine's honor and military success in its "deliberately casual structure" ("The Structure of Tamburlaine" 281).

7. David Daiches reads Mycetes' "Tis a pretty toy to be a poet" (II. ii. 54) as disdainful of poetry. But the conversation with Tamburlaine in II.iv. suggests that Mycetes takes kingly rhetoric seriously, even as Tamburlaine mocks Mycetes' lack of it. In response to Tamburlaine's jeering entreaty to Mycetes, "speak but three wise words" (25), Mycetes says--earnestly, I think--"So I can when I see my time" (26), meaning that he studies his words in order to sound more impressive and kingly. And Mycetes uses what classical knowledge he does have, as his allusions demonstrate.

8. The Scolar Press Facsimile of the 1593 quarto does not show any exclamation points; "wounds" and "pikes" are followed by periods, while "horse" has a colon and "drugs"
Ellis-Fermor, in R.H. Case's edition, explains her modernization of sixteenth-century spelling (vi-viii), which Ribner (in Complete Plays), Steane, and Jump also use.

9. In a minority opinion, Warren D. Smith ("The Substance of Meaning in Tamburlaine Part 1," ) asserts that because his foes deserve their punishments, Tamburlaine is not bloodthirsty nor unfairly cruel. As a scourge of God, he was accepted by contemporary audiences. Smith does admit that his position is contrary to that large and influential group of critics who view the play as romantic or orthodox.

10. But for the opposing view, see Ellis-Fermor, who as might be expected given her romantic interpretation of the plays, finds the poetic spirit of beauty present only in Part 1. Source studies show that Marlowe used most of the available historical material in the first part and therefore had to invent episodes for Part 2. There are also arguments for Part 2's claim to form, by Duthie, Leech, and Gardner (all reprinted in Ribner's edition) among others. The two most recent articles, by Thurn and Cunningham, treat the plays as one, while Rothschild's 1984 essay maintains that they were two.

11. But Cole himself would reject the choice (as would Kocher, who sides with Ellis-Fermor on this issue). Cole
reads the plays ironically though still as orthodox, arguing instead that the pageantry of characterization defeats any romantic exaltation of the individual: "it is not the universe that is destructive, but the heart of man" (250).
Chapter 3
Lords of House:
Dido, Queen of Carthage and Edward II

I

Dido, the queen of Carthage in Marlowe's drama of the same name (c. 1587), is not typical of the Renaissance dramatic representation of women, nor is Edward II's eponymous protagonist a typical king. Dido is a classical tragic heroine, caught between love and duty, who commits suicide after being abandoned by her noble lover. Edward is mired in a power struggle with the barons of his realm, torn between his inherited position and the minion he loves, and deposed and killed for his unseemly actions. Dido was probably the play Marlowe wrote first, while Edward II came late in his career. These plays are linked to Tamburlaine by their investigations of unorthodox princely love.¹

Chapter 2 traced the role of Zenocrate's representation of beauty in Tamburlaine's synthesis of a new mode of action and politics. Una Ellis-Fermor's description of Dido as "an attempt to weigh the forces of love and kingly power" also applies to Edward II (CM 20)
and, though she does not say so, to Tamburlaine. As the Scythian scourge of God pondered the problems of beauty and pity for war's victims, so Dido wrestles with her vow of faithfulness to her dead husband, and Edward elevates his friendship with a minor Gascon gentleman to an affair of state. *Dido, Queen of Carthage* and *Edward II* dramatize the love affairs of two princes and the political changes they make in order to validate their lives.

Both Edward and Dido lose their rule because of their passion. Whereas Tamburlaine could integrate his desire for Zenocrate into his life's passion to dominate, Dido takes her power for granted, and Edward often regrets his. These rulers fashion themselves more or less successfully as they fuse the public and private aspects of their lives.

Marlowe begins his Roman play with a scene between Jupiter and Ganymede, which defamiliarizes the classical story of "tragic Dido." Amplifying Virgil's brief mention of "Ganymede taken and made a favorite" (I. 28), Marlowe's hundred-line opening episode is the first indication (or second, if the play's title counts as an indication) that *Dido* is not merely a youthful rehash of Books II-IV of Virgil's poem, "too literal a rendering of the Aeneid to be significant." This version of Jupiter
is more casually decadent yet confident about his public image and his ability to direct events.

Dido's first scene portrays Jupiter as totally in command, dominating his wife and daughter as well as all humans, yet doting on a boy who owes his preferment to the reformation of the Olympian household by its absolute lord. Marlowe's subversive purpose is most evident when Jupiter gives Juno's wedding jewels to his favorite. The ambiguity is reinforced by the fluctuating tone of Jupiter's speech. Dandling a "female, wanton boy," the thundering lord of heaven vows a grand and terrible retribution on his consort for, anticlimactically, slapping Ganymede. From this lofty diction, tonally appropriate although it comically inflates the situation, Jupiter's language falls into the low comic phrase "sweet wag" and then immediately rises to an image which sounds Olympian ("I.../ Have oft driven back the horses of the Night," I.i. 25-26) but is actually from Ovid's sensual Amores. A far cry from Tamburlaine's rhetorical control, the oscillating Jovian mood unsettles one's expectations of decorous or passionate tragedy.

Marlowe's innovative comparison of Jupiter and Dido elevates Dido's status as a female from the usual low or frivolous or seductive character to lord of Olympus, and it reduces Aeneas from a noble conqueror to a love toy.
Yet because the scene is one of low comedy, it also demeans the queen of Carthage even as it suggests a more serious questioning of roles in the play's main action.

The same situation is alluded to in Edward II, where the king's infatuation with Gaveston is compared to Jove's for Ganymede. Jupiter manages to control the workings of his world in part by choosing to dally with Ganymede. He incorporates the boy into his own role by giving him permission to rule fate and life throughout the cosmos (a role which Ganymede shows absolutely no interest in). Gaveston, the arrogant usurper of royal favor, is another version of Ganymede (the names even sound alike), for whom Jupiter displaced Hebe, his own child with Juno, as his cupbearer. Gaveston also is a foreign parasite rather than a native aristocrat. Edward's letter to his banished favorite shows neither decorum or honor: "My father is deceas'd. Come, Gaveston, / And share the kingdom with thy dearest friend" (I.i.1-2). Gaveston responds foppishly, as did Ganymede. Tragedy will follow, but it is preceded by Edward's irreverent reconstruction of his house--that is, his kingdom--to include his unpopular friend.5

The dramatic pairings of Dido with Aeneas and Edward with Gaveston may be seen from several perspectives. Twentieth-century critics generally discuss Marlowe's
queen of Carthage as though she were a heroine of romance
and his English king as a victim of homosexuality or
homophobia. "Perverse love" is one critical evaluation,
either as improper love of a man for another male or the
distracting and destructive passion of a strong,
domineering woman for a man.

Most critics prefer to analyze traditional
situations in Dido. Don Cameron Allen and William
Godshalk emphasize the unnatural love between Dido and
Aeneas, but where Allen finds Marlowe siding "with his
predecessors who held the Trojan guilty" of seducing Dido
(68), Godshalk faults the queen as "masculine and
unnatural" (46) for wooing Aeneas. Roma Gill, Una Ellis-
Fermor, and M. E. Smith contrast love and honor—Dido's
love and Aeneas' honor. Smith deemphasizes the political
role of Dido, while keeping her stature as heroine. Gill
sees her as the protagonist in Virgil as well as in
Marlowe. Claude Summers also grants to Dido highest
political status in the struggle for power between humans
and gods: "the most powerful and absolute monarch
possible does not have the power to secure the man she
loves" (Christopher Marlowe 38). In this play, unlike
Tamburlaine, the highest power is not in complete
control, as Richard Martin suggests. He continues
Summers' focus on the relationship between earth and
heaven in his analysis of the play's structure: "Marlowe does not simply replace a sixteenth-century sense of retributive justice with an epic sense of divine purpose. In Dido, Marlowe captured for English tragedy a vision of man as a victim" ("Fate, Seneca" 64). Douglas Cole also assigns the victim's role to Dido, but with emphasis on her emotions in terms more appropriate to a sentimental novel. Clifford Leech, on the other hand, regards her almost as arrogant as Tamburlaine, while Paul Kocher dismisses the same passage used by Leech (IV.iv. 70-78, discussed below in section II) as an authorial intrusion. Richard Martin finds the play more important than do most of the above-mentioned readers, but very little analysis of Dido as a ruler is evident anywhere.

Some more recent critics have suggested that Marlowe's text does not regard either Dido's annexation of Aeneas or Edward's dalliance as problematic or perverse. Instead, these critics focus on a distinction, either natural or unnatural, between the presentation of men and women. Mary Beth Rose, for example, finds Marlowe's work to be troublesome in the way it degrades women in its "very clear distinction between private and public domains" (107). Leonora Brodwin develops this assertion further (though in an essay written 24 years earlier) to show that Marlowe ends by validating
homosexuality in Edward II. Leah Marcus discusses Elizabeth's androgynous image, in a fashion that would fit Dido. This body of critics shares a view of the Marlovian connection between duty and love: if the love is important, then it is distracting; if not, it is private. Either way, the separation of public and private is maintained. Despite the use of words such as "radical," "questioning," "subversive," and "problematizing," these scholars of Marlowe retain the division of his dramatic representation into a public, masculine arena of duty to the state and a lesser sphere of emotional love or effeminate desire. Such a separation conserves the traditional polarization of human experience, which is nevertheless challenged by the very acknowledgement of the fluidity of gender definition and roles in the sixteenth century. 

Martin's analysis of genre finds Marlowe's alternative in the combination of history, lyric, and tragedy in Dido. The Queen of Carthage is both female and monarch; her private life is inextricably bound with her public role. In a study of Tudor historiography, Irving Ribner makes a point about Edward II that also applies to the queen of Carthage: "like the traditional tragic hero, he is a king, and his downfall is thus intimately involved with the life of the state"
Nevertheless, Ribner sees Edward and Mortimer as two poles in the universe of public and private; neither character has both virtues. Voss agrees: "the fact that Edward is king, and king of a specific kingdom, assigns a political dimension to his actions" (518). One issue in Edward II is what it means to be a king; Edward is one by definition, a problematic definition and a begged question in most Marlowe studies. The criticism of perverse love in Dido and Edward II is a misunderstanding of Marlowe's drama of power politics. As peerless, friendless political protagonists, Dido and Edward reconcile the division of experience into public and private by reaching toward a livable community of peers, a domus. Marlowe's fusion of public and private challenges the patriarchal pattern of traditional governance, where men rule and women obey, men work and women stay home. In a domus of peers, there is no rule or obedience, and home is brought into the public arena.

The word domination can be traced to the Indo-European root *deme, which means house or household. Its Latin descendent, domus, produces dominus, "lord, master" (of the house). The English verb is dominate, "to bear rule over." In Greek, the word becomes demo, "to build." With the addition of *poti, "powerful/lord," it yields despotes, "master." This etymology supports a
connection between the will to absolute domination, found in Dido and Edward, and their concern for domestic, i.e. private, affairs. When the house is extended to include a city or an "island home," the fusion of public and private has begun. The domination of Dido and Edward is not the tyrannical violence of the cautionary tales (which, as Marlowe uses it in Tamburlaine, strengthens his hero), but the will of a strong protagonist to command the creation of equals. As analyzed in Marlowe by Kocher and Hope, the Empedoclean concept of strife as the world principle means that to be political, one must have absolute power—or at least want it. Dido and Edward give and take, in a pattern more like the Foucauldian idea of circulatory power relations than like the authoritarian despots of cautionary books like the Mirror for Magistrates.

This sharing of oneself with one's friend or lover as an attempt to make the two one, when it is situated in the tragic stories of kings and queens, politicizes a relationship. Edward and Dido are generous in their giving and their passions, even though there are others competing for gifts and love. Neither ruler exemplifies the Aristotelian tyrant who uses his country's wealth to serve private ends. They do remember their rank and power, even as they appear to be
neglecting their station and their duties. They do not forget their roles; they refashion their world of rule into a domus.

Patristic and medieval Christian political theory had already recombined the household and the state in the image of God the father, who of course solely and properly ruled over creation. Arendt notes that the Roman emperors adopted the title of dominus to increase their own field of domination (28, n. 12). Although Dido, Edward, and Tamburlaine all refer to their absolute power over their subjects, despotic rule is not Marlowe's focus.

In The Human Condition, Hannah Arendt declares that the pre-political condition of domination is necessary in order to create a space for real political freedom and action. She contrasts the freedom and equality of the Greek polis with the pre-political management of private households and "the barbarian empires of Asia, whose despotism was frequently likened to the organization of the household" (27). After the Greek moment, she believes, politics decays first into rule and further into the blurry socio-economic-political life of the modern nation-state. Michel Foucault seems to agree, viewing domination as the fundamental aspect of power. Yet he insists that power circulates, that it is not a
one-way repression by rulers, and that "the individual is an effect of power" and also "its vehicle" (P/K 98). Yet it is difficult for people to use this circulatory system to liberate themselves, for any resistance to the structures of power involves them in a paradox:

on the one hand they assert the right to be different and they underline everything which makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way.

(Dreyfus and Rabinow 211-212)

Applied to Marlowe's texts, these redefinitions of power and political freedom are what the overreaching protagonists attempt to realize. They fail because they are not creators but creatures of limit. Yet Marlowe has taken pains to blur those limits in the structural ambiguity of his plays and by questioning accepted limits. His heroes dare to take the very fabric of human existence into their hands and rearrange it into a pattern more suited to themselves.

The problem with seeing these rulers as political beings in Arendt's Greek sense is rather that, as traditional rulers, they have no peers, no equally powerful or acting fellows. In Empedoclean Strife theory, a fully free and realized human being can have no equals,
since domination is its mode of interacting among people. However, not even Marlowe is willing to isolate his superheroes to such an extreme, so his texts allow them to attempt a reconstitution of the familial and the political. Dido and Edward are legitimate princes who rule their subjects but want a freer realm for themselves. Dido extends her house to include Aeneas, and Edward limits his to feature Gaveston; both act to create a political arena for themselves among self-chosen or self-made equals. (Marlowe complicates Edward's struggle by making Gaveston a cocky low-born Frenchman, in contrast to Dido's choice of a well-known warrior prince.) Arendt's historical analysis describes domination as necessary to most states (that is, those which do not follow the Greek pattern) in order to create a space for freedom and action.¹⁰

Foucault notes the ongoing reformulation of the concept of politics. The proliferation in the Renaissance of books on the art of governing indicates that "political reflection was thereby tacitly broadened to include almost all forms of human activity" (Dreyfus and Rabinow 14-15). Most of Foucault's work has explored the means of control over the many: prisons, sex-role restrictions, medicine. His Les mots et les choses discusses the shift in epistemology from the Renaissance
to neoclassicist Europe as a way of perceiving control. Although Foucault insists that power circulates, that it is not only a repression from rulers, he indicates only indirectly how the repressed can use their place in this circulatory system to liberate themselves and (more importantly for this study) how those "in power" might interact without domination.

In a most useful suggestion, Foucault muses that "maybe the [political] target nowadays is not to discover who we are, but to refuse what we are" (216). Accordingly, in constructing a house out of their kingdoms, Dido and Edward refuse the limits of their traditional roles in attempting to explain who they are. Where Foucault almost always declines to draw any pragmatic conclusions, Unger's view of human nature offers a reason for the failure of dominating sovereigns such as Dido and Edward. Domination is unhuman, the only thing people do which is not an expression of their potential. When Dido and Edward are reduced to subterfuge or war, human action is replaced by mute violence, a reversion to the very roles they are trying to break and remake. If community is the "political equivalent of love" (Unger 261), the breaking of the community heralds the defeat of the house of love which Dido and Edward have labored to build.
Virgil depicts both Dido and Aeneas as builders as well as masterful characters; they construct the past and the future of personal and national identity. Aeneas is obsessed with the idea of Home. He continually tells the story of his native city, which he fled in order to reestablish it in Italy.\(^{12}\) In the first four books of Virgil's epic, Aeneas is occupied primarily as a construction worker, with either his ships or the building of Carthage. He boasts of his own domestic nature: "I am true-hearted Aeneas; .../ I carry my gods of Home .../ I go to my own land, Italy, where Jove began our line" (I. 378-80). Dido's domesticity is also expressed through city-building: "eager to forward the work and growth of her realm ... she throned herself on high;/ gave laws and ordinances, appointed the various tasks" (I. 504, 506-07).

Virgil's epic, the main source for Marlowe's drama, is named after its focus on Aeneas; some plays and operas since then have given titular prominence to both lovers or to Dido alone, finding more interest in Dido's romantic plight or her wicked attempts to seduce Aeneas than in Aeneas' destined duty. Marlowe follows dramaturgical custom in naming his play after its most important character, but he departs from tradition by
making Dido his hero. Thus he brings to the Renaissance stage (though at a private theater) a play about a strong woman who fashions her career with no help from gods or men. Marlowe has not written the *Tragedie of Dido and Aeneas*, or the *Perverse Love and Lamentable Death of Dido*, or even *No Second Troy*, but *Dido, Queen of Carthage*.

The earliest mention of Dido in Western literature, according to Mary Elizabeth Smith, is in the third-century B.C. *Fragmenta Graecorum Historicum* (23). Smith and Don Cameron Allen review later treatments of the queen of Carthage, from Virgil's stately tragedy to the noble and chaste widow in Justinus (second-third century A.D.), Boccaccio's *De casibus illustrium virorum*, and John Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*. Allen observes that Marlowe shows some gift for comedy and that "the play has been curiously unprized by critics partly because it seems not to move in the great swinging orbits of the universal tragedies" (64). Investigating the play's ambiguous genre, Martin regards *Dido* as an "exploratory comedy, where paradox destroys absolutism" ("Fate, Seneca" 54). Marlowe's blend of Roman epic traditionalism, "Ovidian sensuality" (57), and lyric romance results in "a dialectic that was incompatible with the tragic dramaturgy of his time" (46). Again,
nontraditional drama does not fit traditional categories. Marlowe adapts his sources and the expectations of genre to recontextualize his characters.

For Virgil, the tragedy of Dido lies in her instrumentality: "poor Dido, fated to be destroyed" (I. 712). Although she is queenly and heroic in her downfall, she is "ill-starred" (I. 798), surrendering her city as well as her own life to Aeneas, whose destiny will destroy them. Although she is clearly also affected by Venus and Cupid, Marlowe's Dido has balanced love and rule from her very first appearance. Whereas Virgil has her enter in the company of her subjects and absorbed in constructing the city, in Marlowe's drama her appearance is made in the company of her suitor Iarbas. Dido's own princely heroism is revealed slowly until the end of the drama, in order to emphasize her struggle with personal and political identity.

_Dido, Queen of Carthage_ does not show the Virgilian respect for city-building which serves in part to equalize the status of Dido and Aeneas. Instead, Dido's people and the Trojans are connected, by three other conditions: exile, an urban destiny, and the protection of Juno. Additionally, the Carthaginians know the history of Troy and respect its heroes. Marlowe thus sets the stage for dramatizing the political
ramifications of a story that has been read as a romantic tragedy. He introduces his two main characters separately, in their public roles, before he reveals the machinations of Venus and Cupid.

Dido is presented as a queen in her own right as well as an object of male desire. Although at her first entrance she is accompanied by Tarbas, it is Dido who speaks for the city, graciously yet imperiously. The queen offers citizenship to Ilioneus and his remnant even before discovering whether his leader is alive or dead. Aeneas, by contrast, is less a prized child of the goddess of love than a blundering defender who runs away from defeat. Allen describes him as "an obedient career pusher, but not overbright" (68). The great Trojan prince failed to rescue Cassandra, Polyxena, or his wife Creusa: "O, there I lost my wife!" (II.i.270). These failures do not slow the Trojan's journey or his narrative, but they do arrest the attention of Dido, who cries out an objection. Having followed the battle tale with appropriately encouraging interjections, Dido is less pleased with Aeneas' careless retelling of his misadventures with women:

Trojan, thy ruthless tale hath made me sad:  
Come, let us think upon some pleasing sport,  
To rid me from these melancholy thoughts.  
(II.i.301-03)
Aeneas seems not to be affected by the relationships between men and women. Although they do concern and disturb Dido, they do not finally defeat her efforts to live beyond the conventional restrictions posed by her widowhood, by the courtship of Iarbas, or by the divine conspiracy to advance Aeneas' destiny.

Marlowe's version of political Dido in this play has two aspects: her insistence on showing her love for Aeneas by integrating him into the city, and the awareness she never loses of her high rank and her role as a ruler. Aeneas has a divine parent, but Dido presents herself as a goddess in her own right, with attendant privileges of action. In this regard she is like Tamburlaine in his unlimited self-confidence and pride of place. Marlowe has her command a place for Aeneas, as Tamburlaine explains his right to have Zenocrate. Such behavior on the part of a widowed queen has elicited enough different reactions to deserve a closer look.

Anna: What if the citizens repine thereat?
Dido: Those that dislike what Dido gives in charge, Command my guard to slay for their offence. Shall vulgar peasants storm at what I do? The ground is mine that gives them sustenance, The air wherein they breathe, the water, fire, All that they have, their lands, their goods, their lives, And I, the goddess of all these, command
Aeneas ride as Carthaginian king.
(IV.iv.70-78)

Dido makes this speech after Aeneas returns from his first attempt to leave Carthage, he having been urged by a dream and by the desires of his fellows to build their own city. Dido persuades him to stay by giving him "the imperial crown of Libya" (34; compare Tamburlaine's investiture of Zenocrate with the crown of Persia in 1.V.ii.427-45). But Dido does not have the unquestioning support provided by Tamburlaine's united front of viceroy's and friends. The compunction of her sister Anna foreshadows Iarbas' more blatant assistance to the Trojans who are helpless to depart, and Dido needs to assert her dominant position against the imagined threats of both vulgar peasants (which do not materialize in the text) and of neighboring male suitors.6

The need and the speech are an ironic critique of absolute rulers, although apolitical interpreters do not find it so. In his book on Marlowe subtitled A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character, Paul Kocher briefly considers Dido's assertive rhetoric in context of the opposition of law and force. Sixteenth-century French absolutist theory upholds force, while Greek, Roman, scholastic, and English thought all place the sovereign under the law, not above it. In spite of the power struggle which Marlowe is dramatizing, Kocher finds no
dramatic necessity for Dido's revealed absolutism. He asserts instead that "it makes no difference to the plot whether Dido is an absolute or a limited ruler and her status as queen is not elsewhere drawn in question" (180). For an explanation of why Marlowe makes her an absolute ruler, Kocher resorts to Marlowe's reputation, as a free-thinker willing to shock others by taking extreme positions, instead of explaining the choice in artistic or thematic terms. Leech shows more respect for the integrity of the text by seeing in Dido's "arrogance a dim echo of Tamburlaine's" ("Marlowe's Humor" 74). Yet for Leech this echo (or anticipation, depending on the order of composition) is a criticism of Dido, who in his view "has already shown herself a mere woman indeed" (74). His placing this mention of Dido's assertiveness in an essay on humor further devalues the play as an effort to construct political action for those without peers.

In Marlowe's text Dido is a woman of high rank, under divine duress, who loses her city but regains her sense of self in choosing to die. At play's end, she is recalled to her former dignity:

Anna: Sweet sister, cease; remember who you are.
Dido: Dido I am, unless I be deceiv'd:
And must I rave thus for a runagate?...
Iarbas, talk not of Aeneas. Let him go!
(V.i.263-5, 283)
Of course she has been deceived, by Venus and Venus' two sons, Aeneas and Cupid. Dido is doomed, but she does not succumb passively. In Act V, her attempts to keep Aeneas from finally sailing for Italy become frenzied. At first she desperately plans to follow him, then hallucinates his return to her (251-61, an echo of Aeneas' vision of Troy at the walls of Carthage in II.i.7-32). Although the end of the drama remains focused on ill-fated love, Marlowe uses the original Latin of the Aeneid to retrieve Dido's Virgilian sense of honor at her death: "Sic, sic juvat ire sub umbras" (V.i.313). The reason Dido kills herself is not that Aeneas leaves her but that she realizes what has happened to her. Iarbas tactlessly reminds his hoped-for lover of her own dishonor and that of her city, and Dido announces "a private sacrifice/ to cure [her] mind, that melts for unkind love" (286-87). At the level of plot, this trick diverts Anna and Iarbas from her actual suicidal purpose; it also enables her to cleanse herself of polluting passion and to regain self-control and self-respect. She had tried to convince Aeneas to stay with her, not by sensual appeals but by binding him to her own city-building project and by literally refashioning him as her husband and dynastic partner. After this failed attempt at enlarging her domus to include the Trojan wayfarer, Dido asserts
herself by setting her city against his with a ritual curse:

from mine ashes let a conqueror rise,  
That may revenge this treason to a queen  
By ploughing up his countries with the sword!  
Betwixt this land and that be never league.  
(V.1.306-09)

Even at her life's end, the Carthaginian queen continues to revise her relationship with Aeneas, now putting it into traditional political terms: herself as queen and both herself and Aeneas as rulers of territory and peoples, no longer as lords of a house.

III

Despite the basic subversiveness of the royal heroes under consideration in this chapter, Marlowe does allow them some attributes of traditional absolute rule: high claims for themselves, rhetorical effectiveness (what we might call "charisma"), and legitimate thrones. These qualities are typical of dramatic heroes, who engage our attention as they act out possibilities beyond the reach of their human audiences.

Dido first makes high claims for herself as part of her self-presentation:

Dido: What stranger art thou, that dost eye me thus?  
Aen: Sometime I was a Trojan, mighty queen,  
But Troy is not: what shall I say I am?  
Ilio: Renowmed Dido, 'tis our general,  
Warlike Aeneas.
Dido: Warlike Aeneas, and in these base robes!  
Go fetch the garment which Sichaeus ware.  
Brave prince, welcome to Carthage and to me,  
Both happy that Aeneas is our guest.  
Sit in this chair, and banquet with a queen:  
Aeneas is Aeneas, were he clad  
In weeds as bad as ever Irus ware.  

(II.1.74-85)

In her very first words, Dido shows displeasure in Aeneas' failure to know his place or to recognize her stature. The metrical stress on "stranger" and "eye" implies that Aeneas is a country bumpkin, a foreigner who does not know how to behave at court. Perhaps she does not recognize Aeneas' own high birth because of his stare and his confused, answering question. The Trojan lieutenant Ilioneus did not know him at first either, in II.i.45-6; this scene anticipates Dido's allowing Aeneas to tell his own tale in the rest of this second act. Aeneas invites Dido to define him, but Ilioneus steps in (as he will also in IV.iii.37-42), perhaps to remind both Aeneas and Dido of Aeneas' history and destiny. Despite this caution, Dido proceeds to define Aeneas as her husband, thus constructing a system of decorum and enlarging her arena of domination. She invests him with her dead husband's robes and even gives up her seat to him. This synecdoche establishes a paradox of control over one who is raised to equal stature—a paradox essential to a political *domus*. Aeneas' son Ascanius also
participates in this self-revision by adopting Dido as his mother, although Aeneas is uncomfortable with their relationship until he can clarify his own position and justify his new rank by recounting the Trojan story. In urging him to this self-affirmation, Dido is acting politically, in Arendt's use of the term, by using her power of creating a domus. As long as she is able to act freely, her action is political. Not until that action is subverted by Venus and Cupid does Dido's controlled action become uncontrollable passion.

In addition to demonstrating her character, Dido's high claims for herself are also part of her power as an absolute monarch; they are more like Tamburlaine's assertiveness than that of Edward II. Edward's claims also involve the refashioning of his authority to make Gaveston and himself royal peers despite the disapproval of the barons. The letter Gaveston reads at the opening of the play indicates that Edward has abolished his father's domus in order to create his own. At first, Edward is heedless of his own rank as he descends to the more frivolous environment that Gaveston enjoys. (See I.i. 50-71 for a description.) Edward soon raises Gaveston to high office, with the same lavish bestowing of gifts and honors that Dido displays with Aeneas, but Gaveston is not entitled to such treatment by birth or...
custom. Edward's distinctions are different from Dido's insofar as they disregard rank or class divisions; they are similar in that Edward uses them to redraw the political boundary between public and private.

Corollary to the main argument of this chapter about domus is a comparison of Tamburlaine and Dido as charismatic rulers; in this discussion of princely rhetoric, the similarity becomes overt. Both the Scythian shepherd and the woman who fled her tyrannical brother at Tyre speak as though they were born to rule—and in Marlowe they were. Tamburlaine is destined to receive the Persian crown (1 Tam. I.ii. 91-92), and his first act is to reveal to a sultan's daughter his true dominating nature by flamboyantly changing his dress and declaring, in images of treasure and victory, that she, "lovelier than the love of Jove" (87), is his. Observations on the necessary connection between Tamburlaine's speech and his actions are frequent; the same connection, though unremarked, may also be found in Dido. She is not so successful as Tamburlaine is; indeed, most critics hold that Dido is a helpless victim either of fate or of her own emotions. Although it is clearer in Virgil than in Marlowe that Dido needs Aeneas for protection, in both versions Dido knows what will benefit her domus and acts to obtain it.
"Action is the political activity par excellence," writes Arendt, and speech is action: "this originally meant that most political action ... is indeed transacted in words, but more fundamentally that finding the right words at the right moment, quite apart from the information or communication they may convey, is action" (HC 26). Again like Tamburlaine, Dido uses both her own speech and that of Aeneas to fortify her position. She lets Aeneas rebuild himself in words after his shattering defeat and escape from Troy, so that he will be fit to assume a productive place in her new realm. Dido herself acts through her speech, in commands to everyone from Anna and Iarbas to Aeneas himself. She makes Aeneas over into Sichaeus, she gets Aeneas' son to adopt her as his mother, and she keeps the father from sailing, in three ways: by speaking, by symbolic action (using such objects as fine dress and ornaments), and by physically sabotaging his ships and removing his son. The political effects of these actions are reflected in the responses of Iarbas, Ilioneus, and Dido herself.

Dido is less willing than Edward to resign her power. Only when she is frantic about her lover's departure does she think about surrendering her throne to live privately with him (V.i. 197-198). Edward, on the other hand, frequently says he is ready to trade his
entire kingdom for a secret retreat with Gaveston (I.iv. 70-73). Yet these rulers show their readiness to fight in order to keep their traditional political domains as well as their ability to reshape them. Edward's apparent descent is a reversal of the traditional public position of monarchy. In identifying himself with Gaveston, Edward departs from Dido's concern for her land by locating his domus not in the city but in the heart of his friend.

Edward's rhetoric matches the uncertain expectations he has of himself and his role. Instead of employing Dido's imperative mode, Edward uses the interrogative to his barons:

Will you not grant me this? ... 
Beseems it thee to contradict thy king? ... 
Am I a king, and must be over-rul'd?  
(I.i.77, 92, 135)

Edward's power is not apparent at first, as is Dido's or Tamburlaine's; he is weaker in both will and speech. Yet except for the royal family of France in The Massacre at Paris, Edward has the most legitimate, enduring throne in all of Marlowe. Despite his dynastic claims, the ability of Edward to act and speak is not so effective as Tamburlaine's nor so strong as that of Dido, though his nontraditional politics is both strong and effective.
His forced abdication in Act V interrupts but does not end his assertions of rightful kingship. Afterward, he regains and refines his knowledge of himself, similar to Dido's recovery of self after Aeneas' final departure. As a king he is weak; without the psychological as well as military support of crown and friends, his weakness is almost total.

IV

The legitimate monarchies (as opposed to the behavior of the monarchs) of Dido and Edward may seem traditional, but they are kept from being so by Marlowe's unorthodox presentation of gender roles. David Bevington has said that a few Elizabethan playwrights saw Dido's infatuation with Aeneas as an allegory of their own queen's ambivalent desire for Essex (TDP 14). Other writings, from John Knox's *First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* to Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, explored the complexities arising from the fact that England's monarch was an unmarried female free of masculine control. The marriage of a ruler and the training of royal heirs was a public affair in the Marlowe's England (much as the election of legislators and executives is now in twentieth-century democracies. Present-day popular magazines still feature England's
royal family.) Gossip about the romantic and sexual activities of celebrities was as common in Tudor England as it is in fin-de-siecle United States. The furor over Henry VIII's divorce and subsequent marriages set an immediate precedent, and the affairs of Mary Queen of Scots were even more intriguing. Elizabeth I's own marriage planning affected both the foreign and internal relations of England, but she refused to allow public comment. Even her intimates had to be careful in their conversations, but few could refrain from speculating about the life of a politically powerful and unattached woman.

The problem is reversed in Edward II, wherein the king is ruled, or at least heavily influenced, by a man. The late sixteenth century (and maybe the twentieth as well) would no doubt have found these two plays more orthodox if the personalities of Dido and Edward had been switched. Had the widowed Carthaginian queen insisted on promoting women of lower status whose main interests were flattery and frolic, she might have married Iarbas and ceased to be politically active. Conversely, if England's monarch had been more concerned with protecting his own kingdom against Scotland and France, he would have been a more typically masculine monarch and probably would have made little impression on
the history (or literature) of political innovation. In the patriarchal and providentialist model of government then current in Europe, both Dido and Edward are anomalies; however, only as such could they search out another politics.27

Dido is a female ruler who, as we see her first in her faithful widowhood, admirably performs a difficult role. In the midst of temptations from Iarbas and the other suitors, she finds it hard to resist the privatizing allure of love, worrying that in spite of what she knows to be right for herself, "I fear me, Dido hath been counted light/ In being too familiar with Iarbas" (III.i.14-15). Alas, Cupid is too much for her, though she can still act on what is right:

Love, love, give Dido leave  
To be more modest than her thoughts admit,  
Lest I be made a wonder to the world.  
(94–96)

She becomes no less a ruler as she becomes more of a lover, and this combination of love and rule is the most subversive aspect of the play. Instead of facing Elizabeth's choice between the woman's traditional and self-effacing role of wife and mother or the unusual but still allowable path of chaste and queenly service to her people, Dido wants both, wants them for herself, and wants them to be fused into one public self-expressive
relationship to the world. When she weakens enough to offer her throne to Anna in exchange for a private life, we know that she is temporarily beside (or outside) herself over Aeneas' imminent desertion. Her suicide is a public act, not a hidden one, which binds her to destiny; her curse on any league between Carthage and Rome imprints onto history her own realignment of public and private. Queen Elizabeth herself may have been affected by Dido's example, though she knew it more as a mirror of fallen princes than as a positive pattern for her life. Nevertheless, Elizabeth remained a strong successful prince without marrying either of the local Trojans, Essex or Leicester, or any of the various Iarbases proposed to her by policy-makers. The virgin queen did not eat her cake, but she did have it for a long reign.

Critical opinion is no more kind to Edward's personality than it is to Dido's: he is effeminate, frolicking, homoerotic if not avowedly homosexual (though this quality has only recently been viewed as anything but negative), and generally weak. Marlowe chose to alter Holinshed's more manly description of him, while keeping Edward's love of poetry and drama, in order to accentuate the difficulties this protagonist would have in constructing an untraditional rule.
Edward II does have the surface features associated with the traditional political qualities of the history play: a problematic king, dissatisfied barons, troubled family life. The situation is overtly political: the barons are overstepping their bounds, and the king is rejecting their historical and legal status as councillors. After Edward succeeds in revoking Gaveston's banishment by those barons, he enlarges the domus he is creating for himself and his first favorite. Not only is the hereditary peerage excluded, but his own queen Isabella is demoted to messenger and diplomat to France. The king's brother has withdrawn from Edward's circle (for reasons Marlowe does not give in the text II.iii.1-15); when he returns, it is too late. Edward continues to promote the Spensers in II.iv., when he sends the Gavestons to Scarborough but keeps the younger Spenser by him. After Gaveston is killed by treachery, Spenser proves himself worthy to replace him as the king's favorite by opposing the barons. At this halfway point, the text clearly rejects an audience's expectations of realistic drama. Things move so rapidly after Gaveston's death as to defy even the semblance of real time. Instead of advancing the plot, the events of Act II repeat those of Act I (McCloskey 38). Within thirty lines in the next act, Edward has learned about
Gaveston's death, completed his adoption of Spenser by investing him with Gaveston's titles, and immediately received a baronial demand to abandon Spenser. The contest is not over homosexual behavior, nor is it even primarily about class (despite the barons' stated objections to Gaveston and Spenser). The struggle is over the king's reconstitution of his peerage.28

The standard political question, "What is a good king?," is fragmented in Edward II into "Who is king, and what can he be, and how much control can he have over himself and over the construction of the realm?" Edward uses phrases such as "if I be king" and even "if I live"; he is not sure. The restoration of the traditional English polity, twice attempted in the reconciliation of this king, queen, and nobles, fails because Edward's basic premise is "if thou lov' st Gaveston" (329), while the barons' is "the love of his renowned peers" (369). Love reigns in Edward's domus, but as attraction and adherence, not as baronial self-interest and power.29

Following my stipulation in this chapter about politics as action which can realign the spheres of public and private, Edward is indeed political to the extent that he forces the barons—in words and in war—to accept his inclusion of Gaveston in their common public existence.30 Remembering Arendt's equation of speech
and action, and having seen Tamburlaine excel in self-definition and Dido attempt it, we now watch Edward become "a man so reduced that only his articulate agony marks him as human" (McCloskey 46).\(^3\)

What does he say? How does he act? Having been an absolute aspirer to new creation, Edward falls from power and is left with only his voice. But he still clings to royal symbols, to the name and deference due to a king. As long as he wears a monk's disguise, Edward is dependent, sad, and philosophical.\(^3\) When Leicester retrieves him, his tone changes to one of self-analysis and more-or-less epic simile (V.i.9-15, 45-46, 53). When he is finally left with no choice but to surrender, he becomes passive, not active, and certainly not frenzied (as Dido is when Aeneas removes himself from her), though he says he is tormented.\(^3\) "I have no power to speak" (V.i.43): literally, to say any words, but also to command. The king thinks he has lost his ability to act effectively while he is overpowered by the barons. Yet he can still utter a prayer, which is then the only power he does have:

Now, sweet God of heaven,  
Make me despise this transitory pomp,  
And sit for aye enthronised in heaven!  
Come, death, and with thy fingers close my eyes,  
Or, if I live, let me forget myself.  
(V.i.107-111)
He also has strength to resist humiliation. Death does come to him, but even then he has not learned to forget himself. He had said he would try, but during his captivity he is still reconstructing "king Edward." He offers his suffering for the deaths of Gaveston and the Spensers, even as he retains his self-image of "England's king" while he is in a dungeon. Instead of invoking a curse after he is forcibly shaved and dunked in puddle-water, Edward offers his life as a sort of atonement, though the "tush, for them I'll die" (V.iii.45) seems flippant and inconsistent with the tone of the speech.34

In Dido, the final catastrophe approaches much more rapidly. The deserted queen is temporarily hysterical, then calm, and arranges her final act and makes her speech. It begins with pride instead of Edward's piteousness ("With these relics burn thyself,/ And make Aeneas famous through the world/ For perjury and slaughter of a queen" V.i.292-94). Dido moves through a transferred self-incrimination which recognizes responsibility for the affair, even as she displaces her responsibility onto a sword, a garment, and "perjur'd papers" (300). Then she curses Aeneas' fellows and his destiny and finally asserts herself as "truest" and her death as a careful Virgilian choice (313).35 This queen shows decisive integrity.
Captive Edward has a much longer time in which to brood and to compose himself after his catastrophe of abdication. His first emotional reactions are the wounded pride of "Call me not lord" (V.i.112), the self-pitying dispatch of a handkerchief "wet with my tears" (118) to the queen, and a symbolic revenge on Mortimer by tearing up a paper bearing his name. Fatalism follows these histrionic outbursts, succeeded by more whining and self-pity. Such moodiness is a stereotypically feminine trait.

Yet Edward still maintains his birthright of kingship (V.iii.40; v.64, 70-72, 91-93). Matrevis, Gurney, and even Lightborn speak of him as the king (though not with any respect) and of how strong he is in enduring the mistreatment they force upon him. Not until Edward sees Lightborn does he give up, knowing that his end is at hand. The deposed king wants to die well in his faith (80), but he also wants to elude death (89-90 and 100-108). He admits his weakness and makes a proper prayer, but his last words show a fearful impatience, reminiscent of the habit of command: "O spare me, or despatch me in a trice" (112), and this last order is obeyed. His fear is justified, because the manner of his death is both humiliating and painful. Like Dido, Edward could not control his fall. Both rulers spoke of
themselves as princely, but Dido retained her dignity and her self-control. Edward resists his captors but, having no *domus* left to support him, struggles to exercise his strength (as in his belated effort to put Lightborn in his place as a subordinate: 75-91) amid his pitiful emotional and physical situation.

Dido's suicide and Edward's murder are fiery historical episodes which Marlowe has used to dramatize the dangers of alternative politics worked out through what had been considered private passions or unnatural emotions.\(^{36}\)

Images of fire are associated with death scenes in most of Marlowe's plays.\(^{37}\) Both the classical symbolism of lust and the Christian addition of damnation are present. James Redfield, in his study of tragedy in the *Iliad*, analyzes the pagan significance of a funeral pyre: "burning is clean" and purifying (180). It ends the liminal state of the corpse (which is still a person though no longer alive) and allows the bereaved to relocate the dead person in their past and thus to go on with the present. Marlowe dramatizes the conclusive aspects of funeral ritual not for the surviving characters, but for the audience. Charles Masinton
argues that these flaming deaths, which culminate spectacularly in the ending of *Doctor Faustus*, "represent the perfectly appropriate retribution for the immoderate appetites each protagonist has wholeheartedly indulged" (7) as well as symbolizing their desires and inner torments (6). Because Masinton focuses on damnation and sees Marlowe's vision as pessimistic, he finds no positive closure in the fires. Marlowe's characters "journey for a star and die for lack of air" (12) in a "violent marriage of heaven and hell [that] engenders the Renaissance will to power" (13). There is no decisive textual indication of Marlowe's disapproval of the appetites or the aspirations of his characters—or that they required punishment.38 The continuing debate over whether Tamburlaine's death was divine retribution indicates the ambiguity in these texts.

The stars and fire in *Dido*, as in *Tamburlaine*, serve poetic and dramatic purpose in reinforcing the attempted fusion in the political realm. Dido sets her relationship with Aeneas in the context of Olympian gods and astronomical bodies, indicating its beauty and importance:

Heaven, envious of our joys, is waxen pale;  
And when we whisper, then the stars fall down,  
To be partakers of our honey talk.

(IV.iv. 52-54)
She justifies her death and her dignity in it by appealing to "ye gods, that guide the starry frame" (V.i. 302) before she sends herself, by means of flame, under the shadows. Marlowe intensifies the effect of this star-fire imagery in Tamburlaine, notably when he threatens fate: "We'll chase the stars from heaven" (1.II.iii. 23), but also when he at various times reminds us of his hero's dual relation to fate: "gracious stars" promised him a crown (I.ii. 91-92), yet death overcomes his natal stars (2.V.iii. 1-9). Both Dido (III.iv. 19) and Tamburlaine (2.II.iv. 2) refer to the fire of the sun in heaven, and Dido's allusion to Aeneas' "amorous face, like Paean, sparkles fire" makes explicit the connection between celestial fire and the flames of passion.

The fire used in the death of Edward smolders in secret, climaxing the mood of frustration in the play. The murder occurs in the hellish depths of a dungeon, at the hands of a man named after Lucifer, the lord of hell, who uses a fiery red-hot spit to do the killing. This death—secret, infernal, and loveless—evokes the surviving son's "grief and innocency" (V.i.102).

Masinton's view of damnation and Redfield's analysis of Greek funerals and the play of imagery reveal the ambiguous closure in this drama. Dido's death represents both defeat by Aeneas and powerful self-affirmation.
Edward's is fiery yet passive, as he often was in life; it results from his inability to impose himself on England and his failure to create a lasting domus. These deaths signify more than the punishment automatically proper for perverse love.

It becomes clear after these endings that Marlowe's creations value aspiration more than achievement. Tamburlaine is often regarded as the most successful Marlovian hero because of his cosmic ambition as well as his stellar ability. After a long and mostly happy life, the once lowly conqueror can speak his last words with acceptance: "Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, must die" (2.V.iii. 249). In remaining regally able to die a good death, as Dido did, or in Edward's case to meet it with the proper words and manner, these protagonists are not finally to be perceived as perverse or tyrannical.

Marlowe could have presented in Dido the tragedy of a fatal, fated passion as an allegory of how love makes even the best of women unfit to be rulers or political beings. Edward II could have depicted a weak king whose morality was insufficient to control his personal desires in favor of the public weal. Instead, this theater articulates and subverts expectations of gender and rule. What the dominant ideology rejected as perverse exists in Marlowe's texts as an alternative, opening the
possibility of heterodoxy in political roles as well as in gender roles. Using rhetoric, imagery, and characterization, it essays an alternative distribution of public and private and an equalizing mode of political action for the holders of traditional power.

Nevertheless, the two plays analyzed in this chapter are not satisfactory resolutions of the problem of human aspiration for non-conventional action; both end in disaster. Not, of course, that Marlowe could have found a solution to the oppressive dominance of monarchy or expressed it in the heavily regulated Elizabethan theater. Within the human will to power, most of his protagonists fail in their attempts to act authentically. Tamburlaine alone achieves some integration of beauty into his project. Dido and Edward both die amid the wrecks of their new model houses, yet they have not quite surrendered themselves. Neither is resigned to death; they incorporate death into their own efforts at shaping the world into a place more congenial to human company.

The next two plays in this study, The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, suffer from corruption either of text or vision. Barabas and the Guise want to define themselves within the traditional political situation in which each finds himself. Beyond the regrettable flaws in the transmission of Renaissance manuscripts, corrupt
texts like *The Massacre at Paris* and *Doctor Faustus* mirror a failure to resolve the tension of absolute power among equals or the creature's inability to become more powerful than the creator God. I want next to examine Henri de Guise and Barabas in their political contexts, tracing out the effects of their more traditional uses of domination. The Duke of Guise seems to be an Aristotelian tyrant of religion, perverting the commonwealth to his own personal goal; Barabas of Malta fuses public and private to serve his economic status.
Notes

1. Dating Marlowe's work is notoriously difficult; Godshalk argues that in the short writing time that Marlowe had, to base any theory of development on an imagined order of composition is futile. A comprehensive treatment of the dating controversy is given by C. F. Tucker Brooke in "The Marlowe Canon." Ellis-Fermor suggests a thematic and therefore possibly a dating link between Dido and Edward II and also between Aeneas' restlessness and Tamburlaine's aspiration; see CM 20-21.

2. Godshalk lists the Jupiter-Ganymede opening scene as an addition to Virgil. Strictly speaking, this is incorrect; Marlowe amplifies Virgil's reference in I. 28, but he did not invent it. See also Martin, "Fate, Seneca" 57 and 60, and Gill, "Marlowe's Virgil" 144. Although Steane and Kocher do find some original interest in Marlowe's version of Dido, they have not usually valued it as much as his other, "major" works.

3. See Steane's note to Dr. Faustus V.ii. 152, where it appears in Latin and in a tragic context different from its original Ovidian setting.

4. Brodwin sees this coincidence as evidence that Marlowe revised Dido when he was writing Edward II (143 and n.4, 148, 152). The speculation is interesting, but
the appearance of the references in dramas usually considered far apart in date seems to me rather to indicate a continuity of purpose. M. E. Smith notes the shared allusion as an illustration of how love interferes with duty (51). See also Summers, *Christopher Marlowe* 23.

5. Robert Fricker argues that public and private are separated in the play. Ribner sees Edward's kingly role as uniting personal and public significance in one character, but only Edward's private ability for friendship shows virtue. James Voss associates the two spheres by calling the public arena "history"; I agree with his view of Edward and Gaveston as posing a challenge to orthodoxy instead of constituting a mere private perversion (518).

6. See Orgel (13-17) and Rose, who argues a shift from Catholic to Protestant idealizations of women, "a coherent, elaborate, and self-conscious effort to construct a new ideology of the private life" (4).

7. Definitions and etymologies in this paragraph are from the *American Heritage Dictionary*, the Liddell and Scott *Greek-English Lexicon*, and the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

8. See Ronald A. Sharp for a general discussion. Mills quotes Aristotle to the effect that there can be no real
friendship except between peers (including economic peers—26), but he concedes that Edward inspires sincere loyalty in his favorites. Summers comments that "Edward fails as a ruler largely because of the qualities which make him a good friend" (Christopher Marlowe 162). Shepherd judges gift-giving between royal characters as object fetishization, whereas Mills regards it as typical of classical friendship. The general trend of comments like these is that such giving is true and sincere despite the complications it creates for other relationships.

9. Bevington and Shapiro discuss the king's prizing of his regiment to honor Gaveston at I.i.164-65: "for, but to honour thee,/ Is Edward pleas'd with kingly regiment." In the play's larger action, this comment may be made as much to antagonize the nobles and to assure Gaveston as to reflect Edward's true regard for his kingdom.

Some critics see Edward as too hasty in replacing Gaveston with Spenser in II.iv.1-10, but Spenser was originally recommended by Gaveston himself. See II.ii.250-254.

10. Voss and Summers (in "Sex, Politics") argue that Edward's attempt to reform the English polity by living a different lifestyle affected English political history; thus they complement Arendt's description of political
action as unpredictable in its future impact.

11. Unger does not claim that there is a knowable or fixed human essence; in fact, the first part of Knowledge and Politics shows why the essentialist idea is illogical.

12. Viktor Poschl calls Aeneas a man of "memory and inner vision" (35). I found his book very helpful.

13. Gill (145, 152) and M. E. Smith (103) agree; Godshalk, Ribner, and Roger Stilling regard Aeneas as the hero. For a listing of Dido plays in English from 1500-1700, see Smith, Appendix A. Her Appendix B lists continental Dido drama; none of those titles features Aeneas. See also Singerman's introduction for later medieval versions of the Aeneid.

14. According to Poschl, Dido's tragedy is not merely fated but occurs "because of the interaction of her character with the situation" (71).

15. For details and line references, see M. E. Smith 86-87 and 93-96.

16. See also III.i.135, in which Dido gives the need for protection as her reason for wanting Aeneas to stay in Carthage. There is some mythological support for Dido's fear of threatening neighbors, which was used by Boccaccio and John Lydgate in their non-Virgilian versions of Dido's life.
17. See Iarbas' judgement for evidence against the latter part of Kocher's assertion: "[Aeneas] hath dishonour'd her and Carthage both" (V.i.280).

18. See Poschl 86-87.

19. James Redfield's comments on fiery funerals as purifying the intermediate state of a dead body also apply here.

20. I don't quite agree with M.E. Smith, who sees in this giving of tokens to Aeneas evidence of Dido's emotions. Shepherd reads the gift-giving as object fetishization (194-195).


22. Virgil holds both. See also Martin, "Fate, Seneca" 48 and 64; Allen 68; and Cole 75. Ellis-Fermor finds "the conflict between love and the instinct for action" in Aeneas, not in Dido (CM 19). Godshalk personifies the gods into emotions (55-6); Poschl qualifies such a stance (72, 74).

23. I am indebted to Karl Frerichs for this insight as well for several enlightening conversations about classical thought.

Jankowski's 1990 MLA convention paper expressed her view that Dido is a focus for male anxiety.

25. Cunningham 210; Shepherd ch. 6; Rose intro and passim; Marcus 70-72; and Marie Axton, whose chapter 2 applies Kantorowicz's work to the queen; chapter 7 discusses Elizabeth's heir and the convolutions of succession theory.

26. Edward II is often compared to Shakespeare's Richard II, about whose eponymous ruler Elizabeth is reported to have said "Know ye not that I am Richard II?" Essex had Richard II performed for the queen; Edward II would have been too insulting, but the connection, though indirect, is still there.

27. Shepherd sees the two plays as problematizing gender assumptions, not political ones (except insofar as the ideological is political). See his chapter 6, especially 192-204.

28. Orgel (25) and Voss (520) suggest that Edward's homosexuality is a cloak for the play's deeper subversions.

29. Voss describes Edward's alternative "lifestyle consciousness" (523).

30. Voss thinks so, in an echo of Ribner and Mills. Contrast Harry Levin's view of Edward's kingship as an ironic coincidence, extraneous to any real political
consideration. See also Summers' n. 6 in "Sex, Politics."

31. But there is more to Edward's death. See Summers, "Sex, Politics" 224, for an alternate view.

32. Simon Shepherd discusses the fetishization of dress in Dido (193-195) and Tamburlaine (202-203). See also Orgel 15 on the Renaissance use of clothing as a reflection of essence.

33. Voss (528) discusses the confusion resulting from subjective reality's disappearance, though he doesn't acknowledge that the crown's existence is not subjective.

34. Tush denotes "an exclamation of impatient contempt or disparagement," according to the Oxford English Dictionary. Webster's Third New International Dictionary quotes another usage from Marlowe for context. Earlier in this play Edward uses the same interjection, to Isabella, in the same manner: "tush, sib."

35. Shepherd sees this as "defeat and powerlessness" (195) because she burns herself with other objects.

36. See also Cunningham 32.

37. See Masinton, 6-7, on images of burning in all the plays except The Jew of Malta and Tamburlaine. Barabas dies in a "cauldron placed in a pit," which does involve fire.
38. While forcefully, even poetically, expressed, Masinton's opinion remains firmly traditional, even in its denunciation of secular humanism. However, his phrase "journey to a star" does suggest the connection between fire and star imagery and the celestial sphere of Marlowe's characters.
Chapter 4

Among Peers:

The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris

I

In Tamburlaine, Dido, and Edward II, Marlowe has presented characters whose ambition is to change their world. Violent methods were required to do so, and the characters who used them were innovative and powerful. Before looking at Marlowe's most audacious portrayal of attempted change, that of Doctor Faustus, I want to investigate two plays whose main characters do not aspire above their surroundings. Instead, Barabas and the Duke of Guise exemplify the values of the society in which they live, and in so doing they illustrate the need for change. The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, often read as plays of policy or as failed portraits of cynical heroism, become domestic tragedies in light of the theory of refashioned politics developed in earlier chapters.

These two dramas share several characteristics. Their very texts are linked by the prologue to The Jew of Malta, which indicates the presence of a stereotyped
Machiavellianism in both plays by citing the death of the duke of Guise (featured in *The Massacre at Paris*) as a reason for Machevill's leaving France for Malta. The ambitions of both main characters are limited to a desire to perform well in their given social roles. Corruption in the play-worlds of Paris and Malta is reflected in the faulty condition of the texts.¹

Both *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* are set in times and places of religious corruption. Malta is governed by a Christian, Ferneze, who routinely oppresses Jewish residents to secure the economic well-being of his island against the military threat of the pagan Muslim Turks. Power circulates among all three factions by force and guile, and the chief Jew of Malta intrigues with and against all of them. As Barabas alienates his daughter and adopts a slave for his heir, he is recreating his family to accommodate the social necessities of Jewish life in Malta. During the time of the 1572 St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of Protestant Huguenots, Paris was a site of internecine family feuding. The war of the three Henries—papist Guise, Protestant Navarre, and Medici Anjou—reflected international policy as well as personal ambition. The complex relationships of the French Valois family illustrate the struggle to maintain the *domus* of absolute
peers which failed in Dido and Edward II. Instead of featuring heroes who aspire to reorganize mainstream politics, The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris question the status quo by portraying evil protagonists who embody it.

In contrast to the eponymous heroes of Tamburlaine, Dido, Edward II, and Doctor Faustus, neither Barabas nor Guise is allowed to give his name to a play. Barabas certainly is not noble enough to be worthy of becoming an eponym, nor was he known from history or previous literature. His importance lies in his wealth, his religion, and his country; the title page of the 1633 first edition lists The famous tragedy of the rich Jew of Malta. Although there is more than one rich Jew in Malta, Barabas arrogates that appellation to himself in a typically presumptuous order: "Go tell 'em the Jew of Malta sent thee, man:/ Tush, who amongst 'em knows not Barabas?" (I.i. 67-68). This play's title indicates a shift in thematic and structural focus away from the monodrama of the four eponymous plays to an interest in the political significance of a wealthy alien resident of a Mediterranean island ruled by Christian knights and fought over by Turks.

Philip Henslowe's diary refers to another play as the guise, yet the undated octavo's title page denotes
The Massacre at Paris: with the Death of the duke of Guise. However, the duke's death is not the climax of the play; it is only one among twenty individual murders counted by Harry Levin. The general scholarly assumption is that, were the play's text not so corrupt, we would see the Guise as another of Marlowe's aspiring overreachers. As it is, he is only one participant in the ongoing massacre, and the textual corruption reflects the ethicopolitical decay of Valois France. Simon Shepherd offers this explanation:

we have been taught to see its incompleteness in a negative way (the mangled text) not positively, with the suppression of the coherent sense of nation and of moral order as a counterstatement to providentialist histories. (123; punctuation sic)

If suppressing nationalism in order to counter providentialist patriotism does not sound positive, that is one more reason to examine the values of society as reflected by Barabas and the duke of Guise.5

Shepherd's observation applies with equal force to those assessments of The Jew of Malta which view its third and fourth acts as interpolation, revision, or distraction from the noble, isolated hero of the first two acts.6 As the villain-hero of all five acts, Barabas is a microcosm of Maltese society, not a victim or a reformer of it. Stephen Greenblatt states one
reason for this state of affairs:

It is because of the primacy of money that Barabas, for all the contempt heaped upon him, is seen as the dominant spirit of the play, its most energetic and inventive force. A victim at the level of religion and political power, he is, in effect, emancipated at the level of civil society. ... Barabas's avarice, egotism, duplicity, and murderous cunning do not signal his exclusion from the world of Malta but his central place within it.

(204)

The politics of Malta is driven by wealth; Ferneze needs it from the Jews to pay the Turkish tribute. Roberto Unger lists economics, along with law and government, as one mode of political organization in his deceptively simple definition of politics: "how men organize their societies" (4). The problem in this mundane definition is not, at least for this study, the significance of "men" but of "societies." Unger is not interested in quibbling over the membership of society except as an indication of the change from classical to liberal theory, in which society is constituted by contract. His interest in political theory is utilitarian, reminiscent of ancient and Renaissance humanism; it is a search for the good, located in the community which allows human beings to actualize their relations with themselves, with nature, and with other people. "Social relations are the political equivalent of love" (261).

Perhaps it is strange to find "love" and "good" in a
discussion of Marlowe's theater, where these values are problematic. Only Tamburlaine is able to deal with his need for love, because he is successful enough to be able to take Zenocrine for granted while she lives, even as he thinks about what her existence means for his. In Dido and Edward II the search for love focuses on Aeneas and Gaveston, male characters who are important but not essential to the characterizations of the heroes. Levin asserts that Barabas wants to be loved by Ferneze and the Maltese as well as by Abigail and Ithamore (78). Even the coldblooded Guise is maddened by his wife's unfaithfulness, and Doctor Faustus wants the love of a wife and, perhaps, of God. But these versions of love are degraded into exploitation by the selfish system of rule dramatized in The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris.

Part of the selfishness might result from Marlowe's Machiavellianism, over which a fierce scholarly debate centers on these two plays, on Tamburlaine, and on the figure of Mortimer in Edward II. Was Marlowe's playwriting affected by his knowledge of the Italian politician? If so, how? Had the Elizabethan ever actually read Machiavelli's own texts, or was he working form hearsay reports like Innocent Gentillet's Contre-Machiavel or Gabriel Harvey's poem (Battenhouse 207-208)?
Who is the Machevill in the prologue to *The Jew of Malta*?

A vice figure from Tudor interludes (as Bevington suggests in *From Mankind to Marlowe* 218-219)? A double of Barabas? A mouthpiece for the author? A mock mirror for princes? As with most issues in Marlovian criticism, there is no agreement.

According to Una Ellis-Fermor, "the dauntless courage and ruthlessness of Machiavelli's doctrines seem at first to have had a strong appeal for Marlowe. ... In *The Jew of Malta* and his next play, *The Massacre at Paris*, he gradually tends to isolate from the body of Machiavelli's philosophy those parts which were most arresting and most extreme" (CM 89). The protagonists of these two dramas "have lost even the faint, ulterior purpose, that of benefiting the state, which was at least in the beginning, the motive of Machiavelli's 'Prince'" (90). What is most Machiavellian about Marlowe, argues Ellis-Fermor, is his honest yet cynical realism in reporting the world as he saw it, a world founded in hatred (91).

Irving Ribner finds the Machiavellianism of *The Jew of Malta* a "ridiculous distortion" ("Marlowe and Machiavelli" 349, 352). He is in agreement with Levin and Paul Kocher, who sees no real use of Italian thought by Marlowe, especially in *Edward II* (194-207). Arguing
that Marlowe's distortion revealed his "special
fascination with brutal facts that marks the disaffected
intellectual" (61), Levin regards Marlowe's
Machiavellianism as a manifestation of a will to power.

Tamburlaine is also touched with the brush of
Machiavelli. Battenhouse finds several parallels between
it and The Prince (208-15), but there is much more to the
Scythian shepherd-conqueror. Harold Bloom compares him
to Barabas; both characters "seek their own freedom, and
ultimately fail, but only because they touch the ultimate
limits at the flaming ramparts of the world" (CM 6).

Edward II's foe Mortimer, lacking Tamburlaine's celestial
vision as well as his refusal to surrender to his
enemies, is an ordinary villain without the heroic
virtues which (the critics might say) even Tamburlaine
possesses. Tamburlaine, then, is more than a site for
Machiavellian exploration, and Mortimer is only one
facet, and not the most important, of Edward II. Dido is
too intimate a play, and Doctor Faustus probably too
supernatural, to be Machiavellian. We are left with The
Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, both of which
surround a central figure with others enough like him to
create a miasma of plots and policy.
II

Unger's definition of the good as the actualization of human potential is a connection between his view of politics and the redefinition of politics in Marlowe, by way of the Empedoclean notion of strife. Kocher discusses Tamburlaine's divine precedent in terms that sound like the city charters of Paris and Malta:

Desire for power, unchecked by morality, is characteristic of the deity. God is a God of Force. ... Therefore the struggle for power is the law of man's life and he must obey it by grasping unscrupulously at the supreme eminence of the throne. This is a true moral imperative, a higher ethics. Force is the nature of God, the constitution of the universe, and the law for mankind.

(71-72)

As the controlling principle of these two plays as well as of Tamburlaine, strife is the means to self-actualization for the aspiring world conqueror. Because neither The Jew of Malta nor The Massacre at Paris has correspondingly dominant heroes, their murder-driven plots are easier to discern. Their protagonists share the goals of their societies, striving to excel in the greedy cruelty of Paris and Malta. Murders leap off the page as they are alluded to by Barabas and Guise, yet they are obscured by the opening scenes of each drama: a treasure house and a wedding.
Before *The Jew of Malta* opens to reveal its protagonist sitting in his treasury, a prologue suggests the complicated, shifting, unreliable appearance of the action soon to come. The speaker, "Machevill," is as elusive (as is the value of truth and human life in Malta), because Machevill is a ghost. Niccolo Machiavelli died in 1527, at least sixty years before this play was written, "yet was his soul but flown beyond the Alps" (2). His Italian political ideas were as controversial in Tudor England as Marlowe's use of them is in this century. In spite of the mixed reception those ideas had met with, and the deceit he has been accused of, this ghost declares his identity and foregrounds his deceit in a rhetoric of paradox.

He first exposes the hypocrisy of others (11. 5-6 and 9-10) and then introduces himself: "I am Machevill,/ And weigh not men, and therefore not men's words" (7-8). The resultant "therefore" is oddly causal here, in a play where deceitful words usually precede rather that follow the revelation of character. Although *The Prince* assumes that people are stupid, venal, and dishonest, its words suggest a regret that this is so and a love for a humanity which, alas, does not fulfill its own potential. Machiavelli writes that

how we live is so different than how we ought to
live that he who studies what ought to be done rather than what is done will learn the way to his downfall rather than to his preservation. A man striving in every way to be good will meet his ruin among the great number who are not good. (ch. 15)

The Machevill's use of "therefore" implies a different attitude toward human nature—that he is no respecter of persons. Every character in The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris will also hold this assumption, even Abigail, who learns that "there is no love on earth" (III.iii.53) and yearns for eternal life (71). Machevill's description of closet Machiavellians reveals their hypocrisy yet paradoxically allows it to continue by acknowledging its existence. People are stupid, he says, as he berates "the sin of ignorance" (15) and loses his composure while describing the sins of past users of force. Abruptly, he recollects himself, almost dismissing his rant as tangential to his purpose: "But whither am I bound! I come not, I,/ To read a lecture here in Britain" (28-29). The prologue ends with a plea to the audience, to "grace [Barabas] as he deserves" (33), though without specifying what grace, if any, he does deserve. In only thirty-five lines, the prologue has layered hypocrisy onto confession, setting a pattern for the paradox of rhetorical action in the play.

The first scene uses the rhetoric of paradox, set up
in the Machevill's prologue, to locate Barabas in a society whose values and pursuits he shares. His opening speech is concerned with wealth as a medium. Glittering jewels and pure metals are more efficient than the "paltry silverlings" which take so much space to store and time to count. In order to confirm his place in the Maltese economy, Barabas puts himself, oddly, in company with traditional enemies of the Jews--Arabians and Moors as well as Indians. In doing so, however, he reduces these groups to their economic reputations. This oppressed Jew does not desire wealth for its own sake; he wants it for power. Notwithstanding their exotic beauty, gold and jewels give their owner a position so far above "the needy groom, that never finger'd groat" (I.i.12) that Barabas could "ransom great kings from captivity" (32). As a result of his command over the medium of exchange, the merchant prince can control the world.

Before he meets any other person, Barabas must complete his own self-presentation, which he does in one of the play's most-quoted lines. Less often examined is the isolating context of this line:

This is the ware wherein consists my wealth;
And thus methinks should men of judgment frame
Their means of traffic from the vulgar trade,
And, as their wealth increaseth, inclose
Infinite riches in a little room.
(33-37)
In this sentence Barabas labels himself a wealthy man of judgment and encloses himself in an infinite, little space. He does not expand his ambitions; he compresses himself into the role which Renaissance Christendom expected him to play. Unlike the refashioning aspirers of the monodramas, Barabas is basically content with his lot. The world has cast him as an evil Jewish usurer, so he will be the ultimate evil Jewish usurer.

At first, he is alone with wedges of gold and bags of jewels. His speech of contemplation leads him to the desire for more wealth, and he begins to wonder about his ships. Like his own image of a weathervane, Barabas will blow with and for whomever is in power, changing directions to protect himself. At this early moment in the drama, the prevailing wind delivers more wealth, thus fortifying his status. Barabas gives the merchants their orders and continues his self-examination. The first part of the play consolidates his infinite isolation; the second expands to include the universe while compressing it within Barabas' own limited vision. Heaven and earth, Christians and Jews, politics and economics, destruction and malice—all are degraded in this self-circumscribed worldview. Having established his stereotypical acquisitiveness in the first part of this soliloquy, Barabas proceeds to expound heresy and to disclose the
character of the society to which he belongs. Jews are identified with earthly rewards: "These are the blessings promis'd to the Jews" (106), delivered by a heaven which is equally unscrupulous about its methods. The rhetorical question, "who is honour'd now but for his wealth?" (115), establishes the values of Malta without actually stating them. Its equivocal action is typical of the language and values of Barabas' world.

When his fellow Jews bring news of the ominous Turkish arrival, Barabas is drawn out of his isolation, though only to preserve it. This first scene thus establishes the paradoxical position of Barabas as a willing participant in a society which does not grant him full membership. Content to be isolated in his wealth, he nonetheless needs a government to secure the peace: "Give us a peaceful rule; make Christian kings" (136). Marlowe has already hinted, in 2 Tamburlaine, what such a peace would be, and he develops it more fully in The Massacre at Paris. Machevill's prologue exposes those who aspire to gain the papacy through deceitful means. Barabas seems more easygoing than Machevill in accepting the violence and ruthless ambition of the Christian government as a necessary risk as long as it does not interfere unduly with his business. Barabas shows his understanding of the distribution of power necessary to a
thriving polity by his willingness to trade citizenship for free enterprise. When the Jews are summoned by Ferneze, Barabas tells him that the tribute must be paid to the militarily superior Turks, an exchange of wealth for protection. Of course he tries to avoid paying it himself, first by pretending to understand Ferneze to be asking for soldiers and then by claiming a tax exemption because of his alien status. His bluff is called by a knight who points out what Barabas already knows, that even Jews are included in the benefits of Maltese rule and should contribute to it. Ferneze, using Barabas' own equivocal methods of argument, reinforces Jewish alienation in describing Barabas and his fellows as outsiders living on sufferance. In justifying his decision to seize half the goods of the Jews, the governor addresses them as

infidels,
For through our sufferance of your hateful lives,
Who stand accused in the sight of heaven,
These taxes and afflictions are befall'n,
And therefore thus we are determined.
Read there the articles of our decrees.
(I.ii.65-70)

This description is as effective as the decree which it justifies. Both are acts of language which embody the secular power of the governor. In refusing to sanction Barabas' position within Malta, Ferneze has upset the working relationship of Jewish economics and Christian
government, so Barabas must meet policy with policy to regain his wealth. He is more than content with the role described in his opening soliloquy, but he will not endure infringement on his own demarcation of the world. The rhetoric of paradox, begun in the prologue, is confirmed in this first confrontation between Barabas and Ferneze. It will continue to equate Barabas politically as well as morally with the inhabitants of his world.

A similar conformity of characters and setting prevails in The Massacre at Paris. Plots, murder, and dissembling are the usual forms of interaction, so commonplace that no one remarks on them. Characters take vengeance, or at least threaten it when they die, but the accepted currency is death. The matter-of-fact violence of the Valois political arena is illustrated by the planning of the massacre by King Charles, Catherine de Medici his mother, Anjou his brother, and the Duke of Guise his "nephew." The theatricality of this scene highlights the Guise's ability to manipulate even the king in order to further his aspiration to rule France. Queen mother Catherine, the stage manager, forces the king into playing an oppositional role, which enables Anjou and the Guise to act out the kingly part of a strong ruler whose first duty is to preserve the state against its enemies. King Charles protests their
proposed action on the grounds of the adverse public opinion which will result, because the Huguenots have been promised safety and are only following the dictates of conscience. His first objection, an appeal to justice, is met by Anjou's "wisdom" of the rule of the strongest: better to punish one's enemies than let them attack. The second objection, framed by the king's "relenting heart," is rejected by the Guise as misguided pity which may harm the state. Charles does not seem convinced by these arguments but he yields to the forcefulness of his family.

After obtaining the king's consent, the Duke of Guise presents his plans for the massacre as though it were a play. He specifies the costumes of the actors and their cue, sets the scene, and summarizes the action. When a messenger enters to announce the attempted assassination of the admiral, King Charles receives directions for the "show" he is to make. The family council then adjourns so that Charles can act his part. This theatrical family circle is the political arena in Marlowe's staging of Valois Paris. Decisions are made by its members for (or against) one another. The Guise's family of wicked peers comes readymade; he does not want to create new ones with whom to share power. Each family member has a characteristic way of relating to the
others, providing a gallery of hypocrites who represent the political beings of this time.

King Charles' weakness appears first, in his support of Navarre's marriage, as resentment of his mother's dominating presence. At his death it is manifested as petulance. When he announces his heart attack and Catherine responds by diverting sympathy to herself ("O say not so! Thou kill'st thy mother's heart"), Charles retorts "I must say so; pain forceth me complain" (III.i. 4-5). One may sympathize with a character caught between a Medici and the Guise. Had Charles known the extent of his cause for complaint against his mother, however, he would be more than petulant. Catherine had noted her son's "lament/ For the late night's work" (II.ii.34-35) of the massacre. When the Cardinal corroborates her suspicion by reporting Charles' collusion with Navarre, she asserts, "As I do live, so surely shall he die" (42), and within thirty lines he is dead. His softness weakens the whole family, so he is eliminated early.

Henry of Anjou is next in the succession. At first a follower of the duke of Guise, Henry shows his desire for the sweet fruition of an earthly crown at his accession to the throne of Poland. The first speech he makes opposes politic wisdom to gentleness, domination to
submission; he would be

a king
As hath sufficient counsel in himself
To lighten doubts, and frustrate subtle foes.

... To please himself with manage of the wars.

(II.i.5-7, 9)

His coronation speech in France reveals a sudden weakness for love. Three times in eight lines he uses the word. The first is meant for the assembled crowd of family and subjects, a formulaic phrase of gratitude. The next two uses and the rest of the speech are directed to his minions, suggesting a dangerous weakness which is further exhibited by his first official act, pardoning a cutpurse. Henry turns this weakness to strength, however, as he begins to separate himself as the possessor of the French crown from the duke's plots to claim it. First, Henry humiliates the Guise for publicly displaying respect for the king's minions despite his wife's affair with one of them. The conflict becomes serious when Henry confronts his rival over the private ducal army. The duke dissembles, as Barabas does in his first encounter with Ferneze. First he justifies having an army "for the Gospel sake" (IV.v.22), then as self-defense against the Protestants who hate him. Finally, he forthrightly announces his intention to "muster all the power I can,/ ...'Tis for your safety" (45, 54).
king is not deceived; he responds first with sarcasm, next by direct order, and privately with a plan for the Guise's assassination. Henry uses his mother's powerful phrase to signal his action: "as I live, so sure the Guise shall die" (IV.v. 95). Sure enough, the king's speech becomes action when the duke is murdered within 125 lines.

In repeating Catherine's words to effect the removal of his own rival, Henry reminds us of his mother's fierce desire for domination and her blunt avowals of the prevailing Valois aspiration. Her first threat to Navarre, to cross his love because of his religion, is followed by an aside on method: "blood and cruelty" (I.i. 26). She forces King Charles to allow the massacre, removes him for his weakness, and vows to have her will: "For I'll rule France, but they shall wear the crown,/ And, if they storm, I then may pull them down" (II.ii. 46-47). She makes her beloved Guise a partner in policy. When he is murdered, she again thinks of her own grief: "To whom shall I bewray my secrets now,/ Or who will help to build religion? "(V.ii. 162-63). The duke is her strength, as he is her only weakness. When King Henry boasts of having him slain, she turns cruel words on her son and reverses her phrase of death in a final action: "since the Guise is dead, I will not live"
These three characters are the duke's political peers as well as his kin, showing yet another fusion of public life and private relationships to form a sphere of political action. Because King Charles had accepted Protestant Navarre and King Henry had reconciled with him, Catherine and the Guise are their mortal foes. Keeping the Valois family together and Catholic is the Duke of Guise's prerequisite for gaining the throne and maintaining his life. It is only by using the murderous methods of Catherine and the duke that Henry can outdo them. When he is killed, he hands the throne to Navarre, whose assimilation into the familial-political circle is sealed by his words, so like Henry's in tone, of revenge. These four selfish, dissembling, murderous characters constitute the political orthodoxy of Paris, whose props are poisoned gloves, muskets, daggers, and hired assassins. They even debate over the least objectionable means for disposing of a corpse.

The infected atmosphere also appears in Malta, where Governor Ferneze maintains it. Extortion of tribute money, the first act he performs in the play, is quickly followed by the breaking of a previous alliance in order to allow the sale of a captured shipload of slaves. Among those slaves is Ithamore, who will assist the plots.
of Barabas. Ferneze's last action is to regain his rule through treachery, having Barabas boiled in a cauldron, violating his promise to the one who had rescued them from the Turks. Ferneze recognizes no human worth at all.

Barabas, at least in Act I, has his daughter Abigail to foster a communal sense of humanity. While the language he uses seems inappropriate in speaking to his daughter, it does express affection. Abigail's actions at first are also motivated by filial devotion, although everyday action in Malta is as amoral as it is in Paris, driven by self-interest rather than any sense of commonwealth. The Duke of Guise's private scorn, "What glory is there in a common good,/ That hangs for every peasant to achieve?" (MP I.ii. 40-41), is more than matched by Ferneze's ironically public use of the Jewish high priests' rationale for killing Jesus: "better one want for a common good,/ Than many perish for a private man" (JM I.ii. 102-03). This logic reveals the governor's matter-of-fact readiness to use any stratagem he needs to preserve his rule.

The hypocrisy of Christian rulers in these dramas contributes to Marlowe's reputation as a Renaissance atheist and iconoclast. Neither the four Parisians nor the Christian governor and the Jewish merchant want to
change their notion of politics for any cooperative human community, no matter how small. The subversiveness of *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* lies in dramatizing the basest motives and means of rule as acceptable, forcing an audience to question the rulers and, perhaps, the system of rule. Major characters seem cynically blunt about their actions: Ferneze negotiates treachery; Anjou brags to his mother that he has killed her favorite nephew; Barabas and the Guise each reveals his character in private speeches in order to dissemble it for policy.

III

Whereas this sort of activity is not quite the mute violence which Arendt's theory opposes to true political action, it does indicate the *modus operandi* of the principal figures in Paris and Malta, placing them outside Arendt's Greek concept of politics. The political arena of individual action, liberated from the traditional restraints of hierarchy, is present only by implied contrast. The Jew of Malta and the duke who produced and directed the massacre at Paris show no desire to recreate their society, but instead work to preserve it. Their speech is not political action (as speech is for Tamburlaine, Edward, and Dido); they speak
as private individuals who control their reputations and their secret selves. Their words are confessional, not communal. All of the Valois behave in this way, and the self-revelation and deception of Barabas is the focus of The Jew of Malta.

Barabas' opening soliloquy, analyzed earlier in this chapter, reveals a lone man constructing his self-image and presenting it to his merchants and his "fellow" Jews. The picture of a person of infinite wealth, with reputation and power to match, yet not allowed into mainstream society, is pathetic in spite of the willfulness and evil which accompany it. Barabas' second speech of self-presentation, his introduction to his new slave, is juxtaposed with a murder plot. The setting of the first speech, in the counting-house, shows a Barabas who desired the most efficient form of wealth to maintain his self-sufficiency as a Jew, a businessman, and a father. By the time he buys Ithamore, Barabas has become more interested in wealth as a source of power over others. Having been manipulated out of that wealth by Ferneze, Barabas will exercise the villainies available to those with means. His plot to murder two young men has no motive but revenge, visited on the children of those who wronged him. He had used Abigail earlier to regain some of his wealth; he uses her again to punish
the one who took that wealth away. This plotting is one type of villainy made possible in Malta by power; his poisoning of the nuns now cloistered in his former house is another. These deaths are not necessary for Barabas' self-sufficiency; in fact, they decrease it by drawing him further into Maltese activities. What they do provide is material for the self-image, assigned to him by Malta, as the monster Jew.

His first speech is to himself; his second is to a slave. The settings of these speeches, the counting-house and the slave market, are sites of commodity exchange, as are all the houses in The Jew of Malta. The Senate House is where Ferneze seize Barabas' goods for tribute and plots with the owner of the slave ship to default on the Turkish tributary contract. Barabas' first house is seized as property and used by him as a safe deposit box, and his second is a status symbol, a dwelling "as great and fair as is the governor's" (II.iii. 14). Given this domestic economy, a slave market is a house for slaves, where "every one's price is written on his back" (3). It is also a place for private conversation, dissembling, and plotting, and after Barabas performs these everyday Maltese activities, he examines his human purchase and finds him suitably malleable.
Barabas asks his newly-acquired slave to state his "profession," a word loaded with significance in this play. Barabas and Ferneze use it to signify "creed" and "craft" (another similarly ambiguous term). Ithamore's use of it includes both meanings, marking him as a Maltese by personality if not by birth. Speaking first of his slave's "trade" (another slippery word in this context), Barabas proceeds to instruct him not about his job but his "affections."

This conversation also delineates Barabas' own character, as it is exhibited in his behavior, and it also indicates his desire to recreate this slave in his own image. The similarity is made explicit in the self-description beginning "As for myself, I walk abroad all nights,/ And kill sick people groaning under walls" (II.iii.179-205). This litany of methods for motiveless murders differs from the alternative political actions of Tamburlaine, Edward, and Dido, because Barabas is only interested in self-gratification at the expense even of his daughter. Presenting himself as adept at secret murders, entrapment, treason, and financial misprision, Barabas also complacently acknowledges the world's reward for his skills. Instead of attempting to change Malta or even to act politically within it, he is so satisfied with his place that he has bought a slave to reflect his
own likeness and to assist him in continuing his activities. Ithamore's response demonstrates his aptitude by listing his own misdeeds. Pleased with this success, Barabas claims Ithamore as his fellow and later as his heir. The superlatives of Ithamore's praise would gratify his adoptive father: "the bravest, gravest, secret, subtle, bottle-nosed knave [with] the bravest policy" (III.iii. 9-10, 13). Abigail's rebuke, "why rail'st upon my father thus?" (12), shows by contrast the moral distance between father and daughter. Ithamore's participation in and approval of the murder plots demonstrates his greater empathy with and suitability to be the heir of Barabas.

During times of distress, Barabas calls on Maltese law to support his rights. Although he devises a revenge upon Ferneze, the Jewish merchant also liberates Malta from the Turkish threat. Even after becoming governor, Barabas is still isolated, talking to himself to arrange the fate of his island. This speech locates him in society and constructs his behavior as a dominator in that society, yet it still continues the theme of self-interest as the motive of public behavior.

I now am Governor of Malta; true--
But Malta hates me, and in hating me,
My life's in danger; and what boots it thee,
Poor Barabas, to be the Governor, ...
For he that liveth in authority,  
And neither gets him friends nor fills his bags,  
Lives like the ass that Aesop spoke of.  

(V.ii.30-33, 39-41)

After bargaining with Ferneze (whom he still addresses as "Governor") to defeat the Turks, Barabas repeats his newly contextualized rule for prospering in Malta:

Thus, loving neither, will I live with both,  
Making a profit of my policy;  
And he from whom my most advantage comes,  
Shall be my friend.  

(113-116)

Levin's assertion that Barabas wants to be loved is correct but incomplete. He does not want to give love, only to receive it. He wants to protect his position, and if professions and acts of love will accomplish his end, he will profess love and even act accordingly. Although Barabas does engineer the end of Turkish military dominance over Malta, his act is not disinterested; he will profit from an independent island base for his business. His speeches throughout the play are not to benefit the common good but for private self-protection—the creation and maintenance of an essentially antisocial existence. Barabas is not interested in rule or in politics or in actualized human community; he wants to prosper as the Jew of Malta.

The soliloquy of the duke of Guise (MP I.ii. 34-108)
makes clear that the Frenchman is like the Jew in his selfishness. From their stance, the entire universe, including heaven and earth as well as European foreign policy, is formed to advance their own purposes. The Guise's ostensible cause is religion, because the Pope has allowed it: "And by that privilege to work upon,/ My policy hath framed religion./ Religion! O Diabole!" (64-66). The Machevill voices a similar view in The Jew of Malta: "I count religion but a childish toy" (prol. 17). Both the Machevill and the Guise are "asham'd" even to use the word "religion" in connection with their plots. From Machiavelli or his influence, they have learned the contrast of idealism and pragmatism and the recommendation that a ruler "learn how not to be good" (Machiavelli ch. 15). Neither the Guise nor his family need this particular lesson, but later Machiavelli discusses it in terms of appearance and reality, a problem central to The Massacre of Paris and one that the Duke of Guise is more likely to encounter: "A prince need not have all the aforementioned good qualities, but it is most essential that he appear to have them." One quality the Duke does profess is religion: "Nothing is more necessary than to seem to possess this last quality, for men in general judge more by the eye than by the hand, as all can see but few can feel" (ch. 18).
Circumstances in both Huguenot France and in Tudor England made the appearance of one's religion a life-and-death issue.

In addition to the Pope's permissions, the Guise also needs the Catholics in Paris to support his bid for power (I.ii.80-87; their rising to him in IV.v. and V.i. leads to the play's climax). This vision of himself as a conqueror gives the lie to the altruistic purpose of his religious crusade, evoking instead Tamburlaine's images of sun, crown, and death walking in his looks. In this first long speech, the Guise presents himself in two modes: the rhetoric of deception, which paradoxically originates in and is required by self-revelation, and the desire to possess the crown. He succeeds in neither. King Henry is not fooled by the duke's pretense of sectarian religious fervor and has him killed before the Catholic uprising becomes too strong.

This failure of the Guise's individual aspirations does not interrupt politics as usual in Valois France. Neither the duke nor the drama will surrender to the finality of death. The dying words of the Guise reaffirm his vision of himself as a Caesar among the crowned heads of Europe, as he calls on the fellow sovereigns he imagines to be his true peers: "Pope, excommunicate! Philip, depose, ... Vive la messe! perish Huguenots!"
His greatest regret is related to his regal pretensions: "To die by peasants, what a grief is this!" (88). Such mortal occasions are frequent in this play, and the same elements reappear in Henry's death speech— the invocation of peers, a call for revenge, and dismay at the manner of death. Navarre's vow to continue the blood feud indicates that murder by royalty in France will not stop with the end of the events in The Massacre at Paris, because the nature of French rule is not challenged and does not change.

The death speech of the Jew of Malta, rhetorically unlike those which close The Massacre at Paris, nevertheless resembles them in continuing to craft the speaker's self-image. Where the Guise surrounds himself figuratively with those he claims as equals, Barabas plays his chosen role of powerful alien by defying his peers: "Know, governor, 'twas I that slew thy son, ... Know, Calymath, I aim'd thy overthrow" (JM V.v. 86, 88). In doing so, he has adopted their methods, for Ferneze had challenged Barabas and Calymath had wanted to subjugate Malta. The Guise's last proud "Thus Caesar did go forth, and thus he died" (MP V.ii.94) is as appropriate for what the Guise wanted in France as are Barabas' curses which isolate him from "Damn'd Christians, dogs, and Turkish infidels! ... Die life!"
fly, soul! tongue, curse thy fill, and die!" (JM V.v.91, 94). The words Barabas uses show his "resolution" to die within the paradoxical relationship to society he had worked for during his life.

Barabas of Malta and the Duke of Guise die as they lived, firmly holding the values that were accepted and practiced in their societies. Final scenes are important to all drama; those of tragedy usually feature the death of the hero and some of the villains as well. In Shakespeare's histories and tragedies, the last words are given to the character most likely to pick up the moral pieces and reassemble them to benefit the state—or those who are left of it. The final words of The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris suggest triumph, deliverance, and revenge. Ferneze, having imprisoned the leader of the Turks, gives thanks for Maltese liberation and defies any future imperialist foes: "sooner shall they drink the ocean dry,/ Than conquer Malta" (V.v.128-129). At the end of The Massacre at Paris, King Henry anoints Navarre his successor:

My lords,
Fight in the quarrel of this valiant prince.
...
Valoyses line ends in my tragedy.
Now let the house of Bourbon wear the crown;
And may it never end in blood, as mine hath done!
(V.v.91-92, 94-96)

But the new king is less sanguinary than his predecessor;
after Henry's burial, he makes a

vow for to revenge his death
As Rome, and all those popish prelates there,
Shall curse the time that e'er Navarre was king,
And rul'd in France by Henry's fatal death.
(110-113)

In these speeches, both survivors indicate their
eagerness to maintain the values of their societies, in
contrast to the grief and regrets of the survivors of
Tamburlaine, Edward, and Dido. Tamburlaine's eldest son
Amyras, Edward III, and Dido's sister Anna miss what they
have lost; Ferneze and Navarre, having the same desires
as their dead foes, will carry on the domination, greed,
and cruelty. Instead of moral closure or tragic
affirmations to end *The Jew of Malta* or *The Massacre at
Paris*, Marlowe provides pessimistic signals that the evil
men do will in fact live after them.

Tamburlaine, Dido, and Edward II affirm their self-
refashioning in their deaths, even as death ended their
political projects. The end of *Edward II*, the play
usually seen as most Shakespearean, affirms nothing.
Edward's son, now the new king, is given the last speech.
Instead of proclaiming his beginning of his own reign and
the end of the previous one, Edward convenes a funeral
for his royal father. He announces, not his future
intention to better govern the realm, but his "grief and
innocency" over the past (V.vi.102). By contrast, Dido's
dying curse and funeral pyre signalled the future end of Carthage and the failure of her experiment. Aeneas had gone, Anna and Iarbas also die, and the end of the play contains the end of Carthage. Prince Edward, though now King Edward III, continues to look back helplessly to his father's murderers and his own difficult role as their pawn. Neither The Jew of Malta nor The Massacre at Paris depict alternate political structures, nor is there any indication that the deaths caused by the prevailing political system will cease.

IV

No commonwealth, no possibility of individual political action, will save France or Malta. The Jew of Malta is as ambitiously conforming as is the Guise of France. It is left to minor characters to provide alternatives.

In a study of Marlowe's "agonists," the morally "good" minor figures, Christopher G. Fanta argues that because the major characters of Marlovian drama lack virtue, and because the plays have ambiguous endings, Marlowe's moral ambivalence is deliberate.15 The agonists in The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris exhibit alternatives to the sociopolitical evil in which they live. Neither play offers a major alternative to
the policies of dissembling, corruption, or assassination, but Abigail, Calymath, and Ramus offer three ways of recreating one's private world. Abigail's sincere conversion to Christianity is motivated by despair, and it cloisters her from the world; Calymath and the Turks maintain their military might even as they keep their promises; Ramus' revolt against scholastic Aristotelianism and his gradual acceptance of the reformed faith removes him from public life.

We first see the "beauteous Abigail," "lovely daughter" of Barabas, lamenting "the wrongs done my father" (JM I.ii. 240). She enunciates the Old Testament law of an eye for an eye as she agrees to help in "whate'er it be, to injure them/ That have so manifestly wronged us" (280-81). In her first scene, the actions of Abigail are not much different from those of her father. She wants to "reprehend" the senate for seizing Barabas' goods, just as he himself had tried to shame and argue Ferneze out of that action. Father and daughter then plot to recover some of their wealth by fraudulently entering Abigail into their recently confiscated house, now a convent, to recover their hoarded treasure. Abigail shows scruples about her dissembling, but Barabas convinces her that "a counterfeit profession is better/ Than unseen hypocrisy" (302-303). To demonstrate his
aphorism, he proceeds publicly to enact his rejection of her. Abigail's own entreaty is not entirely false: she describes herself as "the hopeless daughter of a hapless Jew" (328) and wishes to "profit much" by her own endeavors (345-47). In this expression, she echoes her father's opening words of self-sufficiency.

Abigail's hopes are realized when she retrieves the hidden bags of treasure and is treated by her father with an affection so unfamiliar to him that the scene sounds more like a lovers' tryst than a familial escapade. Barabas is pacing the street in front of Abigail's convent, declaiming dark similes of ravens and scars, and remembering ghost stories. This heavily imagistic speech refers to the God of fire and darkness as it describes a wakefulness in terms more typical of poetically restless lovers:

No sleep can fasten on my watchful eyes,
Nor quiet enter my distemper'd thoughts,
Till I have answer of my Abigail.

(II.i.17-19)

The touching regard verbalized here is undercut by the audience's knowledge that Barabas is at least as concerned about his wealth as about his daughter: "O my girl!/ My gold, my fortune, my felicity" (50-51). Even when he wants to establish human connections, he does not get them right. His imagery reveals an unfamiliarity
with various forms of affection and an essentially selfish vision. The speech effectively contrasts Barabas' ulterior motives with Abigail's unselfish love. His mood is histrionic self-pity and willfulness, whereas her words are trustful and caring:

Then, gentle Sleep, where'er his body rests,
Give charge to Morpheus that he may dream
A golden dream.

(35-37)

Abigail's differentiation from Barabas begins when she reluctantly assists in deceiving Lodowick. Barabas wants her to seduce the governor's son into proposing marriage. Abigail protests "O father! Don Mathias is my love" (II.iii. 242) and finally asserts her own will as well as a sincere human relationship: "I will have Don Mathias; he is my love" (366). Upon discovering her father's deception not only of the two young men but of his own daughter as well, her disillusionment with the state of Malta is complete.

In her conversion to Christianity and the convent, Abigail chooses an alternative set of values. She does not create an ideal polity, but she does refashion herself into a Christian. She has lost her original vision of love as a human connection; in the convent it becomes a trait of "the sun that gives eternal life" (III.iii. 71). The new convert still respects her filial
love by not revealing her father's complicity in the circumstances which drove her to the convent. At her death, however, she seals her membership in that order, which is not of the world though in it, by confessing her own participation in Barabas' plot to murder her two suitors. Abigail's death serves no apparent purpose. She is poisoned, along with all the nuns in her house, "because she liv'd so long,/ An Hebrew born, and would become a Christian" (IV.i. 18-20). She does not betray her father, although she knew of his crime in arranging the deaths of the suitors. Yet Barabas judges her to be like himself in self-interest and therefore a potential betrayer. Of the paternal affection he expressed in I.ii., nothing remains.

With his daughter's murder, Barabas has eliminated any motive for action other than self-interest. When speaking of her to her suitors, he uses two images which reflect this—a diamond, representing the beauty of his wealth, and a book, symbolizing his Jewish identity. For Barabas, neither Abigail nor anyone else exists as a separate person, only as an extension of Barabas' own wealth and identity. Abigail, on the other hand, does recognize love and its objects. She gradually comes to realize that the world of family pride and honest love does not exist in Malta, so she must change what she is
in order to accept another one:

I was chain'd to follies of the world;
But now experience, purchased with grief,
Has made me see the difference of things.

(III.iii.66-68)

Abigail's chief Christian trait is renunciation, but she has not enjoyed the control over her life that Dido, Edward, or Tamburlaine had. She does not find pride or contentment or even much love in the convent, but it is the only choice she can make which will allow her to avoid the deceptive economy of Malta. Abigail abandons Maltese life because, although she is strong enough to withstand domination, she has not the strength to defeat it. In its development of expression from personal love to austere spirituality, the character of Abigail follows an alternative to the economic ruthlessness of Malta.

Another option is suggested by the warrior mode of physical strength and honor portrayed by Selim Calymath. The Turkish tributary league with Malta is the occasion for the interaction of Barabas and Ferneze in this play, but it does not set the pattern for it. Calymath, son of the Turkish ruler, is forthright yet polite when he arrives to collect the overdue tribute. He shows filial respect by supporting the arrangement negotiated by his father. He admonishes one of his bassoes for being discourteous to Ferneze, and he is inclined to show
mercy: "'tis more kingly to obtain by peace/ Than to enforce conditions by restraint" (I.ii.25-26). Perhaps this leniency disguises a policy of attacking the economic heart of Malta's existence, letting the due sum accumulate for ten years and collecting it all at once. Except for this possibility, however, the Turks exhibit integrity in all their dealings with both Ferneze and Barabas. They offer a month's grace period, and they do not return until it expires. After their conquest of Malta with Barabas' help, they repair the damage caused by their battle. Calymath fulfills his promise to make Barabas governor as a reward for his assistance and treats him with the honor due an ally. When Barabas' double-dealing is exposed, Calymath wants to flee the very site of such treachery. The straightforward presence of Calymath provides a positive contrast to the casuistry of the Governor and the deceptions of the Jew.

Though one can hardly expect even Marlowe to suggest Selim Calymath as a role model for prospective rulers, the Turks have the physical strength that Abigail lacks. Their honorable (and usually efficient) use of it suggests another method of social action. Turkish political integrity in this play, contrary to Renaissance English expectations, contrasts with the debased government of Malta but cannot suppress its corruption.
Even the strong Turks are defeated by Maltese values. Neither the Turkish path of human actualization through honor nor the ways of love attempted by Abigail can resist the domination in Malta; this is as subversive a political message for English playgoers as is the image of any of Marlowe's aspiring heroes.

The Jew of Malta is a vision of corporate bleakness only partially enlightened by alternatives to human domination. The Massacre at Paris has even fewer alternatives--only a brief glimpse of Ramus defending himself from the verbal and physical attack of the Guise. Abigail's mode is spiritual and emotional; that of the Turks is martial, physical. Ramus is an intellectual. His short death scene dramatizes a conflict between policy and humanity which offers an ethical norm for The Massacre at Paris much like that of Fanta's agonists. Ramus, the controversial philosopher of logic, is assisted by his disciple Talaeus. The disinterested friendship of these two intellectuals represents a community different from anything else in The Massacre at Paris and unique in Marlowe's drama. King Henry and Navarre do become allies, and Catherine and the Guise support each other's actions, but these relationships are formed for selfish ends. The only comparable friendship is between Edward II and Gaveston, which receives a more
complex development. Ramus and Talaeus declare their beliefs, instead of disguising them to protect their public standing. According to John Ronald Glenn, the emotional immediacy of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre is intensified by Marlowe's depiction of the well-known Ramus as a rational yet subversive figure (373-376). Although the logician made his fame by attacking scholastic Aristotelianism, he enjoyed the patronage of the Guise's brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, until Ramus abandoned Catholicism for a reformed theology. In rejecting both Aristotle and Rome, Ramus is challenging the very notion of authority. Because the philosopher is a renegade figure of authority, the Duke of Guise murders him during the massacre.

Ramus' death is fourth in a series of six individually portrayed murders amid the general massacre. After killing the Lord High Admiral, the preacher Loreine, and the everyman Seroune, the Guise and Anjou next discover the two scholars. Talaeus attempts to shield Ramus by identifying his friend with himself: "I am, as Ramus is, a Christian" (I.vii. 14). Talaeus is dismissed, and Ramus is allowed to speak in his own defense. His offense is described by the Guise as scoffing at "doctors' axioms" and the "argumentum testimonii." But the duke is an authoritarian. Anjou
sneers at the "collier's son so full of pride" (56), and so Ramus is stabbed. To emphasize its importance, this execution is mirrored in the fate of Navarre's murdered Protestant schoolmasters. Ramus cannot save himself by argument, but the attempt does illustrate the possibility (as well as the danger) of religious and political subversion. His final attack is on the "blockish Sorbonnists," more experts, who "attribute as much unto their works/ As to the service of the eternal God" (51-53). The Catholic Guise loses patience at this jab, which describes his own religion as well as his use of it to gain a crown, and he kills Ramus.

Ramus' final phrase is like Abigail's, "the sun who gives eternal life" and like Talaeus' defense: non-specific, non-sectarian, directed to the one universal God. The thwarted daughter and the righteous scholar provide the only alternatives admissible by a Renaissance audience to the violent and hypocritical governments of Ferneze and the Valois, but neither character is able to confront that policy directly. These two plays of evil among traditional peers are the bleakest in all Marlowe in terms of making any successful dissent to a political regime which used providentialist assumptions as propaganda and as justification for its activities.

Ramus had a reputation for "atheism" and "corrupting
the youth" (Glenn 367), which puts him in the company of that other contemporary controversialist Bruno, who informs the creation of Marlowe's most hotly controversial creation. Doctor Faustus takes on the ultimate peer, almighty God, in an attempt to recreate the world from the seclusion of his desk.
Notes

1. J. C. Maxwell examines the editorial practice of Tucker Brooke and H. S. Bennett to disagree with the majority of critical opinion on the text, concluding only that the 1633 quarto of *The Jew of Malta* was printed very badly, not that it is a terribly mangled version of a much better original (224-225).

2. Kocher and Ellis-Fermor regard the later plays as less monodramatic and more aware of society. For William Godshalk, it is the other way around (102). Harry Levin sees all the plays as focused on their heroes (24), although "somewhere between the microcosm of *Doctor Faustus* and the macrocosm of *Tamburlaine* stands *The Jew of Malta*" (61).

3. Much criticism of *Edward II* has not regarded that play as a monodrama but as a conflict between Edward and Mortimer. Ellis-Fermor groups *Edward II* with *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* as political plays of "policy" but distinguishes its hero as "a frail character in conflict with [his] surroundings and gradually overpowered by them" (CM 110).

4. There is comparatively little commentary on *The
Massacre at Paris. F. P. Wilson's *The Massacre at Paris* and *Edward II* is typical in that it spends only three paragraphs on *The Massacre* and eight pages on *Edward II*. Its biographical approach is also common: "We cannot doubt that it was the towering ambition of Guise that most attracted Marlowe to this theme" (129), Wilson's comment on the corrupt text of *The Massacre* is also frequent (128-129).

In his bibliographical review, Robert Kimbrough notes that

> because of the unanimous belief that the extant text of the Massacre represents a drastically fragmented version of what the original must have been, full critical analysis appears only in the book-length studies.

(24)

That belief probably also accounts for the relative scarcity of even partial analyses in scholarly articles.

5. If Barabas and Guise are evil but aren't any different from their fellows, then the logical conclusion is that the morality of the society itself must be questioned. I wonder about such critics as, for example, Alfred Harbage, who finds Barabas so exuberant and antic that he doesn't mention the less enjoyable traits. Harbage also asserts that

> the world of Malta is not depicted as wicked at all. In fact, its governor, Ferneze, would have
been greeted by an Elizabethan audience with warm moral approval. That we cannot endorse this approval is beside the point.

Hence he goes on to describe Barabas as both "morally black" (152) and "essentially innocent-minded" (154), an interpretation best judged as confused.


7. For another view of the Prologue, see Cartelli 119-24.

8. Barabas will explain more fully:

   In Malta here, that I have got my goods,  
   And in this city still have had success,  
   And now at length am grown your Governor,  
   Yourself shall see it shall not be forgot;  
   For, as a friend not known but in distress,  
   I'll rear up Malta, now remediless.  
   (V.ii.69-74)

Whereas most critics read this passage as uncharacteristic patriotism, it is consistent with his acceptance of the hypocritical social interaction of Malta, which even the government sanctions by example.

9. Kuriyama treats the family problems of the Valois in her psychoanalytic study. She makes a good case for Anjou as a stronger character than Guise, and her view of the play's theme as the necessity of rebellion against parental authority is interesting. However, what she
sees as Marlowe's confusion about the Guise's character is a result of her reducing it to either father or son. Such an interpretation limits the political significance of the play.

10. I am using the edition of J. B. Steane, who divides The Massacre at Paris into acts and scenes, perhaps for consistency or convenience. Both H. S. Bennett (the editor of The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris for the standard R.H. Case edition of Marlowe's works) and Irving Ribner (in Complete Plays) use scene divisions but no act numbers.

11. Babb discusses the use of this word as well as its relative, "policy" (86-89). See also Levin 61.

12. It is a striking coincidence that in Steane's edition the last words of Barabas and Guise occur at line 94.


14. I do not find much humor in this ending, but some critics have read irony in the final lines, "let due praise now be given,/ Neither to Fate nor fortune, but to Heaven" (V.v. 130-131), and in some performances the end is played for a laugh. See also Rocklin 138-139.

15. Although Fanta omits Dido and The Massacre at Paris from his study, their inclusion would not materially alter his conclusions.
16. John Ronald Glenn's "The Martyrdom of Ramus in Marlowe's The Massacre at Paris" is my source for this view of the philosopher as a moral norm, as well as for background on Ramus. Walter J. Ong has compiled a short-title inventory.
Chapter 5

"Resolve Me of All Ambiguities": Doctor Faustus

I

I have placed Marlowe's most controversial play in this ultimate chapter to emphasize its importance as a critique of the providential model of politics and as another version of the Renaissance ambivalence toward monolithic power, especially as treated in Tamburlaine. The focus in previous chapters has been on how the plays redefine what has traditionally been a public arena—the role of sovereign. In Doctor Faustus, the inner, private realm becomes fused with public into a unified field of relations with others (including for Faustus devils, angels, Christ, and God).

Doctor Faustus may seem at first out of place in a study concerned with the concept of politics. One aspect of the notion of "politics" I have developed in this dissertation is the self-realization of the protagonist. Because private life is often separated from the political arena, few studies have considered Doctor Faustus from a political viewpoint. The Kimbrough, Post, and Levao bibliographies show that past scholarship has
been concerned with influences and source studies, themes of magic, hell, and devils, and comparisons with Goethe and other versions of the Faust legend. Many interpretations still focus on Marlovian religious orthodoxy and heroic psychology (see chapter 1). More recently, speculation has centered on the function of sexual desire and homoeroticism in the play.¹

The one purposefully political (yet traditional) treatment of Marlowe is hesitant even to classify Doctor Faustus as political. For Claude Summers, this play "documents the limits of human power" (Christopher Marlowe 117) and asserts that its very "quality of ambivalence, this simultaneous stating and questioning, is what makes Doctor Faustus elusive of interpretation and politically significant" (118). Yet he limits that significance by saying that it is "of course, primarily a religious play" (118), as though religion and politics do not mix, and he centers his discussion on the personal power struggle between Faustus and the supernatural: "Not only is it a pity that the doctor does not repent...; it is also, we feel, a pity that Faustus' dreams are forbidden by the Christianity that might have saved him" (120). Having criticized Christianity, Summers proceeds to spend most of his discussion showing the defects of Faustus' arrangement with the devils,
lamenting that Mephostophilis and Lucifer only partially fulfill their infernal promise. Since Christianity satisfied none of Faustus' desires, the devils at least should have kept their part of a pact that then would have been worth the loss of one's soul. In Summers' view, Christianity is as limiting as necromancy--neither will allow Faustus to realize his aspirations.

But as long as Faustus' aspirations are studied in isolation, they cannot be perceived as political. In contrast to Summers' patient tone, other scholars of humanism condemn Faustus' struggle with a puzzling vehemence. M.M. Mahood, Roy Battenhouse, and Charles Masinton seem angry at Faustus and Marlowe for making the wrong decisions, but they do not see any larger context which would explain those choices. They regard the plight of the aspiring doctor as doubly ironic: not only does he lose his individual autonomy in endeavoring to assert it, but he makes his choice knowing in advance that damnation would result.²

Mahood finds disastrous the Renaissance deviation from "true" theocentric humanism to a "false" one which focused only on the human. She traces the "Marlowe hero [as he] shrinks in stature from the titanic to the puny, and his worship of life gives place to that craving for death which is the final stage of a false humanism's
dialectic" (55). Rejecting both false and true humanism, Battenhouse's study of Tamburlaine links that play with Doctor Faustus in its orthodoxy and its use of the morality tradition to dramatize the lessons of de casibus history and salvific religion. Here the "ostensible moral of Faustus and Tamburlaine" is that no truth inheres in humane learning or art (35); Battenhouse finds orthodox comfort in the fall of the hero who defies God. Masinton views all of Renaissance humanism ironically:

Because it turns away from a theocentric approach to life, humanism does more than challenge man to create a new, secular order: it threatens him with intellectual and moral chaos if he does not. ... With no God to help him, the product of radical humanism ironically tries to fashion a flawless destiny by disregarding the accumulated wisdom of his traditions.

(10-11)

Faustus' cosmic alienation shows to Masinton a "humanism with a vengeance," which "thus makes Marlowe the first modern English dramatist" (11).

In rejecting Faustus' humanistic desire for knowledge and power, these critics uphold E. M. W. Tillyard's description of the Elizabethan world picture as rigidly hierarchical. But their view is too limited to account for the ambiguity of, and continuous interest in, the play. Few but literary historians would read it now if it were merely an orthodox study of sin. Faustus'
magic is an alternative way to realize power.\(^3\) It is clear from the prologue that *Doctor Faustus* is not about military might or government. Instead, the quest for power will range from heaven to hell, even as it is centered on "the man that in his study sits" (I.i. 28).\(^4\)

In his article on "Marlowe and God," Robert Ornstein describes the Faustian choice in terms which sharply delineate the view of communitarian politics I have drawn from the theories of Unger, Foucault, Arendt, and new historicism. This play, the text, is a version of that state; or, the state is another version of the play: each is an instance of Elizabethan political culture. As Ornstein puts it,

> the heroic choice is not between alternative paths of self-fulfillment but between the self-destructiveness of mighty strivings and the salvation that demands self-abnegation and the denial of heroic aspiration. For inevitably, man's attempt at greatness must break against a universal order which is predicated on, and which demands, human obedience and denial.

(1380)

Given these terms, it is little wonder that Faustus searches for alternatives. Marlowe constructs his alternative heroic politics against this orthodoxy of choice. His characters choose and aspire to self-affirmation, self-actualization, not commonwealth. Rebellion itself is an idea constituted by the concept of rule; alternative self-actualization (what Ornstein calls...
"self-destructiveness of mighty strivings") attacks the very assumptions of order and rebellion and is, according to Greenblatt, truly and radically subversive. If Marlowe were looking for a way to make the cooperation of domus an alternative, he did not succeed in breaking his characters out of human limits.

The heroic choice does not only belong to Faustus, but to Tamburlaine, Dido, Edward, Barabas, and Guise. Every Marlovian protagonist is destroyed—by illness and age, execution, suicide, assassination, devilish torture—and every protagonist has been received by audiences and some critics as a hero, one who aimed high. The heroic alternative is a political one because it involves others in the domus as well as in traditional power struggles.

In previous chapters I have argued that what has been viewed as either blasphemy or heroic ambition in Marlowe's protagonists may also be read as an attempt to collapse the dichotomy of obedience and rebellion into a third, alternative political choice of fashioning a domus or polis whose members are peers instead of subjects or rulers. Tamburlaine, who compares himself to the gods, "is always more than man" (Bradbrook 113). Dido, Edward, Barabas, and Guise choose family members, friends, and/or lovers for their non-traditional peers. Faustus
challenges the traditional hierarchy of ruler and subject in his own personal life as he struggles against the necessity of salvation.

It is not the very existence of God which Faustus denies, as is demonstrated periodically by scenes of repentance with the good and bad angels, friendly scholars, and the godly old man. In these scenes, Faustus does acknowledge his error and intends to repent, but he is distracted and his will weakened by the bad angel or by the temptations of Mephostophilis and Lucifer. Faustus thus appears to retain his Christian belief even as he rejects its values. In Ornstein's view, Faustus seems to prize willful self-destruction instead of "salvation that demands self-abnegation and the denial of heroic aspiration" (1380). But his arguments and actions form a search for a self-affirming alternative. Faustus claims to believe that "hell's a fable," but his emotions do not follow that belief. Instead, in his argument with Mephostophilis, he is advancing a proposition as though his choice were a student debate. It is absurd for Faustus to tell a devil that Hell is not real; the tone here is one of adolescent challenge to a superior. In spite of Mephostophilis' contractual status as servant, the demon is Faustus' superior in knowledge and in power, a status which
Faustus respects even as he endeavors to invert the hierarchy, to recirculate that power.

The bold doctor is tentatively searching for another stance toward the Christian universe. Because he is a Renaissance magician, Faustus' place in the European social structure is uncertain. He is an accomplished physician and a doctor of divinity, but his studies of magic are accurately termed "cursed necromancy" (Prol. 25)—a dubious pursuit in mainstream Christian Europe. He is ambitious, but his parents are "base of stock" (Prol. 11). Faustus has worked for his place in the world; now he will use magic to flout the very structure of that world.

II

In studying the creation of an alternative relationship to religious authority, an illuminating comparison can be made between Faustus and Giordano Bruno, the wandering philosopher-heretic from Nola who displayed his opinions and his abilities in cities across Europe during the 1580s. There are historical resonances between the two figures, which are textually both suggested and denied by the reference to "Saxon Bruno," whom Marlowe sets up as an antipope (in III.ii). A note in J.B. Steane's edition of the play says that no
historical identification of Saxon Bruno has yet been proven. Roy Eriksen argues in favor of the identification on the basis of references shared by both legends and by parallels between the two figures.⁸

Although this long chain of inference linking Bruno and Marlowe is mostly circumstantial, the direct evidence is slightly less so. The English Ambassador to Paris, Sir Henry Cobham, wrote a letter in 1583 introducing Bruno to Marlowe's patron Thomas Walsingham as a "professor in philosophy ... whose religion I cannot commend" (Singer 25). Preceded by such a reputation, Bruno arrived in England in 1583 and made the acquaintance of Sir Philip Sidney, Thomas Walsingham, Fulke Greville, and perhaps Sir Walter Ralegh and others.⁹ Marlowe was attending Cambridge during the time Bruno spent in Oxford and London. Surely, the playwright knew of him; whether there was any direct connection is not known, though it is very likely.¹⁰

The documentary evidence of Marlowe's own opinions is scant and inconclusive, yet it parallels strikingly the views reported to the Inquisition by Bruno's betrayer. Zuane Mocenigo, who had first invited Bruno to teach him the arts of memory and then become apprehensive about his association with the unorthodox scholar, accused Bruno of believing, among other things, that
"'Christ was a rogue,'" that he and his disciples were but magicians, and that the Virgin Birth was a false doctrine (Imerti 48). These charges sound much like those recorded in the deposition of Richard Baines, in which Marlowe is reported to have said that "Moyses was but a Jugler" (another derogatory term often synonymous with "magician") and that "Christ was a bastard and his mother dishonest" (quoted in Case vol. 1, 98). The echo of these accusations is also heard in the rather backhanded approval given by the two men to the Church. Of Bruno, Mocenigo says that "although he insisted that the Catholic faith was in need of great changes, he nevertheless admitted that it was the religion that pleased him most" (Imerti 46). Baines reports Marlowe's saying "that if there be any god or any good Religion, then it is in the papistes" (Case vol. 1, 99).11

The present argument, however, does not rest on a definite historical link between the two but on the similarity of their search for power through knowledge, especially of theology and necromancy. The two magicians are both aspects of a larger cultural text (to borrow Stephen Greenblatt's concept from Shakespearean Negotiations) about the figure of magus as a relation of knowledge and power, human and supernatural.12 Marlowe's Doctor Faustus shares several traits with the
Renaissance *magus* described by Frank L. Borchardt, including a humanist interest in ancient sources and an ambivalent attitude toward supernatural power which results in a final repudiation of occult practice.

The magician was part of an international network of idealistic philosophers who often used what they learned from ancient Hebrew and Egyptian sources to channel supernatural power through physical objects. Thus Marsilio Ficino advised his patients to attract healing forces by surrounding themselves with gold, carved jewels, and flowers (Yates 63, 80). The Neoplatonic aspect of this knowledge is evident in Bruno's desire to link talismanic magic with classical mnemonic arts in order to achieve a "universe of the mind" (Yates 194, 198). Idealism is not a characteristic attributable to Faustus; the material objects valued by him, such as "gold and orient pearl," represent not magic talismans but wealth. Being a metaphysician, Bruno was a different sort of materialist, using up-to-date Copernican astronomy as well as Presocratic atomist theories and the quasi-Egyptian lore of Hermes Trismegistus. Because of Ficino's discovery and translation of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, which legitimizes magic as part of the repertoire of a "Christian Magus," Frances Yates believes that "it would become a legitimate practice for a
philosopher, even a devout practice associated with his
religion, to 'draw down the life of heaven' by
sympathetic astral magic, as Ficino advised" (12-18, 41).
Bruno's scholarship is matched in scope by that of
Faustus, as the aspiring doctor demonstrates in the
play's first scene.

Renaissance magicians (such as Ficino, Pico,
Agrippa, Reuchlin, Trithemius, and lesser-known figures
of the early sixteenth century) were also characterized
by "ambivalence in general and particularly toward magic"
(Borchardt 73). Faustus is a spectacular example of
ambivalence (as in the several repentance scenes noted
above). All the major Renaissance magi active at the
turn of the sixteenth century eventually rejected the
occult aspects of their magic when it came into conflict
with orthodox Christianity. Borchardt explains it thus:

Magic represented an alternative to the
generally accepted religion. ...This [choice
of orthodoxy] might not have been the case if
high magic had been able to deliver what it
promised in the way of enlightenment. In
certain rare cases--Picino, Reuchlin, and,
somewhat later, Bruno--magic seems to have
"worked," that is, it provided a gratifying
symbolic language which the magi perceived as
consonant with orthodoxy or as a wholly
adequate substitute for orthodoxy (Bruno).
(73-75)

Because magic and esoteric philosophy did "work" for
Bruno, he did not return to Christianity, as did other
scholar-magicians including Faustus, but resisted the Inquisition. His ambivalence is recorded in the proceedings of his eight-year trial which began in 1592. He had fled his convent and the Neapolitan Inquisition; when he returned to Italy and was seized and questioned by the church authorities, Bruno "alternately denied or justified or offered apologies" for his ideas and works and "resolved to explain his views on the nature of God in more ambivalent terms" (Imerti 49, 52). Finally, however, Bruno would not renounce eight of his beliefs which were unacceptable to the Church, so he was convicted of heresy.

Marlowe's play combines the heresy trial and the repudiation of heretical magic in its dramatization of Faustus' end. Because of the freethinking orthodoxy of their work and their lives, both Bruno and Faustus are damned. Bruno unsuccessfully attempts to evade the Inquisition and avoid trial; Faustus writes his contract of condemnation in his own blood. Burned at the stake for heresy in 1600, Bruno's punishment literally recreates the flames of hell. Marlowe's devils execute Faustus in a similarly spectacular fashion, rending his body on their way to hell as Lucifer and Mephostophilis, at least in the B text, watch.

Ambivalence can be traced in Doctor Faustus through
astronomical imagery, the questions about celestial mechanics, and the vacillation of the main character between blasphemy and repentance. In an article on looking up to heaven and the stars, Rowland Wymer discusses that gaze as "an epitome of Faustus' divided impulses towards and away from God" (509). Sometimes when Faustus looks up (as in V.ii.), he sees Lucifer and the devils watching from an upper gallery (Wymer 509). Sometimes, Faustus sees God or Christ above him, and ponders: "When I behold the heavens then I repent" (II.i. 1). Sometimes it is astronomical knowledge which Faustus finds in the heavens, as when he tours the world with Mephostophilis (in III.i.). In these instances of looking up, "the dreams of knowledge and power [are] presented positively and intensely" (Wymer 507), but "the different meanings [of up] oscillate throughout the play, as Faustus himself oscillates" between defiance and despair (509). In the play's prologue, the chorus illustrates Faustus' ambition with a familiar symbol of self-destructive aspiration, Icarus' "mount[ing] above his reach" (prol. 21) in pride yet also "falling to a devilish exercise" (23).

Faustus' search for alternatives is scientific as well as spiritual. Francis R. Johnson shows that Marlowe's astronomical references (especially the
arguments over planetary motion), though not Copernican, are still unorthodox. David Bevington also comments on the rebellious yet petulant attitude of Faustus toward Mephostophilis: "I know better than to ask you [Mephostophilis] about such matters as these." Faustus does want to know, yet as a doctor of divinity he already knows who made the world and how Lucifer got to hell. His first soliloquy does not specifically mention physics or astronomy, but perhaps he studied the relevant works in the Aristotelian canon as well as the two Analytics. Faustus' broad knowledge does not yet satisfy him; he is ambivalent about the structure of the universe which produced that knowledge and equivocal about eternity.

Bruno's cosmological description in On the Infinite Universe and the Worlds captures Faustus's relativist views: "there is in the universe neither centre nor circumference, but, if you will, the whole is central, and every point also may be regarded as part of a circumference in respect to some other central point" (quoted in Singer 365). This heresiarch, as the Inquisition termed him, describes himself in terms as ambitious and overreaching as any Marlovian critic uses about Faustus:

The Nolan ... has released the human spirit, and set knowledge at liberty. Man's mind was
suffocating in the close air of a narrow prison house. ... Behold now, standing before you, the man who has pierced the air, and penetrated the sky, wended his way among the stars and overpassed the margins of the world.

(quoted in Yates 237)

Yates sees Bruno's use of Copernican astronomy as a Hermetic allegory, thus providing another link among the characteristics of Renaissance magicians (237-49).

The Brunian reform of the heavens means ... the old age of the world after the collapse of the Egyptian religion and the Egyptian moral laws is over: the magical religion mounts up again into the sky. (220)

It is easy to see why the Holy Inquisition found Bruno a heretic. For Bruno as well as for Doctor Faustus, as Ornstein says, "the true revelation of the divine is the universe" (1383).

Both the Hermetic magical and religious beliefs and the cosmological philosophy of Bruno keep him concentrating only on the heavens, but Faustus' attention is torn between heaven and hell. There are several images of this division in the play. Good and bad angels appear several times, dramatizing the Christian dilemma of temptation and salvation. Faustus is oblivious to the first, cautionary appearance of the Good and Evil Angels. Immediately after their departure, he lists the material and intellectual opportunities before his career-minded
eye, in another example of divided interests. The later comic scenes show symbolic dismemberment: the horse-courser tears Faustus' leg off, and Benvolio cuts off a Faustian false head. At play's end, Faustus' very body is divided, rent by devils carrying him to hell.

Although he often gazes up to the heavens, Faustus also looks for his place below. For Faustus, Hell is heaven and heaven is a cruelly unattainable divine promise. After he misreads the doctrine of "everlasting death" apparently promised by "Jerome's Bible" (I.i. 38-48), the searching scholar decides that "these necromantic books are heavenly" (49) and immediately sets out to master them. The appearance of a devil demonstrates that his newly-acquired conjuring skills are effective, and the first questions he puts to Mephostophilis (in I.iii.) are about the efficacy of his conjuring on the demons and the nature of Lucifer, their chief in hell.

This entire third scene shows the wide bounds of Faustus' search, from Orion in the night sky (I.iii. 1-2) to "confound[ing] hell in elysium" (59). Lucifer's own fall was far, from "the face of heaven" (68). But Mephostophilis, servant and student of the father of lies, initially reports no specific location for hell. "This is Hell," he says when asked (I.iii. 76). Only
when he has secured the soul of the errant doctor is he
more specific. Hell is "under the heavens ... within the
bowels of these elements" (I.v. 120, 122), yet it also
"hath no limits, nor is circumscribed/ In one self place"
(124-125). At the end of the world and time, "All places
shall be hell that is not heaven" (129). From the
height of Mount Olympus and the Primum Mobile, Faustus
tracks the ends of the world to seek knowledge and "prove
Cosmography" (III.i. 20). The chorus describes this
search in respectful, even sublime terms; however, the
third act dramatizes not Faustus' study of cosmology but
his practical jokes on the Pope which result in his being
excommunicated. Faustus does not tarry in Rome, nor in
any one place, (like Bruno, who often "received no
encouragement to stay" anywhere; see Singer 14). He
dazzles or frustrates the recipients of his magic, but he
always returns to Mephostophilis and his study, where the
play's first and last scenes are set and where Faustus is
"alone with himself--as in the play's beginning"
(Eirringer, "Between Body" 349). Marlowe's
dramatization of the legendary (even in 1590) Faust does
not depict a man with many friends or relatives (despite
the dinners with Valdes and Cornelius). He is not part
of an international network; he rejects the concern of
those around him, even of Mephostophilis (in I.iii. 81-
Michael Scott observes that "for the sake of fame this arrogant doctor wishes for isolation, longs for an unnatural detachment since within that lies his renown and fame" (20). Knowledge is neither a constructive nor a communal pursuit for Faustus, nor does he pursue knowledge for its own sake. Simon Shepherd asserts that a scholar is alien because of his interests and technical language; "he is also socially isolated" (132). "When the scholar places personal feelings before community [as Faustus does], he pursues individual interest, which is a possible political threat" (133). According to M.C. Bradbrook, Marlowe "thought knowledge was the goal of humanity, but only because knowledge could be translated to external power, to sovereignty" (103). The English Faustbuch characterizes the scholar's passionate quest: "Quoth Faustus ragingly, I will know, or I will not live, wherefore dispatch and tell me" (Bates 18). Marlowe's play, in contrast, first presents its hero flipping through books, pausing at certain passages perhaps fondly remembered from student days, and weighing the reward to be obtained from the profession of each branch of learning. H. W. Matalene reads this opening scene not as a set speech but as action which portrays Faustus as a dilettante whose studies are "no more than an impatient
and adolescent hankering after power and social validation" (519). The soliloquy verbalizes a question familiar to modern parents and children: "what do I want to be when I grow up?" A doctor? A lawyer? A minister? A scholastic philosopher? In Marlowe's version of this discussion, truth becomes self-interest, which "is precisely problematized by Faustus where the scholar's project of knowledge is shaped by the material values and interests of his society" (134). Doctor Faustus's society, Renaissance England, was interested in dominion, and Faustus's settling of his studies reduces his ivory-tower delight in the "end of every art" (I.i. 4) to the choice of magic as a career because it promises the greatest material gain. Gold and orient pearl, the kingship of all the provinces, philosophical resolutions, and even a practical joke or two: all may be in the power of the "studious artizan" (I.i. 54). Nor are these desires idle; Faustus has been encouraged to "think of honour and of wealth" (I.v. 21), and by the end of his life he has acquired enough to bequeath to his servant Wagner "his house, his goods, and store of golden plate, / Besides two thousand ducats ready coined" (V.i. 2-3).

These gains, though influencing his choice, are not as important as power is to the aspiring magician. "His dominion that exceeds in this [necromantic ability]"
Stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man" (I.i. 60). Foucault's and Unger's analyses show the complexity of domination as a mode of human relationship. Unger views domination as "unjustified power" (243); while his concern, unlike Marlowe's, is to find justifiable and shared bases for human interaction, both he and Marlowe do recognize the types of domination, ranging from the obvious extreme of physical slavery to "the immediate stratagems by which one mind becomes master of another" (244).

It is control, power, mental and material domination, for which Faustus reveals his desire in his first speech, "and then be thou as great as Lucifer" (I.v. 52). He ponders what to do with his life, "to sound the depth of that thou wilt profess" (I.i. 2). He decides on necromancy, for

Oh, what a world of profit and delight,
Of power, of honour, of omnipotence,
Is promised to the studious artizan!

A sound magician is a demi-god.

(I.i. 52-54, 61)

For Faustus, as for Bruno, magic is a means to knowledge. Bruno's Hermeticism is a means of channeling supernatural influences through talismans. Faustus uses anagrams, pentagrams, and other arcana to wield knowledge as power, as seen in his first summoning of a devil in I.v. But it is clear already, from the beginning of the play, that
Faustus will not settle for knowledge for its own sake; he wants to make himself equal to demons, to control even God.18

Such a pursuit of knowledge is isolating—not exactly an ivory tower but, for both Bruno and Faustus, a pursuit which separated them from others. Bruno often abruptly left places where he had made himself known through his abrasively presented new philosophy. "Always he was encouraged; always his difficult temperament led him into trouble and he was passed onward" (Singer 13). He fled the convent and Naples; left England with the French ambassador whose houseguest he was; chased around Venice, Padua, and Noli; traveled through France but left Paris; bounced around Germany; was bounced out of Marburg and Wittenberg; and finally returned to Italy and the Inquisitors. The movements of Marlowe's traveling scholar compare but do not coincide with those of Bruno. From Wittenberg Faustus went to Paris, Naples, Venice, Padua, Rome, and the German emperor's court; he returns to his study to die.

Perhaps arrogance is also characteristic of famous scholar-magicians. In the company of Mephostophilis, Faustus seems about as tactful as Bruno was at Oxford, alternately badgering and flattering him. At Paris, Bruno once showed a similar lack of grace when he refused
to appear at a public debate, admitting that he was vanquished (Singer 138). Bruno describes the situation in terms equally appropriate to Faustus' antics: "because of the tumults, ... I left Paris" (Singer 139).

Nor was his dispute at Oxford a social success; the visiting scholar called the Rector a "pig" (133). Bruno reported his dissatisfaction with a dinner-party disputation in *La Cena de le Ceneri*:

> And I declare two things: First, that one must not kill a foreign doctor, because he attempts those cures that the native doctors do not attempt, second, I say, that for the true philosopher every land is his country. (Imerti 19)

Again, these could be the words of Faustus on his reception in European courts. Bruno also published refutations which attacked those with whom he disagreed, thus making himself even more unpopular. It is a mark of mystical religion that revelation is given only to a few, and apparently Hermetism was an esoteric cult, not a mass movement. But the cult would not accept Bruno. He was not able to secure long-term financial support, housing, or even publishing contracts, yet he stayed loyal to his religious and intellectual beliefs. Those beliefs helped to change the scientific and philosophical view of the anthropocentric universe.

The similarities between Giordano Bruno's life and influence and those of Christopher Marlowe suggest that
the figure of the ambitious, heterodox Renaissance scholar-magician in Marlowe's text explores one alternative to the prevailing structures of authority and of personal relationships both public and private.

III

Traditional or alternative, politics is difficult for Faustus. He is ruled by no one: not the scholars, the good angel, the old man, not even his diabolic advisor on the pervasive presence of hell. Yet in spite of his solitary pursuit of knowledge, Faustus is not actually alone in the human world. Wagner is his servant, Cornelius and Valdes his friends; his colleagues are groups of scholars, and his admiring public includes royalty and nobility. Even an unidentified old man is concerned with Faustus's spiritual welfare. The aspiring scholar is surrounded by people as well as by books. In the play's first scene, the scholar is in his study; immediately afterward he is inviting Valdes and Cornelius to dinner. While they dine, Wagner encounters some scholars who are concerned over their fellow doctor. These episodes show that Faustus' isolation is not by necessity but through his choice of aspiration and despair--the manifestations of his Nietzschean-Foucauldian "will to knowledge" displayed in his first
speech. He looks to the realm of the supernatural for his compeers instead of troubling himself to alter the forms of relationship on earth, either with servants or friends and colleagues.

Doctor Faustus does nothing to alter the traditional master-servant hierarchy, which is embodied in several sets of characters. Faustus' servant, Wagner, recruits Robin the clown to be his student-servant just as Wagner himself serves Faustus; Robin then repeats the pattern with Dick. The character of Wagner the servant mirrors the great doctor of magic in miniature, complete with learning and arrogance. Wagner demonstrates at least a smattering of Latin and logic when he encounters the scholars in I.ii. They only want to know "what's become of Faustus" (I.ii. 1); Wagner recasts the question as a scholastic disputation, pointing out errors in their "reasoning" and insulting them even though they are his superiors in social and intellectual station:

Yet if you were not dunces, you would never ask me such a question. For is he not Corpus naturale? And is that not mobile? Then wherefore should you ask me such a question? (16-20)

Typical of Elizabethan dramatizations of servants, this saucy response shows that Wagner has mimicked his master's philosophical methods. The servant has also learned Faustus' magic techniques, and he summons up two
devils to prove it to Robin the clown. As Faustus is to Wagner, so is Wagner to Robin in II.ii. This hierarchy is also reflected up from Faustus, who mistakenly believes that Mephostophilis is his servant; that devil proclaims his own service to Lucifer as his master, thus extending an elaborate yet deceptive hierarchy.

Wagner's description of his clown also echoes the real relation of Mephostophilis to Faustus: "the villain's out of service and so hungry that I know he would give his soul to the devil for a shoulder of mutton though it were blood raw" (I.iv. 8-10). The clown replies with conditions for his employment, just as Faustus has composed his own contract of four stipulations. Despite these apparently voluntary contracts and bargaining, Faustus has either no ability to escape Mephostophilis's deceptions or no will to adjust his own attitude of despair.

The indeterminate heroism of Doctor Faustus, like that of Tamburlaine, is reflected in the play's assumptions about morality and servanthood. In the structural argument of From Mankind to Marlowe, David Bevington suggests that ambiguity of theme in these plays results from the unsuitability of the episodic morality structure to a plot focusing on a specific individual.
hero (212-214). Tension in Doctor Faustus between heroic individualism and the inexorable Christianity of the moralities produces a deep anxiety about both salvation and defiance. At the time the play was written, neither viewpoint prevailed.

Social scientist Clarence Green writes that insistence upon the individualistic significance of Dr. Faustus does no violence to the fact that the play depicts one phase of the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance [as Bevington has shown]. ... If Faustus is a type of enlightened and heroic Renaissance rebel... he obviously ought to go to heaven, not to hell.

Instead of the sinner who repents too late, or the "half-hearted reformer," Faustus is a victim of history who is nevertheless, as Green argues, an irresponsible and solipsistic character.

If he remains sane, he must either abandon his individualism or end in futile despair. This is also the tragedy of the transitional age. ...His tragedy is rather that of the extreme individualist who does not, and in the historical circumstances cannot, grasp the full implications of unqualified freedom.

To use Raymond Williams' categories, medieval Christian social roles were a residual element in the dominant Tudor culture, while individualist heroism was emergent, not to appear fully until Enlightenment liberalism. After defining "civic consciousness" in terms reminiscent
of Arendt's social order, political historian Donald W. Hanson argues that, instead of offering the possibility of individual action, medieval "society [was] organized on a radically fragmented basis, oriented overwhelmingly toward local and familial pursuits and loyalties; one in which the chief secular values were the possession of land and military prowess" (17). These local loyalties and families also recall the Platonic-Aristotelian origin of the state in the household relations of master and slaves. Because *Doctor Faustus* does belong in the transition between local medieval Christianity and liberal individualism, any attempt to search for an alternative political *domus* is doomed. Outside of Christian theology, *Tamburlaine* is more successful in creating an alternative.

Perhaps the aspiration of Faustus is doomed because he is human.25 He rejects his human compeers for supernatural peers, so his struggles with right, control, and will are waged in his own body. Magic has gained Faustus entrance to the demonic spirit world, but he retains bodily capabilities even though he has contracted to be a spirit "in form and substance." He wants to meet Mephostophilis and Lucifer on their own ground, that of spirit, in order to organize them into a demonic *domus* of peers. The presence of a contract makes the
relationship among Faustus, Mephostophilis, and Lucifer appear both voluntary and formal. The document is repeated verbally between Faustus and Mephostophilis:

Fau: Here, Mephostophilis, receive this scroll, A deed of gift of body and soul: But yet conditionally, that thou perform All covenants and articles between us both. 
Mep: Faustus, I swear by hell and Lucifer To effect all promises between us both ... Speak, Faustus, do you deliver this as your deed? 
Fau: Ay, take it... (I.v.88-93, 115-116).

Mephostophilis, of course, will not keep all those promises, but neither does Faustus; he tries to renege by repenting.

In basing the parallelism of its characters on their servanthood, Marlowe's play structurally frustrates Faustus' attempt to break out of traditional hierarchy on the strength of his own will. Despite the boons of power he receives, Faustus has made himself a servant to Lucifer. While Mephostophilis often plays the role of an impudent servant (like Wagner), Lucifer's imperious tone confirms both the contract and the earliest admissions of Faustus that he is damned. "Think of the devil," orders the Devil peremptorily—a reminder that Faustus is not among equals, nor will he find comfort or comradeship in hell.

Faustus might have had better success, if he wanted
it, in creating a community of his human friends and colleagues. Instead, this potential peer group of scholars and magi is fragmented by Faustus' deeds and attitudes. Faustus slights Valdes and Cornelius, treats the old man rudely, and neglects his fellow scholars until the end, when he shows off for them. The scholars have no knowledge of magic, only opprobrium for it and caution for their colleague. They hope to enlist the Rector of Wittenberg to rescue Faustus from "that damned art," thereby restoring him to their company. By the fifth act, these scholars (there is no suggestion that the two in Act V are different from those in Act I) seem to have mended their differences with their erstwhile friend. Perhaps he has even convinced them of the rewards of magical practice; they request the apparition of Helen of Troy, whom Faustus obligingly has Mephostophilis produce. But, perhaps Faustus has simply deceived them about the source of his abilities, for one scholar, perhaps ironically, praises Faustus for "this blessed sight" (V.i. 32). When the devils are about to come for their prize victim, Faustus confesses his deed to the horrified scholars: "Why did not Faustus tell us of this before...? Oh, what may we do to save Faustus?" (V.ii. 72-3, 79). Finally, in the B text they lament his death and revere his memory.
In confessing his guilt, Faustus may be obliquely admitting his failure and attempting to join, if only temporarily, his human community. The tone changes in the fifth act from haughtiness to almost humble compassion; Ornstein argues that Faustus' treatment of the scholars demonstrates an increase in his moral awareness. Valdes and Cornelius, invited to dinner in Act I, have been forgotten, but perhaps that is beneficial for Faustus' moral standing. In the eyes of the scholars, the two necromancers are not edifying companions; magicians who practiced "black" demonic magic were widely decried in the Renaissance. That Valdes and Cornelius are among them is evident by Faustus' review of his decision for necromancy, when he says that "divinity is basest" (I.i. 107). They share their friend's desire for material results from their magic, and they teach Faustus how to conjure devils. The various figures suggested as sources for "German Valdes and Cornelius" are notoriously associated with necromancy and perhaps were involved in the informal Renaissance brotherhood of magicians described by Borchardt.

Instead of looking to his human friends for domestic sustenance, Faustus has rejected all human peers and validated the master/servant structure of human domination. His relationships with friends, colleagues,
servants, and guardian angels have been relations of power. Ironically, his own mind, spirit, and body are dominated by the devil—-not only the deceptions of Mephostophilis and the pageantry of Lucifer, but also the Satanic prideful rebellion against love, community, and the benign sovereignty of the creator God. In one way or another all of Marlowe's protagonists exhibit just such a rebelliousness, but in Doctor Faustus the battle is concentrated within one person—-one mind and spirit, but also one body, which becomes the arena of domus and rule.

Faustus says he wants a wife, but only to satisfy his lascivious nature. Mephostophilis refuses his request, since marriage is a sacrament, a "ceremonial toy" (I.v.153). He settles for "a devil dressed like a woman, with fireworks" (s.d.149), whom he calls a "hot whore" (152); evidently, he is not seriously contemplating the sacrament of matrimony. It seems that Faustus wants to escape his body entirely; the first condition of his contract with Lucifer states that he will be a spirit (I.v. 96). Kay Stockholder observes that one need not sell one's soul in order to satisfy sensual desire. Actually, the devils do meet the sexual wants of Faustus, and they choose their times to reinforce his damnation by tempting him when he begins to
regret his contract and yearn for God. The devilish sensory parades sustain Faustus' illusion of control and domus even as he explores the body as a site of rule and community. His desire for Helen of Troy, for example, is cited by W.W. Greg as the point of Faustus' damnation, intercourse with a spirit being the sin of demoniality ("The Damnation" 363). Marlowe's lines do not, however, describe a merely physical sexual desire, but also suggest a power relation:

I will be Paris, and for love of thee
Instead of Troy shall Wittenberg be sacked,
And I will combat with weak Menelaus.
(V.ii. 104-106)

About this passage, Leo Kirschbaum writes that "Faustus will be like the violator of order (Paris), whereas his opponent (the husband, the symbol of order) will be weak; but in The Iliad order wins--and it is bound to win in the play, too" (241). Faustus' disordered desires result from increasing pressure of conflicting demands, represented by the good and bad angels.

In "Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History," Foucault conflates these relations of desire and combat by describing the body as "the inscribed surface of events (traced by language and dissolved by ideas), the locus of a dissociated self (adopting the illusion of a substantial unity), and a volume in perpetual
disintegration" (FR 83). History becomes a "non-place" which continually and only dramatizes "the endlessly repeated play of dominations" (85). As evidence for his views, Foucault studied social conditions, such as madness, criminology, and clinical medical attitudes. Following Nietzsche, the French theorist views knowledge itself as "experimentation on ourselves" (96). He elaborates three categories from Nietzsche's view of history to organize his own work: "a domain of [experiential] knowledge, a type of normativity [involving rules and conformity] and a mode of relation to the self" (333). This methodology is connected to the Foucauldian body, as a rather complicated comparison of these two tripartite descriptions shows. The body's "inscribed surface of events" is "a domain of knowledge"; the "dissociated self" is related to the "type of normativity" which in Doctor Faustus involves both control and despair; the "perpetual disintegration" of the subject as body parallels the "mode of relation to the self" which Foucault discusses in volume 2 of The History of Sexuality as "possible subjects of madness" (FR 336).

In a study of Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age, John S. Mebane conveniently finds three Renaissance themes which correspond roughly to Foucault's
schema.

Magic in Dr. Faustus is a unifying symbol which draws together the three aspects of Renaissance thought with which Christopher Marlowe was typically concerned: the indulgence of the senses and the enjoyment of worldly beauty, the quest for wealth and political power, and the pursuit of infinite knowledge.

Mebane finds magic a unifying symbol in the play because it allows the inscriptions on the body (including sensual pleasure) to depict Faustus' rebellion against religious norms of behavior, a rebellion which ends in the utter and violent disintegration of self.

Marlowe has been criticized for sensational violence, such as Tamburlaine's treatment of Bajazeth, Lightborn's murder of Edward, and the rending of Faustus' body by the devils, yet these deeds were part of the historical and literary sources. Equally gruesome in the Foucauldian connection of body and knowledge is the contract Faustus has written with his own blood. By cutting his arm "for love of" Mephostophilis, Faustus is parodying the solemnity of sacrificially redemptive rituals. The concept of blood brotherhood renders grotesque this attempt to include himself in the demonic peerage. Even Faustus' own body resists the act; first the blood congeals, then letters of warning form on Faustus' skin:
But what is this inscription on mine arm?  
Homo fuge! ...  
My senses are deceived: here's nothing writ!  
Oh yes, I see it plain. Even here is writ  
Homo fuge!  

(I.v. 75-6, 78-80).

The inscribed arm is an obvious image of knowledge gained from the body, and using one's own blood as ink is a graphic image of the body as text. Foucault's inscribed body is literalized in Marlowe's play as the painful images of dissociation and disintegration are realized in Faustus' own life.

Having rejected all human companions and peers, and finding himself puny in the supernatural domus he attempts to create, Faustus has also failed to refashion a community of the body. He uses human forms either for pure physical indulgence or for comic relief. Finally, he confirms the master-servant hierarchy of the Elizabethan playgoers' world. Doctor Faustus is about failed revolt, yet the play itself fails to change the existing state and church power structure. Its morality form lends a twist to its treatment of the subject matter, but the play is still a morality and a paradox. The traditional hierarchy which Faustus upholds on earth he cannot break in heaven or hell. He cannot escape it on earth, because he is too proud or isolated to treat his friends or servants as equals. In the other-worldly
realms, he is too proud to acknowledge the sovereignty of God or to believe in the devil ("hell's a fable"). At his end, Faustus has no peers and no power either.

IV

There are two versions of Doctor Faustus, a fact which contributes to continuing scholarly debate. Tucker Brooke (1910) followed nineteenth-century editorial practice in choosing the shorter, more coherent 1604 "A" text as more tragic and aesthetically satisfying. In the middle of the twentieth century, Boas (in vol. 5 of Case, 1932) and Greg (in the Parallel Texts version of 1950), followed by Jump (1962) and Ribner (1966), preferred the 1616 "B" version as more comic and complex, though less unified. More recently, Bowers (1973) and Ormerod and Wortham (1985) have favored the A text but Gill (1990) the B, while a forthcoming edition by Bevington and Rasmussen will print both texts--not parallel as in Greg's book, but as separate yet related texts. As a result, there are two surviving Marlowe plays about the Faust legend, each varying in detail but with no significant difference in terms of how Faustus interacts with others. The additional comic scenes in B either realize (in Benvolio) or reinforce (in Robin, Rafe, and Dick) the buffoonery of characters who are foils or
doubles of the protagonist. The episode of pope and antipope adds a topical interest. The endings of the two versions, however, do emphasize different aspects of Faustus' death and damnation.

After Wagner enters to inform the audience that his master "means to die shortly" (V.i.1), the banqueting scholars recount their talk of "fair ladies" and ask to see Helen of Troy. So far the A and B versions are very similar. Then an old man enters; two versions of his speech are given, but both exhort Faustus to repent his evil deeds and turn to salvation. Both versions have Mephostophilis following close behind in order to retain his prize; Faustus is won again and urges his devil to torture the old man. Both A and B also have Faustus' last request for Helen. In the A text, the old man returns during this scene. Although he is being tried by the devils, he ends in triumph: "Hence, hel, for hence I flie vnto my God" (1. 1356 A). The 1616 version replaces this reappearance of the old man with the presence of the chief torturers themselves: Lucifer, Mephostophilis, and Belzebub. The conversation of Faustus with the scholars is basically the same in both versions, which report the cause of his illness as "being ouer solitary" (1363). Eric Rasmussen points out that most references to the names of God and Christ were
censored out of the later quarto, so the scholars' comfort is more abstract. For example, A has "remember gods mercies" where B reads "remember mercy."

By interpolating a dialogue between Mephostophilis and Faustus at this point (1418-1419), B emphasizes Faustian stubbornness despite repeated chances to repent, but it also reveals the devilish treachery of Mephostophilis, who confesses with joy that he manipulated Faustus away from repentance. This additional scene does not, however, prove that the doctor was predestined to damnation, because it includes both Mephostophilis' cunning and the good angel's reproachful reminder that "hadst thou affected sweet diuinitie,/ Hell, or the diuell, had had no power on thee" (1442-43, B appendix).

The 1616 text also brings Faustus' fellow-scholars back for a final scene, while A goes straight from the last frightened speech of Faustus to the chorus' moralizing epilogue. Here death is ignominious and its victim a coward. The later, longer version allows some posthumous rehabilitation of the character of Faustus. In a tone horrified yet humane, the three concerned scholars first describe the terrors of their night watch: "Such fearefull shrikes, and cries ... the house seem'd all on fire,/ With dreadfull horror of these damned
fiends" (1481, 1488-89, B appendix). Nevertheless, the mutilated limbs once embodied a "Scholler, once admired/For wondrous knowledge" (1492-93, B), and so Master Doctor Faustus will receive due burial in a "heauy funerall" (1496, B). This textual expansion restores some dignity to Faustus' life. Although he did not die the good death so important in the Renaissance, he will be given decent mourning.

The 1616 text's additional commentary by extra devils, the good and bad angels, and Faustus' human companions, plus the censorship evident in that edition, produce a later B text both more abstract in its references to divinity and more concrete in the multiplication of commentaries on the impending damnation. Both devils and angels regard it with certainty; there will be no further opportunity for Faustus to repent. His doom is certain, his panic vivid, but the divine agent of salvation is blurred. A comparison of the following famous lines shows the difference in emphasis; italics indicate the variants.

O Ile leape vp to my God: who pulles me downe?
See see where Christ's blood streames in the firmament.
One drop would saue my soule, halfe a drop, ah my Christ
(1431-33 A)

O Ile leape vp to heauen: who pulles me downe?
One drop of bloud will saue me; oh my Christ
(1431-33 reconstructed from B notes)
The reference to the streaming blood of Christ is entirely omitted from the B version, although the name of Christ does appear.

This heart-rending, desperate plea dramatizes the Christian view of damnation as a literal separation from God, a loss of God, who is the life-orienting principle for both Bruno and Faustus.

Loss of God in the context of damnation ... is a major idea in the thought pattern of scholastic theology, where God is seen as the last end. Loss of God in this context means the loss of the last end. ... This privation implies that the sinner, on his own determination and obstinately, is turned away from the goodness of God.

("Damnation")

The ambiguous agency reflected in this modern wording shows that the controversy over the nature of hell and the ability to choose one's eternal destination, which raged so fiercely in Marlowe's century, has not now been resolved, nor was it in either the A or B text of the play Marlowe wrote.

Since the time of Augustine and Origen, the church has wrestled with Christian beliefs on free will and predestination, as is shown in William Creasy's survey of controversial positions from Dante to the Cambridge Platonists, "The Shifting Landscape of Hell." Marlowe would have been familiar with Dante and, through his
radical theological studies at Cambridge, with the Calvinist position, a transitional one between the residual, more literal belief in a hell of physical torture and the emergent view of hell's torment as primarily a spiritual separation from God, not only a physical isolation. **Doctor Faustus** is also a transitional document, which does not neglect the physical torture of the damned but emphasizes the relativity of hell's location in the everpresent awareness of eternal separation:

> But where we are is hell...
> This is hell, nor am I out of it.
> Think'st thou that I that saw the face of God
> And tasted the eternal joys of heaven
> Am not tormented with ten thousand hells
> In being deprived of everlasting bliss?
> (I.v. 125, I. iii. 76-80)

The university Marlowe attended was a site of this theological controversy; in the century after his student days, the Cambridge Platonists were arguing the issue of damnation so intensely that they "redefined the very nature of God, and they granted Grace and salvation [even] to Satan" (Creasy 61).

Faustus himself may believe this: "The serpent that tempted Eve may be saved, but not Faustus" (V.ii. 44). Marlowe's Lucifer is in no danger of being saved, but his conjuror is always vacillating between God and Satan, and the A and B texts are similarly indecisive in presenting
the final downfall of their protagonist. Doctor Faustus is orthodox, even conservative, in retaining God as the lodestone of its hero's ambitions; the radical aspect of the play is to be found in the reasons for Faustus' damnation. Instead of imitating Christ, Faustus has chosen to emulate Satan, and he is condemned because he seeks not transcendence but control. This reasoning is consistent not only with Christian theology but with the liberal-humanistic political psychology of Roberto Unger's Knowledge and Politics. Unger holds that in order to improve society, humans must "reconcile the experiences of immanent order and transcendence" by refashioning social and political relations (238). In these terms, Faustus is right to attempt an alternative to existing authority but wrong in basing it on his desire to control others. In Act I's listing of his planned exploits, Faustus reveals the material and coercive nature of the power to which he aspires. His attempted alternative existence in the world is both spiritual and physical, but he cannot accomplish that fusion necessary for the alternative to succeed.

The ambiguity of the A and B texts indicates the ambivalence, shown in other Marlovian works, toward both divine and secular power. The monarch of a realm had the same unquestionable authority that God exercised in
salvation; Renaissance culture both affirmed and challenged that authority. Bruno seems to have regarded the demonic not as a final place of separation but as a step toward final union with God:

> From sense to elements, demons, stars, gods, thence to the contemplation of the one simple Optimus Maximus, incorporeal, absolute, sufficient in itself.

(quoted from Yates 264-65 in Traister 15-16)

Bruno's conflict with Italian inquisitors lasted through eight years of evasion, compliance, and resistance to culminate in the fiery death of a condemned rebel against God and the Church. The heretic from Nola believed that God's presence was spread throughout the universe, but the Holy Inquisition burned him in hellish flames. Such an end, which Marlowe could not have known about, nevertheless actualized his play's own spectacular, ambivalent finale.

The radical attitude toward God evinced in *Doctor Faustus* is not a direct attempt to seize power, as Lucifer's heaven-shattering rebellion was, but it does indicate the attempt of its protagonist to find an alternative, a *domus* of his own ordering. Whether he makes himself a spirit, as Greg argues, or retains his body as well as his soul (though he does neither very well), Faustus is exploring another relationship with
himself and with others. There are two texts extant of this play; there are two modes of existence for Faustus—body and spirit; and there are two destinations for him. During most of the play Faustus tries to evade both heaven and hell by living and acting in the material world, along with the flesh and the devil. He mentions his sexual longings and expresses his geopolitical wishes in physical terms: instead of simply protecting his home, he wants to fortify Germany with a wall of brass and rechannel the Rhine to "circle fair Wittenberg." He brings grapes out of season to satisfy the appetite of the Duchess of Vanholt, and he beholds with pleasure and pride his conjurations of "great Alexander and his paramour" and "that heavenly Helen." Stockholder discusses Faustus' relations with the grape-eating Duchess and with Helen of Troy as instances of a desire for a cozy domestic existence (206-12). Kuriyama also reads the Faustian story as a failed psychosexual struggle between Father and son, but for power instead of domus: "Thus in Doctor Faustus this search for a workable and acceptable [sexual] identity has evidently been abandoned in favor of a comparatively frank, though indirect, self-examination and self-appraisal" (108).

While these psychoanalytic critics emphasize the physical aspects of Faustus' existence, Greg finds the
spiritual side more significant in determining his ultimate fate: "Faustus, then, through his bargain with hell, has himself taken on the infernal nature" ("The Damnation" 103). Greg views Faustus initially as an "austere student" and regards the play as increasing in sensuality, a "strange flowering of moral decay" (103). But because Faustus is human, the body as "inscribed surface of events" is perforce a factor in his decay, despair, and damnation. The inability to reconcile this double human nature is what prevents his attempt at forming a supernatural community from succeeding. He has control, through magic and other knowledge, over the world of the flesh, but not over the realm of the spirit. Though he refuses to yield control in the human world, he cannot attain even parity in the spirit realm. His desire for power with supernatural peers is condemned within the play's Christian universe. Evidently, Faustus is looking for something he is not allowed to have, so he uses the forbidden means of magic to discover and explore a forbidden end—control, power, and domination, which in traditional Christianity is reserved to God, and which Unger says is the only unhuman action.

Previous criticism has interpreted Doctor Faustus in several ways: the play challenges the state, through either ironic ambiguity or the operation of human
freedom; or it affirms its beliefs by validating the damnation in a demonic contract. This study has argued that Marlowe's play dramatizes an attempt at alternative relationship with the supernatural powers. Faustus wants to replace God, whom he cannot control and knows it, with the devils he thinks he can. Such an alternative, even as a failure, suggests an epistemologically more constructive way around the Romantic/Christian critical impasse without taking the pessimistic, purely ironic path of interpretation.35

Magic is one medieval-Renaissance mode of knowing which Foucault discusses in his The Order of Things.36 The book theorizes a complex system of resemblances constituting knowledge in that time, so a complex hermeneutic of logic, divination, and reliance on ancient texts was needed to interpret the world in order to know it (32-37). Had the necromantic doctor combined his magic lore with humanistic and logical knowledge, perhaps he would have found life instead of prophecies which come from dead things. The world was more unified in Faustus' time than in our own century or the previous ones from which Foucault draws his institutional and technological examples of constructed knowledge. "Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting" (FR 88). The humanist reliance on texts, the development of the
science of logic, and the arcana of magical codes and
talismans may be regarded as intellectual technologies to
reform thought and culture. Faustus' knowledge of the
various disciplines becomes fragmented when he chooses to
practice only one. The doctor of magic does cut but does
not understand, so his efforts to reassemble his world
are ineffectual and his fall tragic, because he should
have known better.
Notes

1. See Kuriyama, Orgel, Shepherd, and the notes to chapter 3 above and also Forker; the first part of Kernan, Two Renaissance Myth-Makers; and Friedenreich, Gill, and Kuriyama, "A Poet and a Filthy Play-maker."

2. The debate on whether Faustus chose his fate is unresolved, but I read Faustus' first invocation of and contract with Mephostophilis as another of the choices Faustus makes, like the first one of what occupation to pursue. See I.iii.55, 88-89, and 102-112; I.v.33 and 94-113. Mephostophilis points out the choice in II.i.3-4. The opposite view can be seen in the pope's anathematization, III.iii., and in Faustus' blaming of Mephostophilis in V.ii.98-104. See also King-kok Cheung for a view similar to mine of Faustus' alternation of repentance and defiance; Cheung calls it a dialectic.

3. I do not mean to underestimate sin. What I do mean here is that in addition to being used sinfully, Faustus' magic is politically enabling.

4. I am using the edition of J. B. Steane in this discussion unless otherwise noted; Steane's version combines the A and B texts while noting the variants between them in notes.
5. "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion," 41. The introduction in this version of the essay, published in *Glyph*, is different from the one in *Shakespearean Negotiations*; I owe this reference to Jonathan Dollimore's footnote in *Political Shakespeare* (page 13 n. 31).

6. Eriksen argues that *Doctor Faustus*, written probably in 1592-93, is a continuation of the interest in theology shown by Marlowe since he received the Parker scholarship (awarded to those intending to be ordained). See his chapter 1, especially 33-44. The critical wrangles continue over just what that theology is. See also, for example, Cheung on despair; Hattaway; and Sachs, who disagrees with Eriksen's position but not, I think, convincingly.

7. The literature on Bruno is immense, as Yates remarks, but most of it is written in Italian. I have relied primarily on Yates' *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* and Singer's *Giordano Bruno: His Life and Thought*. These two writers disagree about whether Bruno is more important as a magician or a serious philosopher.

8. See *The Forme of Faustus Fortunes*, chapter 2.

9. Singer, Yates, and Bradbrook all connect Marlowe with these men, as does Bakeless's *Tragical History I*. 90-91, 105, 129, and chapters 5 and 6 *passim*. 
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10. Roy Eriksen’s investigation of Bruno seems exhaustive on the subject. See chapter 2 in his *The Forme of Faustus Fortunes*.

11. Philip Henderson offers two other parallels: "In the *Spaccio*, Giordano Bruno had referred to Moses and Aaron as jugglers" (66). Mocenigo claimed that Bruno had called Christ a magician, though Bruno denied it (67).

12. I am indebted to Greenblatt for this concept. I also trace it in the work of Simon Shepherd, Jonathan Dollimore, and Dollimore and Alan Sinfield’s *Political Shakespeare*.

13. At the 1991 South Central Renaissance Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, Bevington was the keynote speaker on April 6.

14. For another, sexual, interpretation of the dismembering, see Kay Stockholder, to whom I refer later on.

15. At first reading, the verb agreement of this line seems incorrect. I think Marlowe meant that there would be one heaven, one place, and all other places would be hell. The sentence still seems awkward, but from this view it is at least grammatically correct--though Marlowe himself probably was not concerned with subject-verb agreement.
16. See also Spinrad's speculation that "to fulfill the terms of the original pact, [Faustus] must return to the place where it was signed" ("Dilettante's Lie" 249). Spinrad offers no reason for this imperative to return, nor does the "original pact" explicitly include any such direction. But it does seem to fit the psychological as well as the geographical movement of the play. Greenblatt suggests that Wittenberg is an ironically meaningful place for Faustus to die (Renaissance Self-Fashioning 196).

17. Yates discusses this especially on pages 2 and 155. See also Foucault's The Order of Things 32-35 about magic as a respected domain of knowledge.

18. On the use of power, Barbara Howard Traister opines that "though somewhat self-centered, Faustus' aims for his magic are basically good. She calls attention to this passage:

I'll have them read me strange philosophy,  
And tell the secrets of foreign kings.  
I'll have them wall all Germany with brass,  
And make swift Rhine circle fair Wittenberg.  
I'll have them fill the public schools with silk,  
Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad.  
(85-90)

The nature of Faustus' desires is still, I think, open to interpretation. Contemporary author Ken Kesey observes
that when you do magic, it has to do with real power. ... For one thing, I think it is not corrupting, like some people think; it is purifying. People who think they have power yet do not are corrupted. People who really have power are humbled by it.

(quoted in Whitmer, 199)

19. Eriksen (65-66) reports that Bruno uses the pig (porcus) as an emblem of human moral reform in his Cantus Circaeus.

20. If the actor playing Faustus doubled as Wagner, the parallel would be even more obvious. Alas, such casting would violate the stage direction at I.i. 64, which has the servant entering to receive Faustus' order to summon Cornelius and Valdes.

21. A different version of this scene is played between Robin the ostler and Rafe in III.iv. The A and B texts exhibit characteristic confusion about these comic scenes, which nevertheless clearly are not extraneous to the main action or characterization of Doctor Faustus. There is voluminous scholarship on the relation of the two texts; see below, section IV. Most recently, Rasmussen and Bevington (as coeditors of the play) and Eriksen are showing that B is the primary text. Until conclusive documentary evidence is discovered, the debate is likely to continue.
22. See also Nicolas Brooke, "The Moral Tragedy of Doctor Faustus" 662-87, and Michael Hattaway 57-8.

23. This argument is not affected by the exact date of Doctor Faustus's composition (if such a date exists or can be discovered); even a variation of six years is not historically significant.

24. Williams' terms are explained by Dollimore in Political Shakespeare 6 and Radical Tragedy 7; clearly, they are influenced by Hegel. Wilbur Sanders anticipates Williams; see 79.

25. Unlike Tamburlaine, according to Rothschild (63).

26. Ornstein also cites the end of 2 Tamburlaine to prove his point that human limits seem arbitrary "only to those incapable of self-knowledge, who are seduced by Satan or make a god of their own appetites" (1382).

27. See Ransom, Mariann, Roderick Cook, and T. M. Pierce, "German Valdes and Cornelius in Marlowe's Doctor Faustus" 329-33; and Greg, "The Damnation of Faustus" 97-99.

28. See Cheung, 193-196, on the dialectical tease of despair.


30. But psychosexual theory remains the focus of her interpretation, as Freudian views of homosexuality were central to Kuriyama's Hammer or Anvil.
I am not aware of any published opinion that Faustus' dilemma is insanity. However, after reading R. D. Laing on "transcendental experience," I think that the Faustian choice is relevant in Laing's terms:

When a person goes mad, a profound transposition of his place in relation to all domains of being occurs. His center of experience moves from ego to self. Mundane time becomes merely anecdotal, only the eternal matters. The madman is, however, confused. He muddles ego with self, inner with outer, natural and supernatural. Nevertheless, he can often be to us, even through his profound wretchedness and disintegration, the hierophant of the sacred. An exile from the scene of being as we know it, he is an alien, a stranger signaling to us from the void in which he is foundering, a void which may be peopled by presences that we do not even dream of. They used to be called demons and spirits, and they used to be known and named. He has lost his sense of self, his feelings, his place in the world as we know it. He tells us he is dead. But we are distracted from our cozy security by this mad ghost who haunts us with his visions and voices, which seem so senseless and of which we feel impelled to rid him, cleanse him, cure him.

Madness need not be all breakdown. It may also be breakthrough. It is potentially liberation and renewal as well as enslavement and existential death.

(quoted in Howard 198-199)

Birringer also uses this image, in the context of deconstructive theater in "Between Body and Language: 'Writing' the Damnation of Faustus," 338-55.

Kimbrough (28-30) reviews the textual debate. Conference presentations by Rasmussen and Bevington provided the details about their edition for The Revels.
Plays series.

34. Line numbers for this and following references are from Tucker Brooke's 1910 old-spelling edition, which is not divided into acts or scenes. I base my comparisons on his A-text edition and B variants in notes and an appendix.

35. "Pessimistic" is my view of the way Ribner sees it in "Marlowe and the Critics," 211-24. Another possibility, which does not consider Faustus as a character but as a textual strategy, is that of Greenblatt, Dollimore, Shepherd, and other materialists who study the Renaissance theater as an instrument of state power and Marlowe's play as textually questioning yet affirming that power.

36. This work is not from the philosophical poem by Lucretius but is a translation of Les Mots et les choses.
Conclusion:

No Soft Parade

He will say next to nothing here, having spoken for himself, once and for always, and being dead and gone even as this story begins.

George Garrett, Entered from the Sun

The theater of Christopher Marlowe is a spectacular challenge to orthodox Tudor structures of religion, sexuality and gender, and state authority. Walter Benjamin observes that "the history of works of art prepares their critique, and this is why historical distance increases their power" (5). Four hundred years after the death of the playwright, the late twentieth century has seen the rise of philosophical and political liberalism as well as critiques such as deconstruction and Marxism.

Although some New Historiist, Marxist, and feminist theorists have interpreted Renaissance texts and the period itself in terms of their concern with the broad dynamics of ideology, scholars of the Renaissance for the most part have not developed a methodology for analyzing Marlowe's political re-vision of the public and private
and of the role of domination in self-actualization. I began by wondering whether the aspiring individualists dramatized by Marlowe might also be political rebels. Although Marlowe's drama is rooted in the legends, history, and art of its own time, the protagonists of each play construct different arrangements of rule and power, thus challenging the existing structure of authority.

Marlowe does not focus our attention directly on the necessity of community; the commonwealth as a benevolent monarchy does not appear in his works. Instead, a different concept of public is constructed, in which characters attempt to encompass all existence within themselves. It was especially true of the Renaissance, as Michel Foucault observes, that "political theory has never ceased to be obsessed with the person of the sovereign" (FR 63). At first Marlowe seems to share that obsession, shown in the portrayal of Tamburlaine, the world conqueror, and Edward and Dido, public rulers whose private relationships affect their public positions. Other plays, which do not feature monarchs, nevertheless dramatize sovereign vision: the Valois hypocrisy, in The Massacre at Paris, of using public religion to cover private vengeance; the uses of power and wealth in The Jew of Malta; Doctor Faustus' supernatural might containing both hell and (he thinks) heaven in his scope.
Foucault's studies of institutionalized power support what Marlowe's work dramatizes: only empowered persons, those within the governmental power structure, are able to fashion themselves as subjects of politics. Marlowe's rulers are particularly aware of themselves as selves and are able to construct their selves and, for the most part, their peers. Twentieth-century political theoreticians Unger and Arendt offer possibilities for a reconstruction which will not reject entirely the liberal assumptions of Western history. If Marlowe's characters recognize their situation in a power network similar to that described by these theories (which could be positive), then they themselves could use their power for creative, positive ends. But much traditional political science and art focuses on the sovereign (the paradigm of a person with power) and explores the negative, repressive, dominating aspects of sovereignty.

Even Foucault himself associates the institution of sovereignty with a negative view of power; like a strict parent, the prince just says no. Although he believes that other versions of power could be technically creative and positive (FR 62-64), his analyses have been mostly descriptive and thus negative depictions of power. What Foucault calls "subjectification" occurs mostly for those who are already in dominant classes (priests, French bourgeois, Greek citizens), while what he terms
"dividing practices" isolate and stigmatize those already without social or political power (11). Madhouses, prisons, clinics, law, armies—none of these institutions has yet permitted or produced a positive, affirming mode of action either for a state, a society, or a subject. Foucault seems to accept this bias as a human function, even though he calls it "negative." His detailed investigations of hitherto unnoticed connections between different aspects of experience led to the New Historicist critique of ideology as articulated in literature.

Because Foucault opposes much of Western humanism, he rejects a question basic to political philosophy: "How is discourse of truth...able to fix limits to the rights of power?. ...My problem is rather this: what rules of right are implemented by the relations of power in the production of discourses of truth?" (P/R 93). This restatement of the "problem" inverts the traditional focus of political thinking, away from justice and good uses of power in order to concentrate on how power affects the perception of truth, justice, and the good. His question assumes that power exists a priori and that truth is derivative.

Foucault's focus on power leads him to discount the earlier theoretical emphasis on the sovereign in order to study the relations of domination, "the multiple forms of
subjugation that have a place and function within the social organism" (96). Here he seems to conflate the terms "power" and "domination," though elsewhere he separates them not in practice but theoretically, in talking about Arendt (FR 378). And sometimes he considers domination and sovereignty both as structures of power.

Marlowe's theater has a flexibility similar to that of Foucault's view of power; it exhibits variations on a challenge to the traditional organization of authority in government, religion, marriage, and the family. In reproblematizing power and politics, Foucault is examining the apparatuses of "discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions," and the struggles within and among them (P/K 194). Through his analyses of madness, prisons, sexuality, and language, he examines the self and power. Whereas Foucault does not focus on individuals except in the abstract, most of Marlowe's drama does keep the focus on the sovereign in order to experiment with the idea (as Foucault also does), putting Barabas and even Faustus into that role. The refashioned political role of sovereign is important in Marlowe, as are the characters who perform and transform that role, who reconstruct it and themselves, and who are defeated by it.

The definition of power as a relationship is one connection between Foucault and Hannah Arendt. Most well
known for her analysis of genocidal pathology in *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, she also writes on violence and revolution and, most important to this study, traces the historical changes in the Greek idea of the *polis*. Her work, however, separates power from reason and from violence (in *On Violence*) yet employs the relational definition of power that is now identified with Foucault. The political is the arena of self-actualization for Arendt; her book on *The Human Condition* traces through Western history the privatization of political action into social interaction, in what might be termed a pre-Foucauldian archeology of political behavior.

But unlike Foucault's published reluctance to criticize, much less to directly attack, current power relations, Arendt's analysis of the Greek *polis* is an indictment of what passes for modern politics. *The Human Condition* opens with a critique of how Western governmental policy decisions since World War II are more heavily influenced by technological capability than by public needs. The book does not explore these needs but assumes them, taking as its focus the interaction of humans and using the classical term *vita activa*. In the prologue, Arendt acknowledges thought, reason, and other forms of inferiority but places them outside the book's scope:

Whatever men do or know or experience can
make sense only to the extent that it can be spoken about. There may be truths beyond speech, and they may be of great relevance to man in the singular, that is, to man in so far as he is not a political being, whatever else he may be. Men in the plural, that is, men in so far as they live and move and act in this world, can experience meaningfulness only because they can talk with and make sense to each other and to themselves.  

(4)

Arendt thus divides human existence into two realms: public, which comprises decisions which affect a whole community, and private. Interpersonal relations are not political, not public (28). Unfortunately, her book gives no concrete modern examples, focusing instead on the ancient distinction between public polity and private household economy. The 1970s slogan, "The personal is the political," results partly from the increasing importance history has assigned to the individual (an importance spotlighted by Marlovian drama).

Arendt directs her interest to human political action and the power that enables human actualization. More consistently than Foucault, she differentiates between the similar terms "power," "strength," "force," and "violence": "while strength is the natural quality of an individual seen in isolation (and therefore not a political tool), power springs up between men when they act together and vanishes the moment they disperse." The union of words and action produces power, which "keeps the public realm ... in existence" (all from HC 200).
Power "has no physical limitation in human nature, in the bodily existence of man, like strength. Its only limitation is the existence of other people, but this limitation is not accidental, because human power corresponds to the condition of plurality to begin with" (201). For Arendt, the very fact that individual beings differ from one another makes the maintenance of individual human difference morally good and necessary to human self-realization. Foucault does not profess this view; Unger, writing concurrently with Foucault and the post-humanist ethical relativists, will nevertheless also claim autonomy as good.

Arendt's sympathies clearly lie with democratic pluralist government: sovereignty "is always spurious if claimed by an isolated single entity" (245). She criticizes

that identification of sovereignty with freedom which has always been taken for granted by political as well as by philosophic thought. If it were true that sovereignty and freedom are the same, then indeed no man could be free, because sovereignty, the ideal of uncompromising self-sufficiency and mastership, is contradictory to the very condition of plurality. No man can be sovereign because not one man, but men, inhabit the earth. (234)

Most critics regard Marlowe's Tamburlaine as a spectacular example of what Arendt calls spurious sovereignty. A.D. Hope's article about Tamburlaine's
"morality of power" uses Arendt's premises but reaches a conclusion opposite to hers about the good which results from human actualization of differences. In Hope's interpretation, human plurality can allow sovereignty for only one person at a time. Using Empedocles' myth of love and strife, Hope equates human self-realization and sovereignty, with the result that only one person at a time could be fully human and sovereign. Clearly this is not an inclusive theory, unlike Arendt's theoretical rejection of despotic rule as a human action. Marlowe's heroes rule: even as they demand the inclusion of others in their own absolute status, they also seek self-actualization. The power to create that status is amoral--necessary to transform the role but not necessarily oppressive in the action it will enable.

Arendt's use of the term "action" is derived from Greek etymology and the life of the polis (HC 12-14).¹ "[T]he political activity par excellence" (9) is free, significant, irreversible, unpredictable, human interaction: differentiated from labor, which sustains physical survival, and from work, which maintains human cultural separation from nature (7). Following Plato and Aristotle, Arendt asserts that speech is the quintessential political action, because humanity is plural and interaction is the mode of self-actualization. (Arendt briefly discusses drama as a political art in
which actors reveal their characters through words.) "To be political, to live in a polis, meant that everything was decided through words and persuasion and not through force and violence" (26). Since power enables actualization (and both A.D. Hope and Arendt would agree that it does); and if power is relational and also potentially creative and positive, then everyone could engage in self-actualization instead of being dominated by a central authority. But because of the labor and work necessary for human existence, in the polis violence and rule were permitted in the household realm of family and slaves in order to liberate the citizen (the free, male, propertied head of household). The opening pages of The Human Condition suggest that the West has now developed a technological capability for liberation. It does not appear, though, that any democracy or socialist state has yet liberated all of its people for politics.²

Nor do Marlowe's princely protagonists evince much interest in their responsibilities to the common good. The ruthless scheming and audacious goals of these characters are often seen as merely an excessive pursuit of an individualism which the Renaissance was learning to value. But if Marlowe really were a subversive writer (as Altman, Dollimore, Greenblatt, and others argue), then the contradictions in his plays may not be flaws of composition but signs pointing to another view of power.
relations. The failure, in these plays, of central authority to be entirely orthodox or successfully hegemonic emphasizes the transgressive aspirations of the protagonists, who struggle with the structures of traditional authority. A politics of shared power—even shared with only one other person, as in Edward's England and Dido's Carthage—could allow those aspirations to become socially constructive. As it is, the traditional exercise of power is competitive, which as portrayed especially in The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, leads to destruction.

Both Foucault's description of power and Arendt's Greek emphasis on speech and action indicate that such an inclusive politics is theoretically possible. In the work of Brazilian political theorist Roberto Mangabeira Unger, a cooperative polity is not only possible but necessary for human actualization. Unger's interest is in the classical political idea of the good and how it can be realized in human community.³ The first half of his Knowledge and Politics traces the history and examines the internal contradictions ("antinomies") of philosophical essentialism—the theory that human beings (as well as other things) have a fixed nature, an essence which is intelligible. Without the hope of knowing human nature and what is good in it, liberal politics is doomed to the conflict of self-interests or the different
violence of authoritarianism. But Unger's critique of the modern corporate state leads him to construct a model of "organic groups" which can realize the good for human beings.

This direction of Unger's work seems opposite that of Foucault, who began by examining social institutions and moved from there into studying subjectivity. For Unger, the subject is prior: "The doctrine of the self serves as the standpoint from which to establish the meaning and the merits of the historical forms of social life" (KP 22). The self is in relationship with itself, with nature, and with other people. Such a doctrine combines the essentialist and relativist-historicist views into "a universal that exists through its particular embodiments. ... Each person and each form of social life represents a novel interpretation of humanity, and each new interpretation transforms what humanity is" (195). Unger finds that selfhood is diverse ("plural," to use Arendt's term) and indeterminate, yet he can still locate the good in "the manifestation and development of individual and universal human nature" (239). Because Renaissance politics was based on the Biblical claim that human nature was created in the image of God, the fact that Marlowe's heroes are often in conflict with religion is another aspect of their challenge to political orthodoxy. Unger does not
explicitly accept the Biblical assumption, but his work
does have a moral base: "moral discourse always
presupposes the acceptance of humanity and the authority
of the striving to be and become ever more fully human"
(196). Whereas postmodern theory neither considers
itself moral nor is so, Unger argues that domination and
lack of freedom have slowed human moral progress, and he
suggests alternatives.

"Domination is the one form of social relations in
which men's conduct fails to express their being" (247).
Having defined the good as actualization of human
potential, both of the species and the individual person,
Unger develops his argument that actualization cannot
occur when people are oppressed by others. Domination
hinders individual self-actualization; even though
enacted by humans, it is not a humanizing action. As
history continues and more actualization occurs, more
community should develop and less domination occur.
Unger's optimistic prediction is based on the theory that
human nature changes through history. Marlowe's
protagonists fail to develop this possibility of non-
dominating actualization very far, but the attempts of
Tamburlaine, Dido, and Edward to fuse the fragmented
experience of public and private supports Unger's theory
of history.

Unger seems to share with Foucault a view of the
oppressive split between public and private as
artificial, an unavoidable product of philosophical
liberalism. The dichotomy is similar to but not exactly
congruent with Arendt's singular and plural man.
According to Unger, "the conflict between the public and
the private self...has its roots in...the barrier between
the individual and the impersonal, remote institutions of
the state" (KP 62). The public is a realm of shared,
objective rationality of facts and theory; the private is
for emotions, values, and desires. The human species has
both a universally shared aspect and particular
incarnations, a condition philosophers call the "one-
many" problem. Individual persons attempt to transcend
the division within themselves, but Unger demonstrates
the failures of such means and asserts that the solution
lies in restructuring external society.

Knowledge and Politics and Arendt's The Human
Condition examine the same problem--realizing the good in
divided human nature--and employ the same methodology.
Concerned with the deteriorating condition of human
coexistence, they look to intellectual history,
specifically the Western political and psychological
tradition which began in the Athenian polis, to explain
the decay. Whereas Unger wants to fuse public and
private in order to effect human actualization, Arendt
focuses on the location of politics in the public sphere.
Defining "politics" very specifically as the freedom to exist and act in a polis, she traces the destruction of that peculiarly Greek political sphere and the development of the "social" which resulted in the demise of politics as the enabling human arena. Both Arendt and Foucault connect domination with Plato's concept of ruling one's own self as well as with the transformation of the public arena of politics into government, which by definition requires a division of people into rulers and subjects. She glances at the technology that scientists have offered as a replacement for public policy debate, but with little hope that the technology will succeed.

The title of Arendt's book suggests a pessimistic view of the problem; Unger's indicates a solution, though its final appeal is beyond the human: "Speak, God."4 Knowledge and Politics endeavors to unite immanence and transcendence. Along the path to the establishment of organic groups, Unger briefly considers religion, art, and personal romantic love as vehicles to unity. He rejects them because "they represent the good in an abstract way, a way separated from everyday life" and because they are "incomplete and therefore imperfect. They need to be completed by a transformation of society" (22, 231).

Marlowe's theater displays the same qualities found by Unger, Arendt, and Foucault in the indeterminate
relations of the subject to political institutions: bleak so far, yet with potential to affirm the unique life of humanity. All regard the fact of domination and the separation of existence into public and private sectors as problematic. The difference among the theorists is in their stance of moral evaluation: Unger and Arendt regard domination as a flaw in human nature instead of an intrinsic ability. Foucault tries to avoid evaluating the phenomena he investigates, accepting domination as a neutral result of human relations and rejecting "the assumption that domination falsifies the essence of human subjectivity" (P/K 239).

It follows for Foucault from these positions that "the individual is an effect of power" as well as its vehicle (98). Nevertheless, he has spoken a few times about the need to alter current, repressive relations of power. Although his uncompleted study of ancient Greek "technologies" of the self, Le Souci de soi, may be as empirical as his previous work, he has called the hierarchical repression in those Greek structures problematic, even "disgusting" (344-46). Foucault's tone is usually impassive, but in discussing his Greek study he asks, "Are we able to have an ethics of acts and their pleasures which would be able to take into account the pleasure of the other?" (346). Yet even this hesitant, interrogative sentence, with its repetition of the
tentative "able to..." phrase, does not demand that such an ethics be worked toward.

Perhaps Foucault is paralyzed by the very "will to knowledge" he describes in the emergent modern state (7, 95-6). When questioned about his own political activity, the French theorist denies having any particular political agenda. Yet he says that his own work in ethics requires a stance of "nonacceptance" of oppression and makes "that attitude a political phenomenon that is as substantial as possible, and one which those who govern, here or there, will sooner or later be obliged to take into account" (377). About another principle, he is equally cautious: "The farthest I would go is to say that perhaps one must not be for consensuality [that is, consensus--because it is utopian], but one must be against nonconsensuality" (379). Foucault described his work, just before he died, as "the development of a domain of acts, practices, and thoughts that seem to me to pose problems for politics" (384). Perhaps Foucault does believe that the truth will set one free, though like Marlowe he does not appear to accept any reified concept of truth. His pursuit of truth is roundabout, not systematic--an ambiguity of purpose also similar to that of Marlowe's drama. He might also, then, accept the tyrannic personality as natural, whereas Unger and Arendt would reject it as obstructing human actualization and
closing off the arena of true political action. For Marlowe's work, the significance in this theory of problematic domination and the division of experience is its historical optimism: it permits the structures of power and politics to change.

Tamburlaine views power as the foundation of his complete existence. He seizes the Persian and Turkish empires to satisfy his personal sense of virtue. He is the proud warrior disdaining plunder, the gentle yet confident lover finding his ideal woman and realizing that she has affected his view of the world and his own existence as a man of integrity. Beauty beats on his conceits: "What is beauty, saith my sufferings, then? ...[V]irtue solely is the sum of glory" (1 Tam. V.ii. 97, 125). Despite the visual and verbal irony which sometimes accompanies these noble postures, the power of Tamburlaine's vision is respected by all other characters even when it is feared or scorned. Zenocrate, Techelles and Usumcasane, and Theridamas participate in this revision of public life into a domus of power.

Dido and Edward, possessors of legitimate thrones, are not satisfied with the structure of their solitary authority and try to force changes through their championing of Aeneas and Gaveston as equals, peers who share their status and their state. The innovating monarchs encounter resistance to their idea of political
domus, or domestic polis, and both plays end in the gruesome deaths of their heroes.

Barabas of Malta and the Duke of Guise represent a more traditional attitude toward traditional authority; they manipulate the system from within in order to maximize their profit from it. Barabas and the Guise do not so much rebel against ruling orthodoxy as exemplify its horrible extremes of cruelty, hypocrisy, and greed. Audiences watching their participation in a horrible system are shown the need for a more constructive arrangement of politics and society.

Faustus provides a commentary on the dramatist's efforts by exerting a power both more local and more universal than state rule: the soul's struggle with the divine. The aspiring doctor disdains his human companions in an attempt to exert power equally with the supernatural, and his most deeply felt relationship is with the demon Mephostophilis. Faustus finds himself most alive as he is torn between the supernatural appeals of Christ and Lucifer—and most dead as well, banished from the presence of God and condemned to eternal death in Hell.

These six versions of rebellion against the traditional constitution of political authority all fail; not even Marlowe can find a way around the human limits of death and evil. In writing on what could be termed
Marlowe's "liberalism," I am continuing a stance from which to view the world with hope. "The writer cannot organize her desires for writing without some vision of the world toward which one hopes to work, and without having some concept of how literature might participate in such a future" (quoted in Lazer 24). A world which has been dominated by greed and brutality does not encourage optimism about one's public actions nor the efficacy of one's language. Even while Marlowe is producing artifacts in language, he presents a pessimistic view of a world in which most action is either destructive or futile. Yet his characters do try to take control of the world, to act politically, sometimes to act constructively. In dramatizing these efforts to refashion their worlds, Marlowe himself is acting constructively.

Not to act would be to deny one's complicity in that brutal greed, to abdicate one's responsibility to ameliorate it, and to abandon one's essential (yes) humanity. From a different perspective, Gayatri Spivak agrees with the need to connect literary studies with action: "One must fill the vision of literary form with its connections to what is being read: history, political economy--the world. ... [T]he separation between the world of action and the world of the disciplines" must also be questioned (95). To examine
and study Marlowe's "morality of power" (A.D. Hope 49) and his presentation of the political self in drama, in order to relate those ideas to our own continuing action, is a moral action as well as a worthy intellectual endeavor.
Notes

1. Aristotle's *bíoi*, "ways of life," include the *bios politikos*, which becomes *vita activa* in Latin. Arendt maintains the Greek signification.

2. Contemporary feminist theory identifies this division as crucial to gender differentiation. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak maintains that sexism and capitalism deliberately resist the liberation made possible by technology (103). Dorothy Dinnerstein is less pessimistic about the future of equal-sex responsibility for child-rearing (20-26), though she also sees the need for a complete restructuring of family and related social attitudes.


4. Stanley Fish has an interesting critique of this search for an ending in his two-part article on "Critical Legal Studies."
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