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Abstract

My subject is the relationship between rhetoric and the range of possible reaction to Marlowe's protagonists in his five major plays—Tamburlaine I and II, Doctor Faustus, The Jew of Malta, and Edward II. In a very broad sense, I conceive of the rhetoric of each play in terms of opposing rhetorical forces, amplification and irony, and attempt to account for the relative intensity of amplification and irony in each play as I study the rhetoric of the protagonist.

One strategy, amplification, entails the investment of a major character with logical arguments from invention, effective arrangement of ideas from disposition, and specific devices from elocution that create a degree of identification with that character. The force of irony is enhanced through a different use of these three parts of rhetoric—the arguments are dyslogistic, the elements of arrangement act to undercut, and the devices check or even undermine identification with the protagonist.

Many critics have pointed out how Marlowe's rhetoric departs from the "astounding terms" of Tamburlaine that the playwright employed at the beginning of his dramatic career. I follow the stylistic changes in Marlowe's rhetoric and find correspondences between those changes and the increasingly complex portrayal of the central
figure. To this end, I analyze the central figures of each play in terms of that character's logos, pathos, and ethos and attempt to ascertain the degree of identification that the audience may attach to a given protagonist.

In a play-by-play analysis, I analyze the debate over subversion, a perennial issue in Marlowe studies. Fortunately, the elements of classical rhetoric that Marlowe's plays already possess provide easy access to this complex issue, so the application of rhetorical analysis to these plays exists as an excellent method to answer the abiding question of whether the subversion itself is contained.
Introduction

When studying the Marlovian canon, one often wishes to call, like Faustus, on an infernal angel to "resolve [us] of all ambiguities," (1.1.80) since the critical commentaries on the plays harmonize in few places. Nevertheless, several distinct patterns have emerged. Literary historians concur that Christopher Marlowe's plays deserve a thoughtful examination because they represent a transition from the mere sensationalism of early Senecan drama to the naturalism of Shakespearean drama. Moreover, it is generally agreed that in most of his plays (with the exception of Dido and Aeneas and The Massacre of Paris) Marlowe focusses primarily on a central character and that character's concerns rather than on the cumulative effect of a host of more equally developed characters and a complicated plot. However, these characters and their language have aroused an incredible amount of attention and debate.

Since Robert Greene's condemnation of "that Atheist Tamburlaine," much has been said concerning the values, goals, and aspirations of all the characters. Until recent years most interpretations have suggested that their portrayal wholeheartedly supports a violation of traditional Elizabethan morality. Other critics, notably Stephen Greenblatt, admit that the protagonists indeed violate the accepted standards but argue that they
do so in order to fashion an identity for themselves in the void created by the rejection of traditional boundaries. According to the first view, the characters set out to usurp the accepted morality, while the second approach emphasizes that these characters determinedly purpose to "will themselves into new being" (Cunningham 176).

Notwithstanding their different emphases, both of these approaches share the objective of seeking out and explaining Marlowe's intentions in writing these plays. In fact, this major critical trend, pejoratively termed "romantic" criticism, has faithfully pointed out specific associations between the personality of major characters and the personality of Marlowe himself. Following the similar efforts of the Victorian critics, this identification of Marlowe the man with his major characters has often resulted in speculations about the conscious and unconscious intentions of Marlowe when he wrote the plays. Critics have often assumed a connection between the hyperbolizing characters and the tumultuous, though largely unknown, life of the playwright and his explorations of diverse, contradictory values within his society. These interpretations assume Marlowe supported the feelings of his caste of overreachers, creating them as projections of himself. In this estimation, Tamburlaine, Faustus, and Edward voice Marlowe's private aspirations and brooding thoughts about the machinery for
achieving power, infinite knowledge, and love though it be forbidden. Their selves are various embodiments of aspects of Marlowe's aspiring self. For these critics, the characters are the projections of one of the most highly subjective artists of his time.

However, other recent studies that still seek Marlowe himself in the plays record and analyze elements which undercut the protagonists or place them in a tradition which by definition requires their particular traits. One of these critics, Judith Weil, has gone so far as to see a complete undercutting of the protagonists in the plays. She argues that "Marlowe mocks his figures," though she adds that he does so "in extremely subtle fashion" (2). Thus, this approach stands at the opposite end of the spectrum, viewing Marlowe as a largely objective artist who consciously creates his very eloquent protagonists.

Fortunately, much recent criticism has attempted to "take Marlowe out of the monkey house" (14), as Kenneth Friedenrich has observed, by centering close attention on the plays themselves. Linguistic and poetic studies, for example, which involve another of the basic areas of agreement in Marlowe criticism, concentrate on the power of the poetry that these characters manifest. Since Ben Jonson praised the power of "Marlowe's mighty line," readers and audiences alike have appreciated Marlowe's ability to produce some of the best blank verse in the English language. According to Wolfgang Clemen, the power
of Marlowe's line stems from his use, on the larger scale, of the set speech in new and different ways from his predecessors and peers. On the smaller scale, his employment of classical names and places, extended and extravagant similes, hyperbolic imagery, and resounding periodic sentences has also attracted a great deal of critical attention. In this second area, Harry Levin's study of Marlowe's poetics offered an analysis of the verse-sentences and demonstrated the "interrelationship between the metrical and the grammatical structures" of the playwright's lines (173).

This stylistic approach to Marlowe's language emphasizes the similarities that his protagonists possess, some say to the detriment of other elements of the plays. As Karen Jean Cunningham explains, this type of study often "result[s] in a perception of the characters as undifferentiated; all are overreachers, all are versions of the aspiring mind, all are one kind of character conveyed in Marlowe's exaggerated rhetoric" (5). She finds that this type of treatment is a arrow one which ultimately renders the plays closet dramas. Furthermore, as Levin's study itself demonstrates, even a strict poetic approach may conclude by considering and offering a quite uniform answer to the question of the author's intentions with the text.

Yet another strategy has been to explain the iconoclastic tendencies of the major protagonists by
placing them within earlier traditions which incorporated similar traits. Eugene Waith, for example, accounts for the aspiring or iconoclastic nature of these protagonists by placing them in the classical tradition of the Herculean hero whose nature includes their unruly and amoral traits. Thus, Tamburlaine's cruelty belongs to the cadre of the Herculean hero's characteristics and as such does not necessarily represent an intended blow to Elizabethan ethics. Again, the uniformity of the explanation tends to oversimplify the inherent complexity that the plays exhibit.

What is needed is an approach which focusses close attention on the text, while avoiding the temptation to seek a single comprehensive answer as to how the plays are to be interpreted if such a reading is not consistent with the text.

One such method involves Marlowe's use of the various parts of classical rhetoric to achieve his dramatic purposes. These rhetorical materials offer the advantage of already being present in the plays. Traditionally, the classical rhetoric, deriving from Aristotle and Cicero, possesses five parts—Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory, and Delivery. Of these, the first three which deal with the actual text of a speech are more relevant to our study. The last two, important as they are to oratory, are more difficult to apply to a rhetorical analysis of a written text. While the manner
in which a speech is delivered makes a great deal of importance to the meaning of the performance and the identification with the hero, it remains difficult nonetheless to coordinate the texts exactly to their performance in Elizabethan playhouses. Thus, the central concern of the rhetorical analysis is the complex structure of the texts.

With respect to the remaining three parts of rhetoric, elocutio (style) has been employed in rhetorical studies most often. Style involves all of the choices that a writer has made concerning his subject, purpose, and audience. His diction and imagery as well as the numerous devices (tropes and schemes) are the elements of style which aid the writer in making these decisions. With regard to Renaissance poetics, Brian Vickers explains that "of the five parts of the compositional process, elocutio received the greatest attention" (282). The primary reason for the importance attached to elocutio was its central role in arousing the passions, a primary function of rhetoric in the Renaissance poetics. Arousing the passions served the ultimate purpose of persuading the audience to accept or reject a proposal. Vickers continues when he explains, "the resources of language were developed by elocutio in the service of persuasive ends" (282). Thus, the analysis of the style of Marlowe's plays may provide access to one of the means whereby he touched and aroused the emotions of his various audiences.
in the service of persuasion.

A study restricted to style alone, however, must turn out to be inadequate. Indeed, the stale image of the typical rhetorical analysis is of one who moves through the text at hand pointing out interesting instances of *epanalepsis* or *zeugma* without relating these devices to other rhetorical materials or to the overall concerns of the drama. As William J. Kennedy has pointed out, the weakness of a simple stylistic approach is that it is often inconclusive since, "The full range of figures, tropes, and other linguistic structures belongs potentially to all verbal expression, and no one device is sovereign in any particular genre, mode, or style" (2).

Marlowe's use of the elements of *inventio* is just as important as his use of the devices of style. Invention primarily includes the use of various arguments for the purpose of persuasion. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* lists some twenty-eight valid and ten invalid topics as types of arguments a writer/speaker might employ. To locate the form and type of logical arguments and the presence of various solipsistic or illogical arguments will reveal the manner that this part of rhetoric fulfilled Marlowe's dramatic purposes. That is, studying the underlying arguments of given speeches will illustrate how Marlowe uses the topics to increase or diminish an identification for a character.

Finally, *dispositio* (arrangement) just as its name
suggests involves the placing of various arguments and devices into effective patterns so as to enhance the effect of the whole speech. Marlowe is certainly a master of effective presentation as the major speeches of his plays show.

Thus, several parts of the five part rhetoric which descended from the Aristotelian-Ciceronian concept of rhetoric presented themselves to the Renaissance playwright as effective means to construct his plays. Fortunately, the framework of ideas in a rhetorical mode of interpretation presents several distinct advantages. First, it allows recourse to one of the most important tools that the Elizabethan dramatist himself employed in constructing his plays since rhetoric and Elizabethan dramatic composition went hand in hand. Another important advantage that a full rhetorical treatment offers is an avoidance of the error of over-simplifying the complexity of these plays. The tendency to attempt to fit the plays into a single interpretation has already been observed. Finally, this expansion of coverage simply affords a greater number of tools to be used to interpret the plays effectively.

Indeed, perhaps the most important advantage of the rhetorical approach is the close relation of rhetoric to these dramas themselves. As Madelaine Doran has aptly maintained: "To understand Elizabethan drama aright we need to see it against the background of rhetoric that is
one of the distinctive features of the age" (26). She suggests, moreover, that "English renaissance drama is rhetorical from first to last" (51). The plays of the Marlowe canon certainly testify to the truth of these widely accepted assertions as Marlowe's plays exhibit a complex assimilation of the many rhetorical materials that were taught in the schools and used in the royal court and public playhouses.

The importance of rhetoric to Renaissance writing is well-known. From early schooling through the universities, rhetoric along with grammar and logic formed the trivium upon which the curriculum was based. Fortunately, numerous treatises which detail the actual methods of instruction that schoolmasters utilized have survived. John Brinsley's *Ludus literarius: or The Grammar Schoole* (1612) presents the education practices which were used in the fifty years before its publication (Crane 60). Another important treatise on the educational practices of this period is Charles Hoole's *A New discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School* (1637) which explains the extensive use of rhetoric in educational teaching methods during the Renaissance.

According to these works, the young boy must master enough Latin to be able to write complete sentences, and then apply this ability in the composition of brief letters. Serving as models for these short compositions were the epistles of Cicero, Macropedius' *Methodus de*
conscribendis epistolis, and Hegendorff’s De conscribendis epistolis. Later, when the students were ready for theme writing, they used Erasmus’s De duplici copio verborum ac rerum (1511) as well as Aphthonius’s Progymnasmata as textbooks. While many of the schoolmasters praised Erasmus’s textbook, many turned to Aphthonius’s text as it presented the same difficulty for the students and possessed a clearer organization. Nevertheless, both of the texts emphasize rhetorical elements in the process and product of theme writing.

The De oratore, De inventione, and De partitione of Cicero as well as the pseudo-Ciceronian Ad Herennium were all used extensively in the Renaissance schools. Importantly, the copious Ciceronian style was widely taught and upheld as the model to which all students should aspire. Furthermore, two other components of the Ciceronian style which received emphasis in addition to copiousness were amplification and imitation. Hence, the students learned from early on that intensifying and extending were the means both to write clearly, as well as to persuade effectively. To offer the students ample examples of the means to accomplish these three ends, long lists of figures were written. Mosellanus’s Tabulae de schematicibus et tropis (1529) and Susenbrotus’s Epitome troporum ac schematum (1540) presented definitions and examples of many rhetorical devices which the students employed in their own writings.
In the universities, young men continued learning the five parts of rhetoric and attempted to produce adequate orations and compositions which reflected their growing abilities to attain the three purposes of rhetoric as set forth by Horace and transmitted to a Tudor audience by Thomas Wilson: to teach, delight, and persuade. The rhetorical training reflected a deep tendency of the age toward ornamentation of expression which was useful in the courts as well as on the stage. The few students with talent enough to write professionally applied their rhetorical training to their future dramatic compositions as they attempted to entertain as well as to persuade. For the relation of rhetoric to drama the authoritative Renaissance critic Scaliger states: "Now is there not one end, and one only, in philosophical exposition, in oratory, and in the drama? Assuredly such is the case. All have one and the same end—persuasion" (42).

Indeed, this was a very rhetorical age as the plethora of handbooks on the subject testify. Such an abundance exists that they may be divided into three basic groups. Traditionalists like Wilson in Arte of Rhetorique (1560) gave attention to all five parts of Quintilian's rhetoric—inventio, dispositio, elocutio, pronuntiatio, and memoria. In a second approach, the Ramists assigned inventio and dispositio to the discipline of logic, retaining only style and delivery for rhetoric. Finally, the figurists like George Puttenham offered excellent
examples and definitions of figures included in *inventio*. Indeed, it was Puttenham's definition of hyperbole in *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) which Harry Levin used in 1952 as the title of his *The Overreacher*. However, Levin extended the meaning of the term to include the characters's motivation as well as their eloquence, while Puttenham's concern was limited to a definition of a particular figure. Other popular compilations of figures of speech in addition to those mentioned above were Leonard Cox's *Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke* (1531) and Richard Sherry's *Treatise of Tropes* (1550). While their individual concerns varied, all of these theorists and figurists alike, Ramists included, emphasized style (*elocutio*) as the single most important part of rhetoric.

Notwithstanding the great number of treatises and handbooks, it is generally agreed that the major sixteenth-century treatise on rhetoric which dealt with more than style was Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* (1553). Published eight times between 1553 and 1585, the *Rhetorique* treated all five parts of rhetoric, as Wilson devoted a large part of his book to a discussion of the means of amplification as well. Thus, the contributions of Wilson's *Rhetorique* to rhetorical theory and practice in England are multiple. Whereas the handbooks comprised of lists of figures were primarily used in schools, Wilson's work was advanced enough to afford a practical source for "all such as are studious of eloquence" (title
Officials, politicians, and aspirers to office, as well as playwrights to the stage, could make use of the many and varied offerings of rhetorical principles and devices which Wilson had gathered from many of the scattered ancient sources. Furthermore, Wilson sought his examples for these principles and devices in English sources; thus, he made "his rhetoric useful to men in his time by writing it in their native language and by adapting it to their needs" (Wagner 2).

Making no pretense at originality, Wilson owed much of the excellence of his book to the ancient theorists and figurists upon whose books his own treatise was based. Though rhetoric and poetry were closely related by the time of the Renaissance, it was not always so, and Wilson's treatise does not explain this fact. As one of the first to write on the subject of rhetoric, Aristotle sought to separate rhetoric and poetry by offering definitions for each of them. In the Poetics he had defined poetry as an imitation of human beings who are thinking, feeling, acting. It followed that plot, character, and thought were the aspects of poetry that he emphasized. When he came to rhetoric, Aristotle emphasized the idea of persuasion since he was aware of the judicial or legal context of the subject. Thus, he viewed rhetoric as the means of finding emotional and intellectual devices which would persuade an audience to
accede to a certain point of view. Many ancient thinkers perceived rhetoric as more an art of communication and persuasion than the art of embellishment and ornamentation (which would have related rhetoric and poetry). Thus, rhetoric became the use of the three possible means of that communication and persuasion. Winning the audience by convincing them of the speaker's good character and his corresponding credibility he called Ethos. The appeal to reason which employed all the devices from logic or dialectics he called Logos, while the appeal to the emotions or passions of the audience he called Pathos. All of the particular ethical, intellectual, and emotional devices that would effect this accession would be at the writer's disposal.

Quintilian agreed with Aristotle that the basic purpose of rhetoric was persuasion but went on to divide oratory or rhetoric into the five parts which Wilson was to retain: invention, which involved the discovery of arguments or proofs; arrangement, which was concerned with the organization of the matter that had been provided by invention; style, which dealt with the actual choice of tropes and schemes comprising the text itself; memory, which offered techniques for memorizing the speech once it was formulated; and delivery, which involved the techniques for performing the speech in front of the audience. Of these five parts, all except for the last two, which dealt with the actual performance of the
speech, contain elements of what Aristotle termed Ethos, Logos, and Pathos.

Fortunately for later poetry the separation of the two disciplines of poetry and rhetoric did not remain. What Aristotle had separated, Horace joined together by maintaining that the poet’s purpose was either to delight (with ornament) or to instruct (with persuasion) a reader, or preferably to achieve both of these purposes in the same poem. This more inclusive definition of poetry which emphasized the persuasive element dominated poetic theory through the Renaissance, and it encouraged the use of rhetorical elements in the making of poetry. Cicero confirmed this definition while relating his criteria to teach, please, and move to the three styles: the low style was suited for teaching, the middle style for pleasing, and the grand style for moving to great passion (Burke 597-98).

For most of the Greeks and Romans as well as for Elizabethan theorists, the conception of rhetoric was a lofty one: both verbal virtuosity and truth were the ends of eloquence. Moreover, Thomas Wilson’s assertion that eloquence was the force that moved men to virtue supported the Ciceronian view of rhetoric as eloquent wisdom (8). However, a wise Socrates, who in Plato’s Gorgias had much earlier warned of the Sophists’s abuses of rhetoric, suggested another view and one that presciently foreshadowed a common response to the rhetoric of
Marlowe's protagonists.

From Robert Greene's description of Marlowe's style as "daring God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlaine," we can ascertain that there were some contemporaries who doubted that his plays approximated the lofty aim of eloquent wisdom. While Greene's comment may reflect the prejudices of a rival playwright, it is still true that subsequent readers and audiences alike have attempted to ascertain whether or nor the plays possess wisdom or the devil's foolishness. Fortunately, this study's application of the Aristotelian-Ciceronian concept of rhetoric as expounded by Thomas Wilson's *Rhetorique* may shed some light on this problem.

My own study considers Marlowe's five major plays—*Tamburlaine I* and *II, Doctor Faustus, The Jew of Malta,* and *Edward II*—in terms of the changing employment of the conventional five part rhetoric to create effectively opposing rhetorical forces which act to set up or undermine an identification with the central character of each play. From the simplest device to the most significant of the characters' involved arguments, Marlowe's method involves the application of what may be called competing rhetorical strategies: amplification and irony. One strategy entails the investment of a major character with logical arguments from invention, effective arrangement of ideas from disposition, and specific devices from elocution that create the effect of a
sympathetic identification with that character. The second strategy involves the same three parts of rhetoric but the effect of dyslogistic arguments, cunningly crafted misarrangement, and devices acts to qualify, check, or even undermine that a sympathetic identification with the character. Furthermore, in places, Marlowe amplifies another character to undercut an unalloyed identification with his central figure. 14

The result of an analysis of the protagonist of each play in terms of the parts of rhetoric and the competing strategies of amplification and irony will create the potential for several interrelated and successive judgments:

1) We will arrive at an understanding of the rhetorical principles and materials underlying speeches, dialogues, and each entire play.

2) Then, we will apply this understanding to the discovery of the dialectical rhetorical forces, generally termed amplification and irony, which Marlowe employed both in constructing his plays and in creating and/or undermining identification for his characters. This discovery will also help to explore the relative limitations of various characters as Marlowe presented them.

3) With respect to the issue of containment, we will measure, judge, and determine which of the two opposing rhetorical forces encompasses the other in every
individual play. This judgment is essential since it partially explains the relationship between language and meaning in the plays. That is, a rhetorical approach best answers the problems which are raised by apparently contradictory elements within the plays and certainly contradicting interpretations of the plays. If these diverse elements are conceived of as separate and competing rhetorical forces, then their respective elements might be disentangled and extracted from the web of the play, thereby creating the opportunity for measuring the cumulative weight given to each in the play.

When, as in Tamburlaine I, amplification contains irony, then the hyperbolical language and arguments Tamburlaine uses work in conjunction, and the irony that is employed in the play exists primarily to maintain tension and conflict. On the other hand, when the force of irony contains amplification, as in Dr. Faustus, then the undercutting and the hyperbolical language work against each other to create dissonances beneath the level of the music of the lines.

4) Finally, we will use the conclusions involving containment to propose answers to the abiding questions which continue to perplex readers and audiences of Marlowe’s plays. We will, for example, offer conclusions as to whether the subversive element is contained from play to play. Also, Marlowe’s use of a bewildering blend of traditional Elizabethan values with the newer humanist
ideals will be partially explained by the notion of containment.

Thus, the rhetorical nature of these dramas requires the study of their employment of the dialectical method of composition, the use of amplification and irony, in an attempt to discover which rhetorical force is the stronger in each particular play. At the risk of falling prey to the "romantic" heresy and the intentional fallacy, we might add that this type of analysis will show that the plays exhibit a profoundly complex and ambivalent attitude toward competing concerns in Elizabethan England. The beauty of the poetry and logic of the underlying arguments suggest an identification with these usurping, self-fashioning protagonists, and at the same time their dyslogistic reasoning, faulty knowledge, and incorrect allusions undercut this identification.

What this method will not do is reveal a solution to the problem of the chronology of the plays. The inconclusive and problematical information relating to the publication of the plays has encouraged some to attempt a stylistic analysis, as one approach, to determine the order of composition. Unfortunately, no completely satisfactory answer has been accepted. In fact, critics' conclusions in regard to chronology have been many and varied. The problem is aggravated by the late date of existing editions of the works as well as by the disagreements as to what factors to use in judging the
probable dates of the plays.

By way of illustration of the inherent problems of chronology we may study the formulations of three notable Marlowe critics who deal with the chronology issue: Tucker Brooke, Irving Ribner, and Clifford Leech. All agree that Marlowe's earliest literary efforts were *Dido* and *Tamburlaine I and II*. However, while Brooke and Ribner continue to concur with each other (though for different reasons at times) about the entire chronology of the Marlovian canon, Leech holds a different view of the middle and latter parts of Marlowe's writing career.

The three men are also in agreement about the reason they place *Dido* first. Leech states that *Dido* probably began as "an undergraduate joke" (26), and Ribner notes that the act and scene divisions were typical of academic dramas. Brooke further points out that the peculiar "phraseology of the title-page, 'Played by the Children of her Maiesties Chappell,' rather implies that performances were still being given at the time of its publication" in 1594 (2). Brooke also believes that the large number of Latin lines present in the text indicates that Marlowe wrote the play while he was still a young Cambridge student, and he also thinks that the evidence of meter and style link it to Marlowe's earliest works (5). For these reasons, I have elected to exclude *Dido* from consideration of Marlowe's major works.

Brooke and Ribner both cite Robert Greene's allusion
(in his preface to *Perimedes*) to Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* as proof of this drama's early creation date. Thus, they reason that the play must have been composed in 1587-88. Leech, however, presents a different reason for placing these plays second and third in the canon. Leech asserts that both *Tamburlaine* and *Dr. Faustus* are "cosmic tragedies"; in each "an almost isolated figure is seen . . . challenging the heavens" (23). Thus, because of this internal evidence, Leech maintains that *Tamburlaine* was written one year after *Dido* and was followed by *Faustus* which he believes to have been written between 1588-89.

Brooke and Ribner, on the other hand, believe Marlowe wrote *The Jew of Malta* after *Tamburlaine*. Both state that, since Marlowe mentions in the third line of the play, "And now the Guize is dead," the play must have been composed after the Guise's assassination on December 23, 1588. However, it had to have been written before February 19, 1592, for Henslowe notes in his record of dramatic performances at the Rose Theatre that it was in production then and had been for quite some time (Brooke 18). Leech, however, believes that since *The Jew* was Marlowe's most mature work, it was the last drama he ever wrote. Leech argues that it was Marlowe's most complex work, and in it Marlowe "anticipated the grimmer kind of Jacobean comedy that was to come" (24). Marlowe was undoubtedly, Leech suggests, moving toward a type of "writing that combined
the social interest of Edward II and The Massacre with a satiric animus that was to show itself again, when a few years had passed, in the work of Marston and of Jonson" (24).

Brooke and Ribner also disagree with Leech as to where to place The Massacre at Paris. Again, Brooke and Ribner use lines from the play to estimate its date of composition. They maintain that since the piece closes with the assassination of Henry III, which had occurred on August 2, 1589, and since the allusion in lines 1250-51 implies that Pope Sixtus V, who had died on August 27, 1590, was already dead, that the play had to have been written in late 1590 or early 1591. Leech, however, believes that The Massacre was the next to the last play that Marlowe wrote. He cites its "undercurrent of irony" as evidence that Marlowe was maturing and growing as a playwright (25). Leech's contention is that the growth of irony is a reflection of maturity.

Since "the anonymous Arden of Feversham, licensed on April 3, 1592, contains six undoubted pilferings" from Edward II (Brooke 10), Brooke and Ribner maintain that Edward II was probably composed in the latter part of 1591 or early 1592. A number of other post-1592 rival rival poets "borrowed" some of "Marlowe's mighty lines" from Edward II as well. Leech sets no store in such evidence, however, and he places Edward before The Massacre because, of Marlowe's last three plays which center on man in
society, it is the one which contains the least amount of irony and satire and is the most hopeful. Thus, while it is one of Marlowe's "mature plays," it is his least mature because it is his most optimistic. After all, Leech thinks, Marlowe ends Edward with "a suggestion of vice exorcised" (24) and order restored.

Brooke and Ribner, on the other hand, see Dr. Faustus as the crowning culmination of the canon. Both date it 1592 or later, primarily for the simple reason that the English translation of the German Faustbuch by "P. F. Gent" on which Marlowe based his play was not published until 1592. Brooke, in particular, strongly argues against the critics who favor a date prior to the close of 1589. To those critics who say that the words on the title page of the 1592 Faustbuch, "Newly imprinted, and in convenient places imperfect matter amended" imply the existence of an earlier edition of P. F.'s translation (15), Brooke says that the "natural interpretation" (15) is of a book which has been freshly printed. Moreover, the new material which is included in the 1592 book would not have been inserted into a translation "while the German Faustbuch was hot from the press" (15). Brooke also finds the speculation that Marlowe had access to P. F.'s manuscript for several years before it was published ludicrous, and Brooke says that the ballad of Faustus done in 1589 by Richard Jones was not founded upon and is not similar to Marlowe's Faustus. Thus, according to Brooke and Ribner,
Faustus had to have been produced by Marlowe during the final year of his life.

From this brief discussion of the problem of the order of Marlowe’s plays, one sees some of the disagreements that have risen. For those who argue that Marlowe’s style evolved, say from the highly rhetorical language of Tamburlaine to the flat prosaic language of Edward II, the chronology problem assumes a greater importance. However, for the purposes of this study the analysis of the language of each play will suffice. The use of various parts of the rhetoric to enhance or diminish identification with the major character does not necessitate a particular play being assigned an exact date. Thus, the order of the plays will not affect the conclusions that will be drawn based upon an analysis of the rhetoric of each play.

Marlowe’s plays explore the limitations of existence which aspiring individuals, issuing from Marlowe’s imagination, attempt to exceed. Their failure (and qualified successes) raise and discuss distressing problems for the conventional as well as the radically anarchical man. According to one view, the tragedies are grand moral spectacles which reaffirm the era’s social and moral values. Speaking from the opposing view, Pendry goes so far as to argue that Marlowe “does not know why man is put here. But he is sure that the arrangement does not work” (vii). Both of these views are in accord on one
point: Marlowe's heroes fail. If it is true that failure is the final end of all great human aspiration, then that grand failure casts a shadow as much on the order from which the hero emerges as on the inherent human limitation itself. It is toward an interpretation of this failure that an analysis of Marlowe's employment of the parts of rhetoric speaks. Ultimately, a rhetorical analysis of these plays will demonstrate the changing roles of the traditional order and the aspirations of the individual on which this shadow falls.
Chapter One:

"Won with thy Wordes": Tamburlaine I

The language of eloquence in Tamburlaine I attracted early notice as contemporary statements outside the text affirm Marlowe's highly self-conscious use of language. In the preface attached to the 1590 printing, Richard Jones describes the two parts of the play as "tragical discourses" and mentions the "eloquence of the author," hence affirming their rhetorical nature. Also, Robert Greene in his Epistle to Perimedes inadvertently pays tribute to Marlowe's hyperbolic style in the play. Greene's attack of the current tragic style which he describes as "daring God out of heaven with the Atheist Tamburlan" points us to the central place that language holds in this play as well as to the popular response to that style.¹

Alluding to the earliest reference to language within the play, Helen Watson-Williams has observed, "It has always been recognized that Marlowe's Prologue to Tamburlaine the Great defines his intention as to subject-matter and expression" (3). The "expression" she refers to entails a Scythian shepherd who would arrive "Threat'ning the world with high astounding terms" (Prologue 5).² The same passage also emphasizes the role of language in this play by differentiating its language from that of earlier plays whose "conceits" were clownish
or insignificant, compared to the seriousness of the language which is going to "lead [us] to the stately tent of war" (Prologue 3).

While a great deal of violence occurs within the play, it says a great deal about the attitude toward language that very little action occurs on stage. Rather, the audience is presented with the verbal squaring off of opponents before battles and is informed of the results by the boasting victor or the anguishing loser.

Tamburlaine's battles with Mycetes, Cosroe, Bajazeth, and Arabia actually transpire offstage, as messengers or major characters report the outcome only after the battles are over. These dialogues both before and after the battle point to the reliance upon words to carry the action in the play. With the exception of the deaths of Bajazeth, Zabina, and Agydas the violence is done off stage as a great deal of the spectacle is centered on words. Indeed, this emphasis on language over spectacle necessarily centers attention upon the language of the play.

In the play itself the length of both minor and major speeches testifies to "the rhetorical nature of their author's style" (Peet 138). Harry Levin computed the average length of speech in Tamburlaine I as 5.9 lines which, except for the second part of the play, is the highest average of any of Marlowe's plays (187). As the importance of a given occasion increases, the rhetoric the characters employ requires much longer speeches. When,
for example, Tamburlaine first describes Zenocrate’s beauty, he speaks for 24 lines. Tamburlaine’s persuasion of Theridamus runs 45 lines whereas Tamburlaine’s speech following the use of Bajazeth as a footstool continues for 26 lines. Finally, Tamburlaine’s apostrophe to Zenocrate’s beauty runs for 57 lines. Furthermore, fifteen line speeches by secondary characters are not uncommon. Cosroe, Bajazeth, the Governor of Damascus, the Virgins of Damascus, as well as Zenocrate herself all take center stage to deliver moderately long orations. Even minor speeches are often made into occasions for miniature orations as when the messenger Capolin reports to the rulers of Egypt and Arabia on the strength of their forces. Rather than respond with a simple number, he utters an eight line speech which is prefaced by a salutation, developed by division (distributio), and ended with a two-line simile.

Even earlier, when Cosroe asks Menaphon for a simple description of Tamburlaine, Menaphon speaks for twenty-four lines. In this dramatically significant encomium Menaphon reinforces Tamburlaine’s impressive nature just exhibited in the preceding scene when Tamburlaine persuades Theridamus to join forces with him. Menaphon begins his oration with two hyperboles that set the “overreaching” style of the entire speech. The listing of Tamburlaine’s attributes employs the technique divisio, a common device of the longer speeches.
Tamburlaine's tall frame suggests his aspirations to divinity and his breadth of shoulder suggests that he could well bear Atlas' burden. Tamburlaine's head is a "priceless pearl," (metaphora) and his eyes are "fiery circles [which] bear encompassed/A heaven of heavenly bodies in their spheres" (2.2.15-16). That is, they possess the power of astronomical influence. Also, eyes are often a good guide to the throne where he sits royally, as though he inevitably belongs there. Menaphon continues (with hyperbole) to describe Tamburlaine's brows as possessing both life and death in their aspect. The folds of his brow suggest death, while the smoothness of them suggests friendship and life. His hair is gold, and Menaphon sees a parallel to Achilles's appearance. Finally, that the wind loves to play in his hair suggests the support of the forces of nature and the gods for Tamburlaine's purposes. Hence, here is a man whose presence and aspect suggest his complete control and superiority to other men. Thus, in the speeches of even the minor characters Marlowe employs the overreaching ornate language to achieve dramatic purposes.

As if their speeches are not enough, various characters also make comments about language itself, hence testifying to the emphasis Marlowe places on eloquence in this play. Mycetes' well-known deferral of the speech-making ability to his more eloquent noblemen is an early instance of the importance given to effective language.
When he admits that he cannot find the words to express his grief at the attacks his lands have suffered from Tamburlaine, Mycetes gives to Cosroe the right to speak in his place:

   Brother Cosroe, I find myself aggriev’d,
   Yet insufficient to express the same,
   For it requires a great and thundering speech.

(1.1.1-3).

Rather than extol praises of his brother and explain the seriousness of his brother’s problems, Cosroe uses the occasion to criticize Mycetes for his shortcomings, which include his inability with language. Hence, Mycetes’ rhetorical ineffectiveness directly corresponds to his inability to govern effectively. Conversely, Mycetes suggests, by his presence, that the worthy, serious characters in the play will also exhibit this rhetorical power.

Cosroe’s reply to Mycetes is cast into the form of a miniature oration in which form and content reinforce the necessity of effective language. Using the opportunity to exhibit his own considerable powers of speech, Cosroe offers a twelve line speech consisting of two appositional epithets to amplify the seriousness of his subject. The first epithet renames Persia as the one-time seat of “mighty conquerors,” while the second epithet goes on to rename or amplify the prowess of these conquerors who “have triumph’d over Afric and the bounds/ Of Europe”
Moreover, Persia herself is now such an inhospitable place that the "sun dares scarce appear/ For freezing meteors and congealed cold" (1.1.8-9). Cosroe contrasts Mycetes to this view of Persia, for on Mycetes's birthday loving Cynthia and Saturn made love. Also, at Mycetes's birth the gods associated with war, Jove and Mercury, did not lend their characteristics to him. To rule a warlike nation requires a warlike leader, one without "fickleness"; thus, Mycetes sees the Turks and Tartars rising against him precisely because he is incapable of making his own country strong. Another reference to effective language occurs in the same scene, after Theridamus has sworn to find and destroy the Scythian thief. Mycetes announces that because Theridamus possesses "words [that] are swords" he will undoubtedly accomplish his purpose. In doing this, Mycetes has related rhetorical power to national safety. A short time later, Tamburlaine, who possesses concerns of his own "safety," in view of Theridamus's forces, asks Techelles whether he should "play the orator" (1.2.129), another reference to language within the play. After, Tamburlaine has successfully persuaded Theridamus to join his forces, Theridamus confesses that he has been won with Tamburlaine's words (1.2.238). Theridamus' own swordlike words have been turned aside by one who possesses consummate oratorical skills. Thus, in their own references to oratorical power, the characters suggest
that there are successive levels one must master before becoming an effective rhetorician. The characters consciously compare the relative effectiveness of one another's oratorical abilities as they maneuver others through language. Ultimately then, the characters' references to language reveal the power of language is a dynamic, fluctuating force which many of the characters attempt to control and direct toward their own ends.

Of course, Tamburlaine himself is the master orator, and other characters' remarks testify to this fact. Early in the play, reinforcement of Tamburlaine's special verbal dexterity occurs after Menaphon's description of Tamburlaine's physical appearance. Coerco remarks that Tamburlaine possesses the ability to "persuade, at such a sudden pinch, /With reasons of his valour and his life, A thousand sworn and overmatching foes" (2.2.37-39). Time and again Tamburlaine's successes illustrate the truth of this early observation. Indeed, his attractiveness and power are largely attributable to the rhetoric which he employs as we, like Theridamus, are won with his words.

Hence, through remarks both outside the text about the play's language as well as statements within the play, we may discover the central importance given to the language of eloquence in *Tamburlaine I*. Yet the singlemost revealing element is the rhetoric of the speeches themselves. As one critic has maintained, a study of Tamburlaine's major speeches "strongly indicates
a rhetorician is at work" (Peet 140). Indeed, what is revealed in such a study is Marlowe's employment of various rhetorical formulae as set forth by renaissance theorists and figurists as Thomas Wilson, George Puttenham, Henry Peacham, and John Hoskyns. Also, evident is Marlowe's complex assimilation of these source materials.

The long speeches of Tamburlaine encourage exploration of their underlying logic also. The various types of argument that an orator has at his disposal fall into the part of rhetoric called Inventio. Marlowe repeatedly makes use of this part of rhetoric as he constructs valid arguments for his protagonist. At one point in his Rhetoric Aristotle introduces twenty-eight valid and ten invalid topics which are useful in constructing arguments. Certainly, Tamburlaine makes use of the various means of constructing an argument when he sets out to persuade and dissuade potential friends and enemies.

As mentioned in the last chapter, many of Tamburlaine's longer speeches follow the six parts of a successful oration as defined by the Ad Herrenium. These parts of the oration belong to that part of rhetoric called Arrangement or Dispositio, and many of the speeches in this play reflect a concern with proper arrangement of parts of the speech to create the maximum effect on the interior and exterior audience.
Perhaps the most significant of rhetorical techniques in the Renaissance is the technique of amplification which Henry Peacham defines as "the principall part of eloquence" (120). In an often-used sense amplification involves the expansion of a simple statement into a more elaborate one in order to move the audience. John Hoskyns, thinking along this line, offers five means of achieving amplification: "Wee amplifye .5. wayes, by Comparison, Division, Accumillation, Intimation, and Progression" (131). Marlowe especially employs division--cataloguing a subject into a list of separate items--in Tamburlaine's central speeches as his major means of amplification. Other theorists do not limit the means of amplification to five. Wilson, for example, mentions seven means of amplification (120-29) as means of extending a simple statement. Amplification may also, according to Rosamund Tuve, involve an intensification of a statement as well as an expansion of it (90). In various places, Marlowe achieves amplification by condensing and intensifying rather than dividing and extending. The basic function is "to magnify, to make more impressive," (89) whether expansion or brevity is the means used to achieve it.

The particular figures which Marlowe frequently relies upon belong to Elocutio. The correspondence of these figures to the technique of amplification is remarkable. Thus, we find hyperbole, extended two line
similes, metaphors, parisons, and several types of patterned repetitions such as ploce, epizeuxis, epistrophe, anadiplosis, anaphora, parison, and poluptoton. Indeed, various repetitive devices are as important as amplification in this play. Especially in Tamburlaine's major speeches where repetition is most often employed, Marlowe uses the various types of word and phrase repetitions to amplify his hero. As a result, repetition may emphasize concerns of the speaker as well as affect the quality of the reader's response. Repetition may also, in a psychological sense, reveal an abiding passion of the speaker or perhaps, indirectly, one of the author himself. However, Marlowe does not amplify this hero at the expense of Tamburlaine's large simplicity of purpose and manner; hence, the more ornate figures--anacoluthon, aposiopoesis, for examples--are rarely used in Tamburlaine I.

Marlowe also employs rhetoric's three branches: deliberative, judicial, and epideictic arguments. The encomium, the praise of a person or thing by extolling its inherent characteristics, belongs to the epideictic argument. Tamburlaine uses this type of argument when he addresses Theridamus. Furthermore, a great many of the speeches fall into what Thomas Wilson defined as deliberative discourse: "a means, whereby we doe persuade, or dissuade, entreate, or rebuke, exhorte, or dehort, commend, or comforte, any man" (63). One type of speech
which falls into this category is the exhortation, and Wilson offers many topics appropriate for exhortation.

Praise or commendation.
Expectation of all men.
Hope of victory.
Hope of renowne.
Feare of shame.
Greatnesse of reward.
Rehearsall of examples in all ages. (63)

Certainly, Tamburlaine's modus operandi for influencing the decisions of potential followers involves these very topics as set out by Wilson.

While Marlowe employs the rhetorical principles set down by Wilson, Puttenham, and others, he does not do so in any rote manner. Rather, he effects a complex assimilation of their materials in such a way as to conceal the rhetorical basis of his poetry. An analysis of the major speeches of this play will reveal the smooth mixture of rhetorical materials that Marlowe created. The rhetoric that Tamburlaine employs in each of his successively more challenging battles involves various elements of the first three parts of rhetoric handed down by the ancient orators and theorists. Through the magnificent employment of the parts of rhetoric, both amplification and identification are achieved.

Tamburlaine's career is a succession of victories each of which involves a usurpation of established
authority. When Tamburlaine captures Zenocrate, he violates the letters of safe passage given to her by the "Great Cham." Shortly thereafter, Tamburlaine convinces Theridamus to forsake his allegiance to Mycetes, and after a comic interlude when Mycetes himself is deposed, Tamburlaine betrays Cosroé whom he has just helped to conquer Mycetes. When Tamburlaine faces Bajazeth, he encounters his most powerful enemy, the great Cham himself who rules over Turkey. Notwithstanding that the most difficult battles are to come as Tamburlaine faces the Virgins of Damascus and the pleas of Zenocrate to spare her father, how is it that Tamburlaine wins and retains the identification that the Renaissance audience had for him? 8

To win his battles and his audiences Tamburlaine from the first employs his special eloquence to complement the military prowess, the personal courage, sense of honor, and concern with virtue that mark his character. Tamburlaine's first lengthy speech occurs appropriately after his first usurpation of power, the capture of Zenocrate and her train. In this scene Zenocrate and Tamburlaine present different views of Tamburlaine's capture of herself and possessions. Their dialogue which employs the argument from definition, begins with a series of rhetorical questions that follow one another in rapid succession (pyōma) before Tamburlaine asserts that her jewels and treasure "shall be reserv'd" (1.2.3). 9 By this
he is suggesting that he does not think of the acquisition as a theft and that they have, contrary to what is thought, not been taken unlawfully, but are going to be held for her until the time Tamburlaine sees fit to give them back. He then adds that she, in her new, and to her, perilous circumstances, is in "better state" than if her journey had ended successfully at her father's house. Certainly these were confusing words to one whose journey has been interrupted so abruptly. Tamburlaine proceeds to define just what he is, if not to remove the force of her own argument, then to clarify his own.

Zenocrate responds with a definition of her own, describing Tamburlaine's actions as "lawless rapine from a silly maid" (10). Zenocrate thus accuses him harshly and then amplifies the accusation by attacking the manhood of one who would attack a defenseless woman. She then goes on to add that she and her train have been promised safe passage by the mighty Turk. Her argument from definition is that Tamburlaine is a thief and in the wrong because he preys on defenseless people and he usurps the authority of those who are in power.

Tamburlaine counters these ideas with his own notions of rightful action: "these letters and commands/Are countermanded by a greater man" (21-22). Offering a definition of his own, Tamburlaine suggests that an action is good or bad depending upon the status and personality of the man who performs it. What he has said may be
structured in the form of a syllogism which defines right action. All greater men have the power to revoke or modify commands of lesser men. Since Tamburlaine is greater than the mighty Turk, then any action by Tamburlaine which violates the lesser man's commands, is rightfully undertaken. To establish that he is greater than the Turk, Tamburlaine states that "I am a lord for so my deeds shall prove" (34). Applying Aristotle, Tamburlaine argues by changing a key term slightly. He is defining a "lord" by actions rather than birth or office. Position, for Tamburlaine, is earned by achievement alone or it is not merited. He suggests that he deserves the titles and riches only because he has the ability to perform wondrous and awe-inspiring things, or in this case, deserves the things which he takes as establishing the means to achieve greater things. The effect of this argument is to draw attention to the personality and power of the man himself. He maintains that he is basing everything on himself, his personality and achievements.

Tamburlaine goes on to strengthen his position by using an argument of another type altogether. By arguing from necessity, Tamburlaine adds that his prizes are "friends" that strengthen his state and keep him out of servitude while he enlists those men who will aid in his pursuit of kingdoms. Thus, in his eyes he is not only justified in capturing Zenocrate's wealth, but he indeed
must act in this way by the requirements of the moment.

Insofar as the elements of arrangement, Tamburlaine's actions serve as his *exordium* and establish a specific relation to his audience. The speeches of Zenocrate and Magnetes serve to summarize the facts of the case, *narratio*, something which Tamburlaine does not dispute. When he offers his definition of theft as applying only to subordinates, he clarifies the point at issue, *partitio*. The *amplificatio* occurs when Zenocrate stipulates that Tamburlaine indeed has apparently acted as a thief. Furthermore, his definition both of theft and lord serves to entertain and counteract the arguments of his opponents, *confutatio*. Finally, his great hyperbolic statement concluding his argument serves to sum up his argument and to stir the audience, *peroratio*. The typical parts of an oration are utilized even in the brief encounters and it should be noted that the parts follow the order suggested by Cicero and Puttenham.

In his first appearance Tamburlaine's offers some justification for his actions to Zenocrate, but he notes that his captives have not been persuaded as yet. He says,

> These lords, perhaps, do scorn our estimates
> And think we prattle with distempered spirits.  

(1.2.61-62)

Thus, he continues to offer persuasions that are more convincing in his next long monologue to Zenocrate. In
this speech, he concentrates not on his person, but on the person of Zenocrate, shifting his emphasis from self-justification to an appeal to her vanity. Beginning with three rhetorical questions (pygma) which consecutively intensify the indignation and anger he feels at her apparent rejection of him, Tamburlaine proceeds to elevate her to his own near godlike status.

Disdains Zenocrate to live with me?
Or you, my lords, to be my followers?
Think you I weigh this treasure more than you?

(1.2.82-84)

His answer (subjecto) presents a statement of the worth he places on his soldiers:

Not all the gold in India's wealthy arms
Shall buy the meanest soldier in my train.

(11. 85-6)

Here Tamburlaine has constructed a scale of relative value with the wealth that his captives are so disgruntled at losing at the bottom of the scale. Placed above that position are his own soldiers, and Zenocrate and her lords stand at the top of the scale. Thus, Tamburlaine discounts their suspicions of his pecuniary motive for capturing their train as he extols the value he places on the human beings who become his followers.

Now that he has established the importance of his followers in the scale of values, Tamburlaine concentrates on Zenocrate's special worth to him, using his primary
rhetorical device in praise of her worth—hyperbole.

Zenocrate, lovelier than the Love of Jove,
Brighter than is the silver Rhodophe.
Fairer than whitest snow on Scythian hills,
Thy person is more worth to Tamburlaine
Than the possession of the Persian Crowne,
Which gracious stars have promis'd at my birth.

(1.2.87-92)

With three comparatives (parison) Tamburlaine establishes the extent of Zenocrate's beauty: lovelier, brighter, fairer. The objects of these comparatives include both nature and the supernatural. That is, she is greater than all natural wonders (the Rhodophe and the snow, both summer and winter) as well as the wonder of Jove's own supernatural love itself. Having already established his plan to achieve great deeds to establish his calling himself a lord, Tamburlaine places Zenocrate above that vital element of his makeup when he compares her favorably to the possession of the Persian crown.

To reinforce his love for her he makes several grand promises of lavish gifts which would accrue to her providing she will only love him. These promises are arranged in order of increasing significance (auxesis) and emotional emphasis. Her means of travel will be the lavish service of one hundred slaves, she will be clothed in the richest garments, and she will receive the most precious jewels from Tamburlaine's own treasury. The
greatest of the promised gifts is reserved for last: Tamburlaine himself.

With this speech Tamburlaine portrays several aspects of his own considerable personality. His incredible imagination, his personal determination, and the extremity of passion to which his personality inclines are all amply illustrated in the wooing of Zenocrate. These qualities, which this speech amplifies, enhance the positive effect that Tamburlaine has on the audience by adding a sensitivity to beauty to the audacity which has already been seen in the capturing of Zenocrate's train. However, something of greater dramatic importance is accomplished with this scene with Zenocrate. Tamburlaine's sensitivity to beauty is portrayed here and emerges again late in the play and provides a central conflict in Tamburlaine I, after Tamburlaine has defeated a series of increasingly powerful foes and established his awesome power.

In his persuasion of Theridamus, Tamburlaine increases his military strength as he demonstrates different aspects of his magnificent rhetorical powers. This speech (1.2.165ff) exhibits an assimilation of many of the available rhetorical formulae from the large rhetorical patterns to the most specific device. On the large scale, the elements of the exhortation discussed by Wilson are present. Hence, the speech begins with praise of Theridamus in a one line verbal aside and continues
with direct praise as Tamburlaine compliments Theridamus' looks and bravery (lines 165-71). Then, Tamburlaine explores Wilson's topics "hope of victorie" and "hope of renown" by suggesting that Theridamus might, with Tamburlaine's aid, rule the world with him. To substantiate the hopes that Theridamus might feel, Tamburlaine outlines his own great power which provide the basis of hope for both warriors. Tamburlaine "hold[s] the Fates bound fast in iron chains" (174) and "turn[s] Fortune's wheel about" (175) with his own hands. In suggesting that his power exceeds the power of fate and fortune, Tamburlaine offers what is to him a guarantee of their success. Wilson's final topic, "rehearsall of examples," is explored when Tamburlaine details his recent achievements. He offers as his first example the fortuitous capture of Zenocrate and her train. This incident, Tamburlaine explains, is furthermore supported by supernatural forces. Tamburlaine maintains, that "as a sure and grounded argument" (184) Jove has sent Zenocrate to be his queen and empress.

Another of the large rhetorical patterns finds expression in this speech. The five means of amplification of John Hoskyns, mentioned above, are employed. First, there are "comparisons" of Tamburlaine to Jove himself and of Tamburlaine's similarity to Theridamus. Their suggested alliance at the end of the speech is a further comparison of the two warriors. Then,
the device of "division" is employed as Tamburlaine, in an often-used manner, breaks down his topic into several carefully delineated parts. In this case, the rewards that are to accrue to Theridamus are set out. Tamburlaine first offers Theridamus a share of the "Egyptian prize" (190) taken in the capture of Zenocrate. He then expands the prospect of riches to include future "conquered kingdoms and of cities sack'd" (192). Finally, the power that they both will obtain is mentioned last as ultimately Theridamus is to sit with "Tamburlaine in all his majesty" (209). Furthermore, this method of arranging rewards in order of ascending importance involves Hoskyns' "progression," the last of his five means of amplification.

On the smaller scale, Marlowe does not neglect the devices of style or elocutio. Indeed, various devices of repetition are perhaps the most important rhetorical method in this significant speech. Through repetition, Tamburlaine centers attention on himself, even as he is attempting to persuade someone else. One of Tamburlaine's obvious means to increase identification for himself is the repetition of the various forms of the personal pronoun. He highlights his power and possessions by acclaiming "my hand," "my soldiers," "my queen," "my conduct," "my estate," and "my name and honour." These resounding repetitions both draw attention to Tamburlaine's self and also work to override any
resistance that Theridamus might harbor insofar as leaving his king to join with Tamburlaine. That is, Tamburlaine's rhetoric suggests that he is the greatest of mortals, and that Theridamus, by joining with the strongest of men, is committing no wrong. Rather, he is following a higher good.

Another word repetition (the device ploce) that Tamburlaine employs is his use of the verbs "shall" and "will." In this speech these predicates occur frequently, twelve times, as Tamburlaine establishes the certainty of his future achievements. The present and the future are profoundly connected, and Tamburlaine possesses the ambition and the power to carry out the cause-effect relationship he establishes between them. Indeed, as he himself says later, "For will and shall best fitteth Tamburlaine" (3.3.41).

Tamburlaine also repeats his central idea which is an offer to Theridamus to join with him. This offer is persuasively repeated three times in the speech each in a slightly different way. First Tamburlaine says,

Forsake thy king, and do but join with me,
And we will triumph over all the world. (173-74)

These lines which occur early in the speech represent the thrust of his argument, what he is attempting to gain. Shortly, he returns to the same idea, but this time he expands upon Theridamus' promised rewards with what Susenbrotus defines as "an enumeration of parts," or
distributio:

If thou wilt stay with me, renowned man,
And lead thy thousand horse with my conduct,
Besides they share of this Egyptian prize,
Those thousand horse shall sweat with martial spoil

Of conquered kingdoms and of cities sack'd.

(ll. 187-92)

When the argument is presented for the third time, it occurs at the end of the speech and Tamburlaine offers even greater promise to Theridamus, who is to become almost equal, "competitor," to Tamburlaine himself:

Join with me now in this my mean estate . . .
And when my name and honour shall be spread
As far as Boreas claps his brazen wings,
Or fair Bootes sends his cheerful light,
Then shalt thou be competitor with me,
And sit with Tamburlaine in all his majesty.

(ll. 202-08)

Furthermore, each of the three repetitions of the offer occurs in a heightened sense every time the idea is repeated. Marlowe is both repeating an idea and employing the technique of progression simultaneously, thus exhibiting his subtle manipulation of various rhetorical methods.

The analysis of these speeches and previous elements of the play reveals Marlowe's unique emphasis on language,
specifically rhetorical language to amplify and create an identification for his hero. Marlowe uses the rhetorical formulae to invest Tamburlaine with a magnified grandeur. Through Tamburlaine's far flung hyperboles, extravagant similes, as well as his incessant repetition of words and ideas relating to his own power, prowess, and possessions, Marlowe creates a character that is truly large enough to master an old order and even establish a new one. And this is precisely what Tamburlaine does. What he forecasts, he achieves. Meeting and defeating a succession of ever more powerful enemies, Tamburlaine does accomplish those "lordly" deeds that he forecasts so early in the play. Language, moreover, is the most important weapon Tamburlaine uses to advance his ambition and ultimately to cause others, including the audience, to identify with him. Indeed, language lies at the very center of what Tamburlaine is. The overreaching protagonist matches the overreaching figure of hyperbole which he is so adept in using. The language that foretells a bright, certain future is connected so intimately with a central character whose certainties require the verbs "shall" and "will" to express his plans.

Yet, Marlowe does not sacrifice the grand simplicity of Tamburlaine's character in his use of these rhetorical materials. Thus, there is a noted absence of the more ornate figures such as anadiplosis or antanaclasis. There is, moreover as one critic says, a "ritual sameness"
(Divakaruni 56) about Tamburlaine's language that gives his speeches a fixed quality and enhances the simplicity of his character. Thus, these two speeches, the panegyric to Zenocrate and exhortation to Theridamus, establish the pattern which the rest of Tamburlaine's speeches follow. Ultimately, his language is as fixed as his unswerving purposes, and he himself goes through few significant changes while his actions so drastically alter the world that is external to him.

Everything Tamburlaine touches he transforms as he relentlessly pursues honor through achievement, albeit a notion of honor that he defined in his first appearance. Furthermore, his rhetoric creates a sympathetic identification for him early on. The grandeur of his rhetoric relates to the grandeur of his person just as the simplificity of the figures Marlowe uses corresponds to Tamburlaine's simplicity of purpose. Certainly the confidence with which Tamburlaine undertakes challenges parallels his confident mastery of eloquent language. Indeed, the identification with Tamburlaine that is formed in the early scenes is gradually strengthened until it reaches its greatest intensity in the play's crisis, the Battle of Ankara. The early battles represent preparations for this as Tamburlaine wins noble warriors over to his side (in Theridamus), deposes the weak and effeminate (Mycetes), and defeats the brother who would be king (Cosroe who is also a traitor). However, in the
third act the easy battles are at an end as Tamburlaine faces his strongest opponent in Bajazeth. When they meet, their similar and dialectically constructed rhetoric reflects their awesome power. When Tamburlaine triumphs, his military challenge has been met.

Every element of their confrontation possesses its structural and rhetorical complement. The arrangement of this confrontation is indeed precise as an analysis of its rhetorical structure will reveal. Bajazeth enters with his "contributory kings" as does Tamburlaine. Bajazeth speaks first addressing his kings, and Tamburlaine responds with comments to his own. Furthermore, the entire confrontation is analogous to an extended *progressio* in which the dialectically opposed statements are arranged in order of increasing intensity. Each potentate expresses anger at the familiarity with which the other addresses him. Tamburlaine has dared to call Bajazeth by his name rather than title, as Bajazeth has done the same. Then the rulers proceed to outline what is to be done with the other when he is vanquished. Tamburlaine is to tend Bajazeth’s concubines, and Bajazeth’s fate, while concealed, is to be just as ignominious. Before each ruler begins his central peroration, the accompanying kings hurl parallel insults at each other. Bajazeth then hyperbolically extols the virtues of his empress as being the mother of "three braver boys than Hercules" (103-04) who also possess
strength superior to Typhon's children and will grow to "their father's age" (110) to "batter turrets with their manly fists" (111). Keeping with the accelerating passion of this symmetrical diatribe, Tamburlaine praises his own future queen. However, Tamburlaine (perhaps by necessity) argues for the incomparable quality of his own consort's beauty, in an identical hyperbolical manner. In a parison similar to his earlier panegyric to Zenocrate, Tamburlaine describes her beauty as being "fairer," "brighter," and "more pleasant" than pearl, the lamps of heaven, and sweet harmony, respectively.

When the lesser kings and the worthy wives have been treated, the two contending rulers face each other. Bajazeth begins by outlining the vast destruction which their confrontation entails as "thousands die: their slaughtered carcasses/Shall serve for walls and bulwarks to the rest" (138-39). Bajazeth continues to elaborate his vast power, comparing it to the many-headed Hydra which when "subdu'd, shall stand as mighty as before" (141). When he finishes, Tamburlaine counters these threats with those of his own. To parallel Bajazeth's description of "carcasses" Tamburlaine substitutes an even more bloody image of "bowels" being trampled by horses hooves. To counter Bajazeth's comparison of his power to the Hydra, Tamburlaine offers a comparison of his own host to the camp of Julius Caesar, a historical figure whose exploits suggest greater power than the mythological
monster Bajazeth has referred to. Tamburlaine then adds that, furthermore, his forces will be guided by "Legions of spirits fleeting in the air" to direct their swords and bullets.

The two warriors are then nearly alike in their central speeches, with Tamburlaine retaining a slight advantage in number of lines (16 to 14) and in degree of hyperbole. Other slight but significant differences in these speeches may be noted, differences which hint of the outcome of the forthcoming battle. Whereas Bajazeth has referred to the child-bearing capacity of his wife, Tamburlaine has focused on the beauty of Zenocrate, a quality which carries greater attractiveness. Also, Tamburlaine allies himself with the supernatural as Bajazeth limits himself to the strictly mythological. Finally, Tamburlaine's last speech ends on a greater exclamation with the rhyming couplet, whereas Bajazeth's speech has no rhetorical flourish at its end.

When Tamburlaine reenters shortly with the victory, his greatest threat has been overcome and his moment of greatest identification has arrived. Having begun earlier by resting his claim to lordship on his personal achievements, Tamburlaine has achieved what no man had done--rule more of the civilized world than any ruler before him. His claim to lordship rests on solid ground. Furthermore, his equating virtue and honor to the identical idea of achievement insures that he has acquired
the highest virtue and greatest honor afforded to any warrior-king of the time. Finally, his often claimed support by the natural and supernatural forces in the world has apparently been supported by the evidence of his successes. Tamburlaine, indeed, is the favored child of Jove, Mahomet, the spirits of the air. However, this moment of near unalloyed admiration is shortlived as the portrait of Tamburlaine begins, in succeeding scenes, to grow somewhat more complex.

Up to this point Tamburlaine’s rhetoric reflects these elements of his character and his achievements. Through his arguments from logos and ethos (inventio), his carefully arranged speeches (dispositio), and various amplifying devices (elocutio) such as hyperbole, extended similes, and various means of repetition, Tamburlaine’s own rhetoric parallels, reinforces, and to some extent causes his meteoric rise to fame and power. Through his early confrontations he has paid close attention to the relative power and accompanying rhetoric of each of the succeeding foes he has vanquished. Now, however, Tamburlaine’s view of himself and rhetoric changes as he begins to disregard the power of the rhetoric of his enemies and equate himself, his power and person, as greater than that of the gods.

It is interesting to compare the role of rhetoric from the first three acts to its use in the last two acts of the play. In the confrontations with Zenocrate,
Theridamus, Cosroe, and Bajazeth, Tamburlaine employs rhetoric to persuade and exhort others to act, as well as to threaten his enemies and predict the outcomes of battles. In all of these confrontations his rhetoric is carefully matched to the occasion, to the relative power and person of the audience. Nowhere is this better exemplified, as we have seen, than in the highly dialectical organization of the dialogue preparatory to combat with his most powerful enemy, Bajazeth.

In the last two acts, however, as the focus of the play changes, so does the role of rhetoric, not entirely, but enough to affect the heretofore complete identification with Tamburlaine. It is not as if Tamburlaine lacks great eloquence in the second half of the play; his panegyric to beauty, for example, stands as one of the drama's most significant speeches. What is notable, however, is the number of opportunities to speak that he passes up, an action which never occurred earlier.

When Bajazeth and Zabina, for example, curse him he sits silently, perhaps taking pleasure in their impotence. Certainly, they are powerless, and his exhortations and "persuasions patheticall" are not required; thus, in one sense his silence is understandable. Furthermore, it may be argued that the threatening and vengeful speeches that Bajazeth and his deposed empress utter are merely another of the various set speeches required by the dramaturgy of the day. Indeed, Wolfgang Clemen includes this type of
oration under the heading of the emotional set speech, by far the largest group of set speeches (50-52). However, he later explains that "the set speeches [in Tamburlaine as distinct from the earlier plays] are unified with something in the play--in this case, character" (114). It is their comments on character that make Bajazeth's and Zabina's orations in their captivity so compelling.

This is the first time that Tamburlaine is silent in the face of criticism from those who have significant judgments to pronounce both on him and on life itself. Bajazeth and Zabina, who have no political or military power left, nevertheless offer more than mere ill-spirited curses of bitter vanquished enemies. Their sufferings are those of fallen potentates who have played by the harsh rules, and having lost, begin to turn to ideas that their lives had not included. This view of the vanquished does not coincide with the interpretation that Tamburlaine's victims "are not seen as suffering humanity but as steps in the grand scheme of inevitable rise" (Bradbrook, Conventions 134). In this alternate view, even the suffering of the Virgins of Damascus is not apparent as they become "a set of innocent white dummies, without sticky blood like Duncan's" (133).

First, Tamburlaine has Bajazeth placed in a cage only to be taken out to be his human footstool. Bajazeth and Zabina respond to these indignities with the appropriate curses and threats that portray their understandable anger.
at this treatment. Here, Marlowe has followed the formula for the emotional set speech of the vengeance type. Hence, there is little shift of sympathy from Tamburlaine to Bajazeth. However, near the end of the footstool scene, Bajazeth begins to make another kind of comment that will resonate throughout the rest of the play in his last speeches as well as in the speeches of other characters who feel that Tamburlaine has overstepped the boundaries of right or natural behavior. Bajazeth predicts, "Ambitious pride shall make thee fall as low" (4.2.76) as Bajazeth himself has fallen. While Bajazeth still attributes this impending fall as following from Tamburlaine's "treading on the back of Bajazeth" (line 77), the cause and effect relationship between Tamburlaine's emerging reckless hubris and his fate has been set forth.

Here as elsewhere, Tamburlaine responds that he will retain his newfound titles, conquer all foes, and "will maintain it against a world of kings" (line 81). I think that what Bajazeth is suggesting does not involve a defeat at the hands of any king, but a fall through a form of self-destruction tracing to a character flaw.

What Bajazeth suggests is reinforced by Zenocrate's expressed concerns as well. She expresses sorrow for the those who have guiltlessly died at Tamburlaine's hands, and extends this to anxiety for Tamburlaine's fate which she feels may be disastrous because of what Anippe calls
his "ruthless cruelty" (5.1.346). Zenocrate, furthermore, views the bodies of Bajazeth and Zabina as an emblem of what the future may hold for Tamburlaine himself. Looking at their corpses, she moans, "Behold the Turk and his great emperess" (5.1.354), and in a 25 line speech repeats this line three times. By this repetition, Zenocrate focusses attention on the bodies of the pair as emblematic, an indicator of what must result from Tamburlaine's practices.

Other language reinforces Zenocrate's concern with the results of Tamburlaine's actions. Her metaphorical description of "fickle empery" (line 352), "slippery crowns" (line 356), and the "wavering turns of war" (line 360) all point to the tenuous nature of earthly power as well as to her fears that Tamburlaine has not exhibited any awareness of his human limitations.

Tamburlaine pays little attention either to the curses of the fallen or to Zenocrate's womanly (and thus weak) anxieties. Her arguments stem from pathos, or appeals to emotion, which to Tamburlaine paled in comparison to his world of will, character, and fact. Understandably, a short time later he boasts to Zenocrate, "I glory in the curses of my foes" (4.4.28). And he offers a justification for this unconcern: "Having the power from the empyreal heaven/To turn them all upon their proper heads" (29-30). This idea is the familiar one of his special alliance with the supernatural powers.
However, there are problems with this argument which Tamburlaine's new view of himself creates, problems that simply did not exist earlier. In his rise to power, Tamburlaine has always portrayed himself as protected by Jove who "will stretch his hand from heaven" to shield him from harm (1.2.180). He has stated that the Persian crown "which gracious stars have promised from my birth" (1.2.91) has been guaranteed him as being "nature's pride and richest furniture" (1.2.156). Again, to Cosroe, Tamburlaine maintains that "fates and oracles have sworn/To royalize the deeds of Tamburlaine" (2.3.7-8). These statements reflect his attitude toward the supernatural forces in the beginning of his illustrious career. Now, however, a new attitude has begun to emerge which points up the illogic of his unconcern toward the curses of his foes. Once he did believe that the power was given to him by the powerful gods; now, however, he has begun to see himself as vying with the gods for power. He explains to Zenocrate who has asked Tamburlaine to raise his siege of Damascus, "Zenocrate, were Egypt Jove's own land/Yet would I with my sword make Jove to stoop" (4.4.75-76). His contributory kings are divided in their attitude toward this new conception of Tamburlaine's nature. When Tamburlaine offers his dagger to Bajazeth to kill Zabina for food, Theridamus wonders whether "Mahomet will suffer this" (line 53). Techelles answers without any hesitation, "Tis like he will, when he cannot let it"
(line 54). It is the attitude of Theridamus that lends support to Bajazeth's growing sympathy. But Tamburlaine has no ears or eyes for his own growing recklessness. Indeed, he emphasizes his new relation to the gods in his triumphal scene after the defeat of the Soldan of Egypt:

Jove, viewing me in arms, looks pale and wan
Fearing my power should pull him from his
throne.
(5.1.452-53)

Allied with this new conception of his power is an investment of Tamburlaine with the characteristics of fate and fortune. For example, Tamburlaine's notion of honor now includes such characteristics as irreversibility, and his control over the forces of life and death equate him with Fate itself. When the Virgins arrive to make their plea for mercy, Tamburlaine remarks lightly: "What, are the turtles frayed out of their nests?" (5.1.64) After their plea has been made, Tamburlaine refers them to "my servant Death" (5.1.117), as they are led away he explains that they should have known that "my customs are as peremptory/ As wrathful planets, death, or destiny" (5.1.126-27). When the Virgins slaughtered carcasses are strung up on the walls of Damascus, Tamburlaine has reached his darkest hour. Paradoxically, he is also in his brightest hour of achievement and power as his enemies have been defeated and his marriage to Zenocrate is forthcoming. Yet we see a Tamburlaine that has become
indifferent to Fortune's wheel, a force which he thinks he now can control. He also believes that he may rule the gods. These ideas lead him to a new attitude toward others' rhetoric, a rhetoric which undercuts his own reckless self-enhancement in the final two acts. Furthermore, that Tamburlaine's darkest deeds coincide with his highest achievements are testimonials to Marlowe's dialectical arrangement of the materials of this drama. The resulting complexity has understandably inspired a variety of response. The questions remain to plague critics today.

How are we to view Tamburlaine ultimately? Have his most recent attitudes and actions violated that earlier amplification and complete identification? Whom the gods wish to ruin, one remembers, they first make mad. At the end of the play, which is an apparent celebration of complete victory, there is still the feeling that Tamburlaine might have overstepped his bounds by violating his central practice of paying close heed to the powers about him as well as to their rhetoric (at least when their power requires it). In this regard, the predictions of Bajazeth combined with that pair's onstage suicide serve to undercut an unalloyed identification with the protagonist. Furthermore, while the virgins do not have military power to command attention to their rhetoric, they have another kind of power which their highly organized rhetorical efforts reflects: the power of their
innocence. Here again Tamburlaine's identification loses some of its completeness, as the audience must begin to wonder not so much whether Tamburlaine will succeed but just how far he plans to go. Certainly he grows in stature, growing more terrible as he threatens to take over even the heavens from Jove. Yet, the reality and military power which he creates with his own rhetoric come to be allied with the notion that he can defy the power of everything under and above the sun: even the gods themselves. Certainly, a Renaissance audience concerned with the removal of old limits, must view the ending of Tamburlaine I with greater anticipation, and unresolved conflict, than they viewed the demise of Mycetes, Cosroe, Bajazeth, and the Sultan of Egypt. What will happen to such a character who can successfully defy the powers greater than man must be the central concern of part two of the play.\textsuperscript{15}

Tamburaine's successes directly relate to his eloquence as Marlowe manipulates the materials of the five part classical rhetoric to present a hero who is capable of transcending limits and transforming reality. Tamburlaine's language is unique to him and distinctly contrasts with those who oppose him. This uniqueness is reflected in that the sources of his arguments and devices relate primarily to the realm of logic (logos) and character of speaker (ethos), whereas those who make the most impression on Tamburlaine-- Zenocrate and the Virgins
of Damascus—as well as the weaker of his foes base their speeches on appeals to emotion (pathos). The more powerful foes who attempt a rhetoric similar to Tamburlaine's do not speak with the same authority as he does because their hyperbole, exhortations, and predictions of future outcomes are not as extravagant and ultimately are not fulfilled. Ultimately, however, it is not the relation of this "figure of romance" (Giamatti 537) to his enemies that is the central concern; rather, as Part Two will show, it is the relationship between Tamburlaine and those forces larger than mere mortals to which he aspires that will reveal the final word on Tamburlaine himself.
Chapter Two:
"If wordes might serve": Tamburlaine II

In Tamburlaine I the protagonist's rhetoric foretells and fulfills the military and political progress he makes as he effortlessly wades from one success to another. Tamburlaine's language is the summit of his achievement as he proves more than a match for every situation he encounters, though the power of successive foes increases. The shepherd-king gathers his wealth, enlists powerful followers, overcomes foes, and ultimately wins the love of a beautiful princess. And though the rhetoric of Bajazeth and Zabina as well as some of Zenocrate's eloquent moments all work to place limited qualifications on Tamburlaine's attractiveness, Part One concludes with the celebration of his incredible achievements in the marriage of ruler to princess. The case is different in the second part of the play, however.

Writing of Tamburlaine II, Christopher Leech has said, "In place of the explicit moral lesson, [Marlowe] aimed almost consistently at inducing a double response" (68). That is, he believes that Marlowe creates a complex protagonist who both inspires identification and elicits condemnation. Leech's appraisal takes a moderate position on what has become a much debated critical issue, namely the basic problem of "determining what attitude the audience is to adopt toward the protagonist" (R. Levin 63
Levin finds that the answers that have been recently proposed show a wide diversity and a great deal of disagreement. These answers range "all the way from wholehearted admiration to equally wholehearted condemnation, with a number of intermediate positions" (51). At one extreme Tamburlaine is the Promethean hero who achieves, conquers, brings order, and aspires to unchartered limits. At the other he is the Icarian fool whose ventures beyond the limits prescribed by God, natural law, or Elizabethan convention set him up for a deserved fall.

The changing patterns of Tamburlaine's rhetoric from Part One to Part Two, particularly his rhetoric in relation to other characters in the second half of the play, reflect the doubleness that has created problems of interpretation. In Part Two, Tamburlaine's Promethean image grows as his military successes continue with the growth of his kingdom. Furthermore, his rhetoric at these encounters matches the language he used earlier with similar success in battles with men such as Mycetes or the Soldan. Moreover, in his speeches to his generals and his sons his rhetoric echoes the success of his earlier eloquence. Finally, as we will see, at times Tamburlaine employs a new language of pathos which may also contribute to his portrayal as a Promethean hero.

However, with Calyphas in particular we will see a significant difference in response to Tamburlaine's
hyperbolic rhetoric, and the Icarian image of the protagonist creeps in. In addition to the problem of Calyphas' reaction to Tamburlaine's eloquence, there is Tamburlaine's handling of Zenocrate's death. Her death presents Tamburlaine with his first insurmountable obstacle, and his response to it indicates both his strengths and limitations. Certainly, limitation was not an essential factor in Part One of the play. Finally, the persistent fact that other characters make use of the hyperbolic rhetoric with success separates the singlemost important trait of Tamburlaine's character in Part One from his portrayal in Part Two. This separation suggests some important ideas about how we interpret the career of the world conqueror. Hence, the changes in Tamburlaine's rhetoric, the response of others to that rhetoric, and the use of a similar hyperbolic language by other characters all complete the portrait of Tamburlaine as an Icarian figure.

Additionally, larger rhetorical elements, such as Arrangement, reveal changes that enhance the Icarian image of the protagonist. That is, both rhetorical and structural elements work to diminish the already established identification while not undercutting the central character entirely. To begin with, there are simple structural parallels between the two parts of Tamburlaine which underscore the essential differences between the plays. For example, the opening scenes of both
plays present characters who are having some conflict with Tamburlaine. Through their dialogue, the audience is prepared for his arrival. The encounter between Mycetes and Cosroe in Part One exposes both the necessity of responding to the usurper Tamburlaine as well as Mycetes' inability to find the resources to handle the situation adequately. Tamburlaine's powerful presence necessitates this meeting as well as precipitates Mycetes' anxiety. In Part Two, however, the ongoing war between the Christians and the Turks is the prime reason for the scene, and Tamburlaine himself is at a greater distance from this focal point. Thus, the basic structural similarity between the two plays points out a difference in the handling of focus on the central protagonist. Whereas nearly every line in the first play brings attention to the person of Tamburlaine, the initial scene in the second part shows that new concerns will diminish Tamburlaine's centrality as they focus attention elsewhere.

Another element of Arrangement is the parallel of the death of Calyphas in Tamburlaine II with the death of Agydas in the earlier play. Both of these characters die because they represent forces antithetical to Tamburlaine's purposes. Similarly, the deaths of Agydas and Calyphas raise doubts about the rightness of Tamburlaine's power. Just as important though are the differences in the two situations. Agydas takes his own life after Tamburlaine merely sends him a threatening
look, thus accentuating the terrible but grandiose power
of Tamburlaine. In the murder of Calyphas, however,
Tamburlaine is himself taking the life of his own son who
is not allowed to speak in his own behalf.

Calyphas, who has already expressed his distaste for
combat and military achievements, is silenced but his
words still exist to undermine the authority of
Tamburlaine.

In a third structural similarity, the treatment of
the captured concubines parallels the handling of the
Virgins in Part One. Both groups of women are subject to
Tamburlaine's authority, and in both cases Tamburlaine
dispenses certain doom to the women. However, there is a
tenderness that is heroic in his first responses to the
Virgins that is absent when he tells his soldiers to do
what they will with the concubines. Moreover, the pleas
of the Virgins elicit an extended response, while a
similar plea for the concubines goes completely ignored.

A similar extension of Tamburlaine's cruelty occurs
when the kings are made to pull his chariot with "Holla ye
pampered jades of Asia/What can ye draw but twenty miles a
day?" (4.3.1-2). This scene parallels two scenes in
Tamburlaine I as Bajazeth is forced to become a footstool
and also to reside in a cage prepared for him by
Tamburlaine's men. The spectacle of the king-powered
carriage, more dramatic than the appearance of a king in
jail, reinforces a key difference between the two plays.
By degree, Tamburlaine extends his domination over those he defeats in battle. Mere defeat is no longer sufficient; new forms of humiliation become a necessary part of the formula of their treatment.

Thus, by diverting some of the attention from Tamburlaine elsewhere and by extending Tamburlaine's cruelty, Marlowe is handling his central protagonist differently. In addition to these structural components which serve to enhance the Icarian portrayal of Tamburlaine, Tamburlaine's language in relation to other characters presents ample evidence with an identical result. In several places during Zenocrate's death scene, for example, Tamburlaine's rhetoric exhibits some marked differences from the language he used in Part One. This speech, which combines panegyric and lamentation, uses many of the same rhetorical figures as those employed in Tamburlaine I, but the overall tone is different. Additionally, for the first time, Tamburlaine exposes vulnerability as he encounters a foe he cannot defeat with words or actions, and for the first time his rhetoric of command begins to sound strained.

Heretofore, his powers have been more than adequate to gain his ends. Indeed, in the beginning of Part Two as his generals offer their newly obtained crowns to Tamburlaine in deference to his power, Tamburlaine appears invincible as ever (1.3). Yet, in the approaching death of Zenocrate, Tamburlaine faces his first insurmountable
obstacle, and the audience witnesses the manner in which he deals with this new type of enemy. At first sight Tamburlaine appears not to have changed at all when he speaks with hyperbole, associating Zenocrate with the heavenly powers:

Black is the beauty of the brightest day;
The golden ball of heaven’s eternal fire
That danc’d with glory on the silver waves
Now wants the fuel that inflam’d his beams.

(2.2.1-4)

Through alliteration and antithesis of light and dark imagery Tamburlaine has reinforced the difference between the extraordinary beauty of Zenocrate and her inherent superiority to things divine. Characteristically, however, Tamburlaine links himself and his beloved with the natural forces and with supernatural beings who control them. For the moment, Zenocrate’s powers win out over the forces in nature. Through prosopopoeia Tamburlaine ascribes actions and human traits to the inanimate objects in nature, as they lose their powers in the face of Zenocrate’s death. That is, Zenocrate’s approaching death has had cosmic consequences: the luminous natural beauty of day has dimmed with her waning and the sun itself has lost its brightness. Furthermore, it appears that Zenocrate’s beauty has provided the “fuel” for the brightness of the sunbeams in the first place.

She is all light and is antithetical to the darkness which
her death has brought about: her eyes shoot light from their Ivory bowers (l. 9).

Paradoxically, the same forces with which she has been linked have brought about her ruin, according to Tamburlaine’s reasoning:

Now by the malice of the angry skies,
Whose jealousy admits no second mate,
Draws in the comfort of her latest breath,
All dazzled with the hellish mists of death.

(1l. 11-14)

Attracted by her beauty and desirous of possessing her for themselves, the "skies" (or fate) have determined that she must have no one but themselves. Tamburlaine, as second mate, loses her to the jealous and possessive forces of the heavens. It is ironic that while Zenocrate fuels the beauty of the skies, in taking her from earth, the skies lose some of their own power and "fuel." By taking her, they make themselves weak.

These lines reveal both something old and something new in Tamburlaine’s use of language. First, he is adept at relating everything in the world and above it to himself and his own concerns. How completely he does this has been seen repeatedly throughout Tamburlaine I. He has expressed his understanding of himself as the right hand of Jove, as God’s scourge, as allied with the gods and supernatural forces in general. Ultimately, what he wills corresponds to the intent of the cosmic forces. Thus,
when he allies Zenocrate with the beauty of the skies, in one sense, he is saying nothing startlingly new. However, for the first time Tamburlaine views cosmic forces as working against his objectives and personal desires. He makes the twin realizations, or rather the situation forces the discoveries upon him: that forces are outside his control and that those powers may work against him.5

The last twenty lines of this speech reflect Tamburlaine's eloquent attempt to impose order on this apparently unacceptable idea. I say unacceptable because here, once again, Tamburlaine resorts to the highly ornate language of rhetoric, perhaps this time as an attempt to harmonize Zenocrate's impending death with the natural order of things and thus to create order out of the disorder he perceives. Using division and progression, Tamburlaine describes the effects Zenocrate's person will have on the inhabitants of heaven. Consisting of six parts, each section concludes with an identical refrain: "To entertain divine Zenocrate."6 Having allowed that the jealousy of the gods is what has prompted them to take Zenocrate, Tamburlaine reconstructs the meaning of her demise. That is, heaven is taking her from a "loathsome earth" (1. 19) to give her glory and honor up above. Furthermore, all the beings are to take note of her presence there. Apollo and Cynthia, even the crystal springs which run through the heavens, are to entertain his Zenocrate. Tamburlaine's joy at her entry into and
her effects upon heaven overcome his sense of loss for a moment. In fact, there is, for once, a deep reverence and a loss of self "in contemplation of the harmony of the universe. Instead of approximating the cosmos to aggrandize his identity, Tamburlaine envisages for a moment atonement with God through Zenocrate" (Barber 21). This desire for being at one with the forces in the universe is best seen in the closing of this speech:

> And in this sweet and curious harmony,
> The god that tunes this music to our souls
> Holds out his hand in highest majesty
> To entertain divine Zenocrate. (11. 30-33)

Divakaruni suggests that this speech does not fit into any rhetorical category, the deliberative or the exhortation speech, that Tamburlaine uses so often in the first play (85). However, it does fit partially into the demonstrative rhetoric used in praising a noble person and describing his worthiness. But the demonstrative speech had to include a discussion of the person before, during, and after this life, and this speech includes only the third. Thus, Tamburlaine is expressing elements of a new rhetoric, including as he does, a new, although momentary, attitude toward the natural order.

For this brief moment Tamburlaine does not challenge the order in Promethean fashion, nor does he recklessly attempt to transcend the limits in the Icarian style. Rather, during his inner struggle over the loss of
Zenocrate he becomes more human, a mortal who is most sympathetic when he faces his greatest weakness with a yearning for oneness with the larger forces in the universe. This key moment, when Tamburlaine exposes his vulnerability, links with the language of a similar dramatic moment at the end of the play when Tamburlaine faces his own death, but for now the change in rhetoric is about to be abandoned as Tamburlaine shortly returns to his former self.

By the end of this speech, the "magic moment" will be gone, and we will return to the world of Tamburlaine as military rhetorician. Hence, Tamburlaine must soon resume the rhetoric of command. After Zenocrate reveals that she senses an "enforc´d and necessary change" (line 46) coming over her, Tamburlaine loses or rejects his vision of heavenly harmony with, "May never such a change transforme my love" (2.4.47). About to assume the rhetoric of command, he speaks for the last time here as the mortal man who needs the woman he adores. Returning to his original idea of her as bringing light to the world, he beseeches her for his own needs to live "and so conserve my life, Or dying, be the author of my death" (2.4.55-56). The polyptoton-- live/life; dying/death--underscores the bond that exists between Tamburlaine and Zenocrate. Tamburlaine touchingly sees their lives as so entwined that the loss of one will inevitably lead to the other's demise.
In *Tamburlaine I* the protagonist's confidence is overwhelming; when his men face Bajazeth's army, they also face death as Zenocrate does here. But in the earlier play there is no possibility of death or defeat for Tamburlaine. His speech which closes the confrontation with Bajazeth ends with "Fight all courageously and be you kings; I speake it, and my words are oracles (3.3.101-02)."

His last words in the speech on Zenocrate's deathbed, however, contain a telltale difference. That certainty is lacking; this fact is revealed in the use of "or" (line 56). His purpose is still persuasion, but the effects are different. The rhetoric here in Part Two underscores Tamburlaine's mortality, whereas it earlier had highlighted his control over these forces. Thus, his word is not always reflective of reality, nor does it create a new reality; rather, he is subject to forces beyond his control. The language is devoted more to an imaginative vision than a transformation of existing reality. Hence, the last part of the scene shows Tamburlaine's limitations as he attempts to cope with a situation beyond his control.

Strangely, however, this part of the scene does not necessarily undermine an identification with him as the central protagonist of the drama. Tamburlaine's suffering, nowhere else better expressed, may elicit a sympathetic response. As the audience sees his vulnerability, the revelation of the depth of his love and
need for Zenocrate overcomes the attendant weakness. Whereas he has won identification through his eloquence and power before, now he gains sympathy through his eloquent powerlessness in the face of Zenocrate's death.

What does undermine the identification with Tamburlaine here occurs when he resumes a futile rhetoric of command as Zenocrate's death nears. Tamburlaine's growing anger is evident after Zenocrate beseeches him to let her die peacefully and with resignation. He responds to her request with growing wrath as the early Tamburlaine would:

Proud fury and intolerable fit
That dares torment the body of my love,
And scourge the scourge of the immortal God!

(11. 78-80)

This anger soon gives way to threats he makes against the heavens as his earlier vision of heavenly harmony dissipates. Speaking to his faithful Theridamus, Tamburlaine instructs him to

Raise cavalieros higher than the clouds,
And with the cannon break the frame of heaven;
Batter the shining palace of the sun,
And shiver all the starry firmament,
For amorous Jove hath snatch'd my love from hence.

(11. 103-07)

Tamburlaine thus graphically outlines what he wishes to
do, but in impotence is unable to accomplish. His ambivalent attitude toward the powers that guide the universe is evident in the sexual jealousy expressed toward "amorous Jove," who has presumably taken Zenocrate to make her one of his own lovers. While his grief, perhaps even his rage, is understandable, now his threats ring hollow. For once, the rhetoric which marks his unsurpassed powers does not match the reality which he proposes. The rhetoric is similar to that which he has employed with success—the hyperbolic images are there as he would "break," "batter," and "shiver" the heavens. He again places himself on the equal footing with the powers that be in exhibiting a disregard for their omnipotence. However, the result is not the same. Now, Tamburlaine has become one whose powers are not a match for the situation. He is only an angry mortal railing against those forces beyond his personal control. In short, his aspirations do not match his rhetoric, and Tamburlaine's limitations become plain. He is no longer the transformer of new realities, but only the frustrated man filled with empty threats against a universe over which he has no power—in short, a man who has encountered his limits but recklessly vows that he can transcend them.

Theridamus himself recognizes this Icarian foolishness when he encourages Tamburlaine to realize that "all this raging cannot make her live" (line 120). He goes further, indeed, when his own hyperbolical assertions
place the first limitation upon language in either of the two plays:

If words might serve, our voice hath rent the air;
If tears, our eyes have watered all the earth;
If grief, our murdered hearts have strain'd forth blood.

Nothing prevails, for she is dead, my lord.

(11. 121-24)

As Theridamus has explained, nothing (not words, tears, or grief) has the power equal to death. Tamburlaine's response to this wisdom acts to undermine further an identification with him. First, he denies her death ("yet let me think she lives") by proposing to encase the corpse in gold and carry it with him wherever he goes. Furthermore, any sympathy he might win with this touching sentiment, Tamburlaine next undercuts with his vehement desire to raze the town they are near simply because Zenocrate has died there. This act of destruction does not relate to any glorious military conquest; rather, he now acts out of frustration. Tamburlaine has no power to conquer death, but he has it in his power to destroy humanity, and this desire for increasing ruthless destruction is what primarily characterizes him and his rhetoric in Part Two.

A significant difference from Tamburlaine's speeches in *Tamburlaine I* is his employment of his existing power
and the diminishing use of the exhortation as means to
greater achievement. In the first play, Tamburlaine
manipulates a grand rhetoric to inspire his followers to
feats that bring him new titles and territories. Here, in
Tamburlaine II the exhortation has largely vanished.
Rather, the language of exhortation and persuasion is
employed by other characters—Orcanes and Sigismund, or
Callapine and Almeda, for example. The emphasis on
"shall" and "will" as predominant verbs is now adopted by
Orcanes as he predicts the downfall of the Christian
forces (1.1.34,38,40). The verbal devices of repetition
such as parison and isocolon also appear in Orcanes’
speeches when, for example, he repeatedly reminds
Sigismund of his vast powers:

Forgett’st thou that I am he

. . .

Forgett’st thou that I sent the shower of darts,

. . .

Forgett’st thou that to have me raise my siege.

(1.1.86,91,98)

Furthermore, he employs Aristotle’s enthymeme, the
argument by transfer of authority when he identifies
himself with Jove, as Tamburlaine has so often done. This
gaining of power by association, also the mark of Orcanes’
rhetoric, was once the sole province of Tamburlaine’s
language. Even Bajazeth never identified himself with
heavenly powers as Orcanes does (1.1.98-101).
Notwithstanding the similarities of the rhetoric, the impact of the speech on Orcanes's audience significantly differs from the result of Tamburlaine's speeches in Part One. Sigismund, who has felt the force of this rhetoric, promptly breaks the pact between the Muslims and Christians which was designed by the two leaders to enhance their power to fight Tamburlaine together. Thus, the same hyperbolic rhetoric of exhortation and persuasion which was used so successfully by Tamburlaine has lost its powerful force, now being employed as a language of deception and empty bravado. In Tamburlaine I Marlowe had created an identification for his protagonist through the hyperbolical language used exclusively by the hero as his words created a new reality. Now, however, if Tamburlaine is to be seen as the Promethean hero, it will not be through the exclusive use of a transcendent rhetoric, for it is apparent that Marlowe has invested others with a similar rhetoric though with different effects. Indeed, Marlowe's use of rhetoric is never static, and has changed even from Part One to Two of the same play.

One could argue that Orcanes is no Tamburlaine, and that only Tamburlaine can effectively use this type of language successfully. However, the success of that idea depends upon severing Tamburlaine from his potent rhetoric and ascribing his early successes to something other than his language. Certainly Tamburlaine's presence, as described to Cosroe in Part One, contributed to his
success as did his military prowess; however, the single most important factor contributing to his success was the eloquence that Theridamus referred to as having "won him with his wordes." Besides, the rhetoric of exhortation and persuasion is used with success by others in Part Two.

In a speech that is reminiscent of Tamburlaine's speech to Theridamus, Callapine, the son of Bajazeth, slyly intimates to his jailor that "were [he] now but half so eloquent/ To paint in words what I´ll perform in deeds/I know thou would´st depart from hence with me" (1.2.9-11). Then he promptly proceeds to convince his jailor to release him by a skillful manipulation of the elements of the exhortation as set forth by Thomas Wilson: the hope of reward, renown, and glory being the principle means to effect persuasion of the jailor. Hence, Callapine manipulates the same topics, figures, and techniques that Tamburlaine had used earlier. Ultimately, this demonstration of rhetorical power relates to Tamburlaine himself as rhetoric's power is divorced from the person of Tamburlaine himself and comes to exist in its own right as capable of being employed by the person who can master its elements successfully. This separation of rhetorical power and Tamburlaine himself indirectly serves to undermine an unalloyed identification with Tamburlaine. While not going so far as to maintain that the speech undermines Tamburlaine, J.B. Steane has allowed that this scene "unfreezes the officialdom of speech"
Hence, the more democratic employment of eloquence does result in the separation from Tamburlaine's character of what had once belonged to him entirely.

Another type of language emerges in *Tamburlaine II* which also serves to circumscribe Tamburlaine's once unlimited powers. While even Tamburlaine's enemies attempted to employ a rhetoric similar to the world conqueror, here in Part Two Calyphas's language takes a different approach. The language of Calyphas provides a direct contrast to the rhetoric of his father. Calyphas, who speaks without hyperbole in a straightforward, almost prosaic manner, may recall the inability of Mycetes to present effectively himself and his concerns. However, Tamburlaine responds to Mycetes's efforts with laughter, whereas Calyphas elicits anger and even rage from Tamburlaine. While the difference is striking and may even suggest a diminishment of the rhetorical power of Tamburlaine's language, Calyphas is definitely not a powerful antithetical force in this play. Rather, he acts primarily as another of the effeminate, weaker characters (like Mycetes). Nevertheless, it remains true that Tamburlaine's rhetoric does create immediate effects on everyone in these plays except for Calyphas. Mycetes quakes after stumbling upon the Scythian shepherd, but Calyphas expresses a comic disregard for his father's words. In fact, Calyphas' language has more of an effect on Tamburlaine. Tamburlaine spends a great deal of time
and effort instructing his sons in the rudiments of war, and his greatest exhortatory efforts involve the scenes in which he is doing this. Unfortunately, while his eloquence makes a deep impression on Amyras and Celebinus, Calyphas has a different response. Similar to Calyphas' earlier statement to Tamburlaine that "You have won enough for me to keep," (1.3.68), Calyphas now responds to the lengthy 40 line speech of Tamburlaine with:

My lord, but this is dangerous to be done;
We may be slain or wounded ere we learn.

(3.3.93-94)

It is not accidental, I think, that the first to respond after Tamburlaine's eloquent exhortation is Calyphas, as his comments reveal, for the first time in both plays, a starkly different response to Tamburlaine's efforts at persuasion.

Denied the customary acquiescence, Tamburlaine feels driven to greater lengths to make his point. As had happened earlier at Zenocrate's deathbed, Tamburlaine's pride cannot abide a failure. Hence, he responds with greater wrath than at any other time in the plays:

Villain, art thou the son of Tamburlaine,
And fears't to die, or with a curtle axe
To hew thy flesh and make a gaping wound?

(3.3.95-97)

Whereupon Tamburlaine disdainfully demonstrates the proper attitude of the warrior by cutting his own arm and showing
the wound and dripping blood to his sons. This second speech runs to 35 lines of exhortation, wherein Tamburlaine offers hope of renown and glory to his amazed sons. His plea ends triumphantly with a question to which he apparently feels he has won the correct answer: "Now my boys what think you of a wound?" (line 129) While two sons respond enthusiastically by asking to have Tamburlaine cut them, too, Calyphas is definitely not convinced; rather, he is once again the first son to respond to his father's rhetoric. His nonplussed and prosaic answer to the question suggests what little effect Tamburlaine's rhetoric has made: "I know not what I should think of it; methinks it is a pitiful sight" (line 131). Calyphas' responses to Tamburlaine's language undercut the omnipotence of his rhetorical power. Before, Tamburlaine's exhortatory speeches had always led up to a climax followed by the appropriate humble response. Here, however, Calyphas' words provide an anticlimax to the exhortation and ultimately render Tamburlaine's own rhetoric impotent, not omnipotent. Yet Calyphas is himself no permanent obstacle to Tamburlaine. When Tamburlaine interrupts Calyphas' cardplaying and executes him for his lack of participation in battle, it is not accidental that Calyphas dies without the opportunity to deliver any more prosaic, undermining remarks. Hence, the rhetorical force which Calyphas represents is finally weaker than Tamburlaine's own as Calyphas dies speechless.
Nevertheless, the point has been made that Calyphas' speech and his attitude toward the speech of Tamburlaine are sufficiently strong to resist the eloquence of his own father, whereas no one could resist his eloquence before. Additionally, the fact that Tamburlaine must resort to wrath and finally to the murder of his own son testify to his weakness (or at least to a changing use of eloquence by Marlowe) rather than to his strength.

The killing of his son is not the only sign of the extremity to which Tamburlaine is willing to go. The strain of Tamburlaine's hyperbole shows up clearly when he threatens the gods after the death of Zenocrate, for example. Furthermore, in his predictions of the future destinies for those who have betrayed him, a special vehemence emerges which he expresses to the jailor who has released Callapine (3.5.117-28). Tamburlaine's language here grows even more graphic in its depiction of the grotesque as he describes Almeda's certain demise. Whether cast from a rock, tortured until his seared flesh falls from his body, or racked on the wheel until all of his joints crack, Almeda will pay for his betrayal of Tamburlaine. The passionate tone of this description is almost an echo of Tamburlaine's earlier wrath with his son when Calyphas likewise betrays an expectation that Tamburlaine possesses for him. Almeda, having betrayed Tamburlaine's trust, inspires a similar reaction. The Tamburlaine of Part One is always confident in
confrontations with enemies and with his limitless self-assertiveness, and perhaps not accidentally he is never betrayed. However, in Part Two, when he faces certain treachery, Tamburlaine's language is not marked by the same calm self-assurance but instead with increasing wrath and cruelty—signs, I think, that Marlowe is handling the hero somewhat differently.

Perhaps the most powerful scene which circumscribes Tamburlaine's power occurs when Tamburlaine abuses the Koran. Nowhere does Tamburlaine's rhetoric go farther in his vehement hyperbole than here when he has the Koran burned, calling them "superstitious books" (5.1.172). Here, Tamburlaine defies the word of the Islamic God in its most holy form as he asserts his invulnerability to this god. Threatening Mahomet directly, Tamburlaine challenges:

Now Mahomet, if thou have any power,
Come down thyself and work a miracle.
Thou art not worthy to be worshipped
That suffers flames of fire to burn the writ
Wherein the sum of thy religion rests.

(5.1.185-89)

J. B. Steane maintains that this speech is Tamburlaine's most boastful and hyperbolic speech of both plays (122). The earlier attacks on the ancient gods of Greece or Rome were not so impertinent as this one on the God of a living religion.
However, the issue of identification and undercutting grows more complex after the direct challenge. First, the Elizabethan audience, belonging as it did to the Christian tradition, may not have viewed this attack on Islam as blasphemy; thus, the criticism of the Islamic God need not be interpreted as contributing to the portrayal of Tamburlaine as Icarus. However, when Tamburlaine becomes "suddenly distempered" (line 216), the proximity of the oath and the beginning of Tamburlaine's final sickness does raise the question of retribution, and not retribution sent by a Christian God but by an Islamic one.

While Paul Kocher argues that retribution cannot be implied here since it would "signalize a triumph for Mahomet as against Tamburlaine's semi-Christian loyalty" (90), many critics have interpreted them as causally related. Clifford Leech, who sees Tamburlaine's mortal illness as the result of the blasphemous burning of the Koran, says that Marlowe "discreetly invited us to entertain its possibility" (46).

Certainly, evidence which identifies Tamburlaine with the Muslim religion strengthens the idea that he is operating in a Muslim universe. First, the hero's own references to Mahomet suggest his identification with that religion. He swears "by sacred Mahomet" (1.4.109), "by Mahomet" (4.1.121), and mentions the "tears of Mahomet" (4.1.197). Furthermore, the historical Tamburlaine was at least nominally a Muslim. However, complicating this
particular issue in typical Marlovian fashion is the fact that Tamburlaine is tolerant of other monotheistic religions, as for example, when he shows compassion for the Christian slaves in Part Two. Furthermore, throughout both plays he invariably swears by (and at) the deities of Rome, especially the most powerful like Jove, Saturn, and Mars. Thus, by "generally associating him with the mythology of classical Europe, Marlowe brings him closer to the Elizabethan audience than his adversaries are" (46). But this proximity may take him farther from an association of him with Muslim. Further complicating the situation is that all of Tamburlaine's references to Islam occur in the second part of the play when the audience has less sympathy for him. As Leech concludes, all this "makes it the more ironic that his mortal illness comes so quickly after his defying of Mahomet" (46). Thus, with respect to the issue of our hero's religious affiliation and more importantly, the identification of the God of the play, Marlowe has arranged the various elements to create a very complex mixture.

Nevertheless, the groundwork for this scene has apparently been laid early in the play. The idea of retribution occurs before Tamburlaine has fought a single battle in this part. After breaking his sacred promise as Christian to Orcanes, Sigmund proceeds to lose the following battle as his forces are destroyed. After the battle, Sigismund confesses that God has brought this upon
him as "vengeance" for his misdeeds, and Orcanes, who has prayed for such a response from God, heartily agrees. Thus, notwithstanding the difficulties with the idea of retribution, the proximate relation of the curse, the burning, and the sickness combined with the presence of the earlier retribution scene suggest that Tamburlaine is about to receive punishment for committing an unpardonable blasphemy. If this be the case, then Tamburlaine has certainly recklessly overstepped his legitimate bounds and precipitated his own demise.

Up to this point the evidence seems to argue for the Icarian portrait of the protagonist. The rhetorical response of Calyphas in conjunction with the two plays' structural parallels, Tamburlaine's resumption of the rhetoric of command after Zenocrate's death, the use of the hyperbolical language by other characters for deceptive purposes, and possibly Tamburlaine's defiance of Mahomet all combine to question any Promethean depiction of Tamburlaine in Part One. To an extent, the doubleness of response which Leech describes as Marlowe's *modus operandi* in this play does find expression in some of these elements of the play's language which serve to complicate an identification and/or undercutting with the hero. Certainly in Zenocrate's death scene, for example, Tamburlaine's yearning for oneness with universal forces counters his resumption of the hyperbolic rhetoric. Moreover, there is other evidence that suggests a vastly
different image of Tamburlaine.

In fact, the doubleness of response may even be weighted toward the Promethean side of the spectrum. When, for example, Tamburlaine takes the dagger and lances his own arm, it is notable that of his three sons two of them greet his action with a vast enthusiasm, even asking that he wound them, too. Similarly, they answer his challenge when he earlier exhorts them to put aside their effeminacy (presumably learned from their mother), and take on the manly arts of war (1.4.79-84). In scenes such as these we may feel that the Promethean Tamburlaine remains the dominant force in *Tamburlaine II*.

Another element which reinforces this idea is Tamburlaine's ability to withstand the rhetorical efforts of others as well as he could in Part One. He rejects the pleas of the Babylonian governor just as he had the cries of the Virgins in a similar situation. Furthermore, he remains eloquent and persuasive as he withstands the alternating boasts of his enemies: Callapine, Orcanes, Trebizon, and Soria (3.5). Indeed this scene freshly recalls the confrontations with Cosroe and Bajazeth as Tamburlaine assumes the imperial manner that characterizes him.

A third element which suggests a positive characterization of Tamburlaine is the fact that Tamburlaine's language reflects a self-conception that increasingly puts him on equal footing with the gods and
heavenly forces. At times this identification of himself with the universal forces is a harmonious one as when he transfers Jove's authority onto his own concerns:

Nor am I made arch-monarch of the world,
Crown'd and invested by the hand of Jove,
For deeds of bounty or nobility. (4.1.150-52)

Not for this type of deed has he been invested with power; rather, Tamburlaine fulfills the role that the gods have ascribed to him as

The scourge of God and terror of the world,
I must apply myself to fit those terms,
In war, in death, in blood, in cruelty,

(11. 153-55)

Thus, he is one whose evil the gods use to wipe out even greater evil on earth. In this capacity Tamburlaine justifies his own cruelty and sees himself as fulfilling a useful role. Insofar as this element finds emphasis, the characterization of Tamburlaine is neither Icarian nor Promethean, for he is in league with the gods.

However, in times of powerfully disturbing emotion another view of his relationship with the heavenly powers emerges. At these times Tamburlaine curses and threatens the supernatural with his own hyperbolical and vaunting rhetoric. As an extension of the powerful self-conception revealed in Part One, it is not inevitable that these boasts undermine Tamburlaine as Prometheus himself dared to counter the will and power of the gods. When
Tamburlaine stabs Calyphas, for example, Tamburlaine directs his angry thoughts to Jove who has sent him this effeminate brat of a son,

A form not meet to give that subject essence
Whose matter is the flesh of Tamburlaine,
Wherein an incorporeal spirit moves,
Made of the mould whereof thyself consists,
Which makes me valiant, proud, ambitious,
Ready to levy power against thy throne,
That I might move the turning spheres of heaven.

(4.1.112-18)

Here, the expostulation in this moment of incredible tension serves to underscore his definition of personal honor. Tamburlaine's description of himself as valiant, proud, and ambitious approximates the daring creativity of Prometheus himself. Indeed, one who is capable of such action might be able to assault the heavens with similar fury. In the same scene he manages to reassert his alliance with the gods when he vows to continue as scourge of the earth until he hears or sees a voice from Jove telling him to cease his efforts (4.1.199-201).

Similarly, when he speaks to the Governor of Babylon, Tamburlaine boasts that he has the power to "wake black Jove to crouch and kneel to me" (5.1.98). Here, again the boast is not juxtaposed with circumstances which expose his weakness but his strength. It is, as we have seen, only when such boasts are made in circumstances that
clarify the impossibility of their fulfillment that they point up the speaker's weakness.

Hence, there are many images and words of the fire-giver scattered throughout the play, but the best evidence for a Promethean view of Tamburlaine occurs during Tamburlaine's weakest moment--the impossibility of avoiding his own death. Of course, the various religious frameworks--Muslim, Christian, and Latin--have raised the question as to which God is functioning in this play. While the answer remains nebulous, it is certain that even the exceptional human being cannot forever remain beyond or above His supernatural power; for Tamburlaine the time to die has arrived. Ultimately, the rhetorical materials in his death scene clarify, in condensed form, the greatest of Tamburlaine's strengths even as his human limitations come into focus.

As before in Part Two, his weaknesses seem more apparent; for example, the arrangement (dispositio) of materials in this last scene shows a narrowing world laid out in shrinking concentric circles which match Tamburlaine's shrinking rhetoric. He addresses in chronological order first the gods, then death as a force, his foes, his sons, and finally the necessity of accepting his own death. Thus, beginning with the entire universe, he gradually narrows his focus to the immediate, and in the process reveals in miniature the influences for and against an identification with him.
After the three loyal generals have delivered their lamentations, Tamburlaine begins, as he is often wont, by threatening the gods: "What daring god torments my body thus,/ And seeks to conquer mighty Tamburlaine?" (5.3.42-43). This _erotema_ he answers for himself by telling Techelles and the rest to "take your swords/And threaten him whose hand afflicts my soul" (ll. 45-46). In similar fashion, Tamburlaine threatens to wage war against the gods (line 52), to pierce Atlas's breast (line 58), to bring down Jove himself to earth to heal him (line 62). However, these avowals are punctuated with irony. That is, the moment Tamburlaine has instructed Techelles to take up swords and set black streamers in the sky, Tamburlaine adds, "Ah, friends, what shall I do? I cannot stand" (line 51). The irony is heightened by the antithetical juxtaposition of the commanding order to march on the gods with the ensuing confession of helplessness.

Figures of _pathos_, especially paradox and antithesis, fill this speech. Hence, the rhetoric of power is replaced by a rhetoric with a strong emotional appeal. While the elements of _pathos_ have been used throughout parts one and two as signs of weakness, we nevertheless respond to Zenocrate's worries in Part One as we respond to Tamburlaine here at his death. _Pathos_ does replace _ethos_ in the final scene, but while it violates the earlier characterization of _pathos_ as weakness, it
nevertheless humanizes (and thus creates sympathy for) Tamburlaine. For in the final analysis it has always been a man that we have been viewing, not a god. If he must fall, it will be as a man that he has risen and as a man that he falls. His ethos which gave him strength is supported by a pathos which gives him emotional power and ultimately much sympathy. As Marlowe has invested other characters with the rhetoric of hyperbole, he has given Tamburlaine, at rare but dramatic moments, a rhetoric which employs the figures of pathos and characterizes the protagonist as poignantly human. While Marlowe's use of hyperbolic rhetoric has changed from Part One to Two in this new method of building identification for his central figure, what has remained the same is the fact that powerful sentiments are raised for his hero. In Part One the predominant feeling involved awe, and in crucial dramatic sections of this part of the play the feeling involves pity. The gradual shift from awe to pity parallels a concurrent rhetorical shift from hyperbole and exhortation to the elements of pathos as the central figure nears his certain fall.

In the next part of this scene, after Tamburlaine expresses his recurring desire to do battle with the gods, his thinking devolves to death. Here he expresses his awareness of a relationship with death that is new, more ambivalent to him. His earlier conception of death he expresses with
See where my slave, the ugly monster Death,  
Shaking and quivering, pale and wan for fear,  
Stands aiming at me with his murdering dart  

(11. 67-69)

Traditionally, Tamburlaine has always controlled death as he has controlled and directed everything else. Death has been his slave and servant, providing lessons in awe and fear for Tamburlaine's opponents. Now, however, the metaphor is unsuccessful as Death is stalking Tamburlaine, albeit fearfully. Still able to exert a degree of control, Tamburlaine looks Death away only to find that when he is not vigilant, Death approaches him again. Thus, like his ally/adversary relationship with the gods, so is a similar relationship with the universal force which will end his existence. But Death is no victory over a cruel and inhuman world conqueror; rather, Tamburlaine appears as the master though he is dying.

Narrowing his concerns even further, Tamburlaine next expresses his willingness to fight his remaining foes, one area in which he has always had the upper hand. A brief interlude in this death scene occurs as Tamburlaine is carried out to show his presence in his last battle, ultimately another victory. This victory suggests that battling others remains the proper sphere in which Tamburlaine may work successfully. In the outer realms of the gods and forces in the universe such as death, he is not masterful; however, in his confrontations with men on
the field of battle, he has been and remains the superior warrior. His repeated lamenting (parison) that he must die without conquering more of the known world ("And shall I die, and this unconquered?") suggests his acute awareness of the proper sphere of his endeavor as well as its incompleteness.

As the dispositio of Tamburlaine's concerns shows, Tamburlaine attempts success in all spheres of action, but he is ultimately successful only in the last. Even that success is circumscribed by the line of his territories and by the limit of his own natural existence. Thus, he looks to the future for comfort and for hope that his dream will be realized. Hence, the last series of lines he utters may be taken to apply to the future of his kingdom, and unfortunately, here lies another area which remains beyond his control. When Tamburlaine has his sons crowned, it is apparent that these boys will not be the man that their father is. The created impression is that their enthusiasm is not enough to maintain the kingdom which their father has established. Thus, the discrepancy between Tamburlaine's own satisfaction at his death and the likelihood that his kingdom will begin to weaken underscores his lack of control of reality.

Tamburlaine is discovering several severe limitations here in the last scene, and his appeal is being enhanced by his effective use of the elements of pathos. What further redeems an identification with him
and reaffirms his essential greatness of spirit is his manner of accepting his fate when the facts have become clear to him. His instructions to his sons include meditations on his own nobility:

Let not thy love exceed thine honour, son,
Nor bar thy mind that magnanimity
That nobly must admit necessity. (ll. 199-201)

There is much that Tamburlaine must ascribe to necessity in this scene: his inability to assault the gods, to keep off death, to expand his kingdom, to insure its survival for long past his death, to accept the fact of his own death and helplessness. After his first eruption of anger against the gods early in the scene, Tamburlaine’s hyperbolic predictions are silenced. There are no great exhortations; his instructions to his sons serve more as warnings against treachery than as inspirations to further achievement. When the repetitions, parisons, extravagant metaphors are all quieted by the approach of death, there remains a deep vein of stoical, understated strength in Tamburlaine’s character. He dies simply, leaving behind the grand rhetoric based upon the figures of logos and ethos, and even his latest use of the figures of pathos as well.

Through his career, he has expanded his kingdom and control through the "honour" of warring achievement as far as natural and supernatural forces will allow him to expand, and in the end admits nobly to necessity. It is
in his submission and acceptance that Tamburlaine expresses true greatness of spirit. His organization of his own death is calm and measured as he first removes himself from the throne, crowns his sons, gives them final moral instructions, calls for Zenocrate's hearse, and prepares himself for his own funeral. His last words anticipate a "heaven of joy" (line 227) he feels will be his as he looks forward to rejoining Zenocrate. Indeed, Tamburlaine's calm recalls his earlier desire for oneness with the forces that control the universe when Zenocrate died. Tamburlaine is at peace with himself as he anticipates with calm regard his own life of achievement as God's scourge. He senses no punishment or deprivation for blasphemy; rather, he envisions eternal reward.

In the final analysis the question of sympathy or identification for or against Tamburlaine revolves around this complex depiction of Tamburlaine as Promethean hero or Icarian fool. Marlowe's portrayal of Tamburlaine as the greatest of men who achieves, conquers, bring order, and aspires to unchartered limits competes with the view of the Tamburlaine as one who ventures beyond the limits set for him by God or natural law. Tamburlaine's demise is a given, but the interpretation of the fall is a matter of dispute. If he falls from pride or foolishness, then he is like Icarus who flies too near the sun. But if he falls from necessity, if the gods have arbitrarily and perhaps unwrightly turned against him, then he appears to
be the Promethean hero. Indeed, the response of Mahomet seems somewhat personal and arbitrary as Tamburlaine has been allowed such great acts of cruelty only to be punished when he burns the Koran. Tamburlaine could inflict incredible woe on humanity with impunity only to be immediately afflicted when he transgresses on what appears to be arbitraily forbidden ground, a rule which has nothing to do with human suffering. Yet one may doubt whether the action of the heavenly forces serves to undermine or support Tamburlaine since his cruelty lasts so long that one wonders whether his final fall is an act of retribution linked to his cruelty or simply to God’s desire to avenge himself on someone who has blasphemed him. Indeed, as Leech points out, "The heavenly powers, if they are active in this, show themselves active on their own behalf but indifferent to the suffering of man. These powers are concerned with themselves as purely as Dionysius is in the Bacchae of Euripides" (47). Hence, a God who acts only out of self-concern may not be a sympathetic force Himself.

Thus, it is difficult to choose which agent, god or man, carries the greater sympathetic force, for the killing of Tamburlaine may be as much of an indictment of the traditional idea of justice as it is an undermining of Tamburlaine himself. The manner of his death also enters into the question as Tamburlaine calmly and nobly submits to necessity with a last yearning look at the worlds (and
heavens) that he is leaving unconquered.

This analysis of Tamburlaine’s rhetoric in the second part of the play shows a subtle change in Marlowe’s use of rhetoric which on the surface is not apparent. That is, some things (such as military battles) always remain within his control. On the battlefield, Tamburlaine is always in command; his rhetoric at these times matches his intentions, and the results are those he predicts. However, Tamburlaine’s language grows more authoritarian and less authoritative when circumstances exceed his control. There are particular times when that to which he aspires is patently beyond him. In these circumstances, his high rhetoric and intentions are at odds with the inherent reality of the situation (as in his response to Zenocrate’s death and Calyphas’ resistance to his exhortative efforts). Furthermore, the successful use of a similar rhetoric by other characters shows a cleaving of the protagonist’s character and the rhetoric that was once solely his domain. His is not the only language that can control and create reality. Modelling himself on Tamburlaine, Callapine uses rhetoric to escape from his jailor. This is something that only Tamburlaine could have done in the first part. Tamburlaine also has rivals in speech, not only in action. Olympia now uses the same promises with Theridamus that Tamburlaine had earlier used with Zenocrate. Hence, as the sequence of actions proceeds, "the great conqueror inevitably shrinks" (Leech
Tamburlaine devises the chariot drawn by kings, and makes a public show of killing of Babylon's governor. No truce with the world is possible for such an emperor and as he inevitably attempts even greater feats, his identification shrinks. Ultimately, the only achievement left for him is to defy his god, Mahomet.

But the most significant change in Marlowe's use of rhetoric appears toward the end of the play as the devices of pathos, earlier employed to exhibit a character's weakness, are here employed in an exhibition of Tamburlaine's nobility. From Part One to the end of Part Two, Tamburlaine's language shifts from transformation of existing realities through hyperbole to an acceptance of the reality of his own limitations through the elements of pathos. There is great significance in Marlowe's changing rhetoric, but not as many have said that Marlowe is undercutting Tamburlaine by investing him with the language of pathos. Rather, I believe that a new handling of character is reflected in the shifting rhetoric. It is not so much that Marlowe is losing his faith in hyperbolical language as the medium for portraying his hero. Hyperbolical language fit the Tamburlaine of Part One.

But as the widespread undercutting of the early Tamburlaine continued, a new and more subtle Tamburlaine emerges, one whose rhetoric has changed to suit his new conditions. We see this person emerge momentarily during
Zenocrate’s death scene and fully arrive during his own death scene. Certainly, the early Tamburlaine does not die without a struggle as the moments of strained hyperbole, even greater cruelty, and more farflung vaunts reveal. But by the end of the death scene, the reckless Icarian has given way to the noble Promethean, and Marlowe has won sympathy, perhaps even identification, for his protagonist while depriving him of his vaulting rhetoric.\(^8\)
Chapter III

The Failure of Scholar, Saint, and Sinner:

**Dr. Faustus**

*Dr. Faustus* shares a similarity with the rest of Marlowe's tragedies; it raises the familiar question whether its orthodox or subversive elements are stronger. In one sense Faustus is the foolish sinner operating within the overall Christian framework which contains the play; Faustus is an individual who suffers damnation for trading his immortal soul in return for a few years of vain pleasures. According to this view, "Faustus loved the things of this world so much that he was willing to sacrifice his soul in order to free them from time" (Mizener 85). However, subversion coexists within this thread of straightforward orthodoxy, for Faustus also lives out the dynamics of an increasingly secular, heroic age--one form of the subversive. As he dreams, plans, and takes it upon himself to try his own brains "to get a deity," he dramatizes "Renaissance man's profound conviction that he is a Proteus, that he can remake or change or transform himself" (Giammati 102). Faustus's concerns include the desire to escape and control time, to enjoy the life of the senses without paying any penalty for excess, and to use the quasi-scientific knowledge as the means to accomplish these ends. In doing this, he opposes that traditional scheme based on submission to
God, thus opening himself up to great suffering when the conventional forces are brought to bear. However, in his suffering, the Christian powers are strangely quiet—a second means by which the subversive enters into the play. Thus, Marlowe has pitted a Renaissance scholar against the traditional, larger forces in the universe and in so doing has much to say about Renaissance ideals as well as the Christian ethos. Ultimately, both forces collide in Faustus's fall.

A great many recent critical opinions on Marlowe's Dr. Faustus devote an unfortunate amount of critical energy positing various causes for Faustus's fall. These explanations manipulate two distinct terminologies in explaining Faustus's end as a triumph of Christian theology or a failure of humanistic endeavor. Leo Kirschbaum's comment, in a broad sense, approximates many critics who think "we are beginning to perceive that the late sixteenth-century drama Doctor Faustus is wholly conventional in its Christian values and is in no sense iconoclastic" (101). Indeed, Kirschbaum adds, "There is no more obvious Christian document in all Elizabethan drama than the play under discussion" (102). Aligned with Kirschbaum's position are the many critics who also use various terms of Christian theology to explain Faustus's demise.¹ Robert B. Heilman traces it to Faustus' overweening pride, whereas Joseph T. McCullen posits the source to be Faustus' sin of sloth.² Similarly, C. L.
Barber asserts that Faustus fails in his attempt at omnipotence by substituting gluttony for the rituals of the sacrament. Finally, Helen Gardner also employs theological terms in finding Faustus' final sin as despair of his salvation. For the critics who emphasize the Christian structure and meaning of the play, Faustus, the sinner, appears very foolish.

Other critics employ a second set of terms which we may denominate "humanistic" in their efforts to explain what causes Faustus to fall. Philip Brockbank sees Faustus unsuccessfully challenging the powers that be through his yearning for omniscience and omnipotence, recalling to mind the many ancient heroes who, doing likewise, suffered a similar fate. Cyrus Hoy finds room for condemnation in Faustus' acceptance of ignorance, a deadly failing in both the ancient and the Renaissance world. Employing similar language, Douglas Cole traces the fall to Faustus's self-imposed blindness which brings about his irrevocable despair. Roland M. Frye suggests the cause is Faustus's "rejection of humanity" (328) for what amounts to petty accomplishment as even the comic scenes "serve to underscore the dissolution of Faustus' human dignity" (324). Yet another critic explains that Marlowe is in this play exploring the "humanist fallacy" of denying man's "middle state" and thereby rendering him prey to the extremes of "exultant individualism and despairing fatalism (Mahood 104). In this view, Faustus
fails because he follows a "misdirected desire" (105). A. Bartlett Giamatti asserts that Faustus's fall involves language, which he feels is the deepest issue in the play. For Faustus language is simplistic, static. Thus, he moves toward damnation because he does not understand the complexities of language which he misuses. Hence, Faustus's failing is primarily a lack of knowledge or understanding of the medium which he employs. All of these interpretations, notwithstanding their different emphases, point out elements of the heroic in Faustus's concerns. That Faustus fails does not contradict his heroic dimensions and aspirations since the failure of a hero may lend stature to his tragic dimensions.

Everyone who sees or reads the play knows that indeed Faustus does fall, but the meanings attached to his demise depend upon the characterization of the protagonist. Most of the interpretations range between these two poles of Faustus-as-hero and Faustus-as-fool. In general, the interpretations which emphasize the orthodox Christian structure of the play tend to view Faustus as a fool operating within that structure, while those who place Faustus within a secular context emphasize, at least to some extent, his heroic dimensions.

Certainly, the dramatic power of the final scene serves as one justification for the wonderful diversity of responses to it. The incredible intensity of
psychological suffering which Faustus experiences here is rare in early Renaissance drama. What may account, then, for the either-or trend of critical opinion can very well be the tragic dimensions of that final scene which seem to demand such an emphatic, even if arbitrary, response.

In addition to the evocative power of Faustus's fall, a second reason for the bifurcated critical response may be traced to the apparent necessity of explaining why Marlowe wrote such a different play, one that is lacking a clear identification for the central figure as he had done in Tamburlaine. Thus, one group is brought to the position that Roy Battenhouse took in his analysis of Tamburlaine, maintaining that Marlowe produced a genuine Christian drama. The second group must find contentment in outlining Marlowe's exploration of the limitations of secular ideals of the Renaissance.

However well-based or well-intentioned, each interpretation discounts the other to some extent in denying adequate attention to contrary signals we receive in the play, a failing which disguises criticisms both of orthodoxy and Renaissance ideals as well as the existence of undeniable sympathetic elements in the portrayal of Faustus. An analysis of this drama's rhetorical strategies will correct the tendency toward oversimplification of the complex portrayal of our protagonist.

Marlowe's rhetorical control is nowhere more apparent than in this play where he explores "tensions.
heterodoxies, and tragic possibilities in the *ethos* he dramatized," says Lawrence Danson, who analyzes the various rhetorical questions Marlowe used in this play (3). Not only is Marlowe's control apparent, but also his employment of a changing rhetoric reveals itself. Indeed, the rhetoric that Marlowe employs in *Dr. Faustus* is noticeably different from that of the *Tamiburlaine* plays.

Before these differences can be pointed out with any confidence, a primary difficulty in this regard must be examined briefly; the existence of the A and B texts raises the question as to the validity of any comparison that might be made. Essentially, the longer 1616 ("B-text") possesses the prose comic scenes, particularly scenes 3.1.32ff, 3.2.1-56, 4.2., 4.3., 4.5., and 4.6.32ff.

Also, in some parallel passages the B-text presents a smoother, more poetic text. Until the W. W. Greg edition (1950) most scholars believed that the additions were written by Samuel Rowley and William Bird, to whom Henslowe recorded a payment on November 22, 1602. Greg argued that the above-listed scenes existed in the original play. However, for the purposes of this paper the issue whether these scenes were present in the original play is irrelevant. My primary interest parallels the opinion of Robert Ornstein whose concern is "with the integrity of the play as a work of dramatic art, not with the integrity of the text as a literary document" (165).
The comic scenes that do exist in the shorter 1604 edition suffice to show the importance of the comic subplots to the rhetorical techniques within the play. Furthermore, the choice of most editors to use the B-text as a basis along with the A-text to correct the editorializing of the later edition offers the best overall text for the play. Finally, my comments about any scenes where the two versions diverge will be duly noted.

That certain rhetorical differences exist is apparent, and they must be analyzed before any conclusions be advanced as to why Marlowe's rhetoric has changed. One of the most noticeable rhetorical differences is that Tamburlaine's sustained ornate soliloquies have given way in places to more straightforward "flat" dialogue alternating with bursts of elevated poetry which correspond to the varying moods of the speaker, particularly our protagonist. The average length of speeches of Faustus is only 3.6 lines compared to a hefty 5.5 average for Tamburlaine (Levin 187). This fact becomes more striking when we see that both protagonists possess roughly the same percentage of overall lines in their respective plays: 40% for Faustus and a little more than 36% for Tamburlaine with both parts of Tamburlaine averaged. Hence, the central character still dominates the stage, but he is doing so in a different way. Now, for example, other characters assume a greater importance (as does Mephistopheles) and even
suggest at times that the authorial voice does not emanate from the protagonist alone.

Also, in *Dr. Faustus* the occasions both for the extended utterance as well as his less exalted dialogue correspond more closely to the particular mood of the protagonist. That is, when Faustus does speak at great length, these extended orations contain many of the same devices of the earlier set pieces—metonymy, synecdoche, and metaphor—as well as the devices applied to longer sections of poetry—merismus and synathroesmus. Yet Marlowe has reserved the longer speeches for times of great distress or desire as in the first and last scenes as well as in Faustus' apostrophe to Helen's beauty.

Another of the rhetorical differences involves the effect of the protagonist's rhetoric on others in the play. *Tamburlaine I* and *II* present to the audience a protagonist whose words denote power. Rhetoric and power are interdependent in these plays. Furthermore, Tamburlaine's rhetoric and power usually transcend the language and power of other characters in each play. A great deal of doubt on this point exists in *Dr. Faustus*. While the concern with the transforming power of words, specifically magical words in this case, is present in *Dr. Faustus*, the play quickly reveals the limitations of magic and Faustus' own use of language. Faustus who has earned a reputation as master of language, knowledge, and wisdom places a deep trust in the language of magic when he calls
forth Mephistopheles. Shortly, however, Faustus is told that his incantations were but the cause per accidens of Mephistopheles's appearance. This single example is reinforced by other instances that Faustus uses language to confound both himself and, as some maintain, to lead himself toward damnation. Furthermore, Tamburlaine's rhetoric bespeaks his own unwavering confidence. It entails his success for the most part, and it involves a transformation of existing political reality, as words generally match the evolving reality which they describe. While Faustus repeatedly mentions his own "resoluteness," in Dr. Faustus words and reality grow ever farther apart as the play progresses, and as words and reality grow apart, Faustus's resolution fades so completely that in his final anguish he pathetically offers, "I'll burn my books!"

These changes in the larger aspects of the rhetoric of Dr. Faustus prompt an analysis of the specifics of Faustus's own rhetoric and his relationship to the language that he uses. Through attention to the manner in which the parts of rhetoric (Invention, Arrangement, and Style) are employed in the portrayal of Faustus, we may delineate the two opposed interpretations that critics have found in this play.

However, before the portrayal of Faustus is unveiled, the Prologue provides information which may predispose the audience to see him in a negative light.
The audience is informed that, while Faustus has excelled in scholarly matters, particularly divinity, he is so "glutted now with learning's golden gifts" (1.25) that he has become "swol'n with cunning, of a self-conceit" (1. 20). Moreover, "His waxen wings did mount above his reach/And melting, heavens conspir'd his overthrow" (11. 22-23). Through words such as "glutted" and "self-conceit" as well as the allusion to Icarus the audience has been prepared to view this scholar sitting in his study as largely foolish. Yet the terms also incorporate two separate worldviews which Marlowe manipulates throughout the play. The sin of gluttony, one of the seven deadliest, places Faustus's aspirations within the context of the Christian cosmos, while the "cunning" and "self-conceit" of the previous lines portray Faustus as the Icarian hero of ancient times. Hence, before he has had an opportunity to reveal himself, the Prologue presents him to the audience using a line of argument (definition by giving characteristics) which Aristotle sets out in The Rhetoric (Bk II Ch 23, 7). This dual view receives emphasis when the Prologue narrows the focus of this play, rejecting war, love, politics, and proud deeds for the performance of "the form of Faustus' fortunes, good or bad" (line 8). The noncommittal "or" of this line recalls a similar phrase, the "as you please" of the Prologue of Tamburlaine I. Thus, the viewers are left with the final responsibility to interpret this
Sufficient reasons for seeing Faustus as playing the fool emerge in the first scene, though his elocution makes what appears quite deceptive. Judging from Faustus’s diction in this first appearance at first glance, one might think Faustus knows what he is doing, for he shows no hesitation as he sets about examining the inadequacies he perceives in the various golden gifts of learning. Indeed, he frequently bolsters himself with thoughts of what can be attained by his own "resoluteness." When Valdes, in his exordium to Faustus, promises wealth and fame if "learned Faustus will be resolute" (1.2.133), Faustus vows he is "as resolute am I in this/As thou to live" (1.134). This term is repeated throughout the first scenes as Faustus demonstrates his confidence in his knowledge and in his own power with words.

Furthermore, to emphasize his weighty understanding of the various avenues of learning Faustus focusses upon the "end of every art" (line 4). Having long since mastered the rudiments of each art, he feels adequate to an analysis of the ultimate purposes that each possesses. He successively describes the ends of philosophy, medicine, law, and theology as being effective disputation, bodily health, disposition of worldly goods, and metaphysical illogic.

But as A. Bartlett Giammati has noted, Faustus possesses a blind belief in language. "For while his
words tell us he has soared above all organized human knowledge, they actually show us deep ignorance, particularly in the simple and central matters of the soul" (109). Marlowe reveals this ignorance as Faustus (using *distributio* by organizing and arranging the areas of knowledge) dismisses the respective disciplines, often with a partial quotation. Faustus rejects philosophy as mere logic, thereby confusing Aristotle, the metaphysician, with Ramus, the logician. When he declares that Law is "paltry legacies," (1.1.30) and "external trash," (1.1.35) he misquotes Justinian to prove his view. The irony here is underscored in the unfinished quotation, "The father cannot disinherit the son except" (1.31). What Faustus demeans as "paltry legacies" is precisely the idea he cannot understand. The inference here is unmistakably plain: the Father cannot disinherit the son except when he exchanges his soul for a few years of vain pleasure.

In his rejection of divinity, the partial quotation from *Romans* 6:23 ("The wages of sin is death") is seriously self-limiting. Norman Rabkin succinctly describes what others have also pointed out, namely "Faustus's inability to remember the second half of any biblical text he quote[s]" (13). Failing to finish the verse ("But the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord"), Faustus instead proceeds to quote from the Book of *John*: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive
ourselves, and there is no truth in us." With the premises of the syllogism as he has set them up, Faustus is able to conclude as he wishes: "We must sin, and so consequently die" (1. 44).

What Faustus has invented here is a valid argument as it stands. However, most Elizabethans knew what was included in the second halves of the two Bible verses which Faustus has quoted: the idea of eternal life through Christ and the notion of forgiveness extended to those who confess their sins. In explaining the various fallacies of argument included under a discussion of Invention, Aristotle could easily have been referring to this syllogism when he says, "this fallacy might also be said to be due to omission" (Bk. II Ch 24, 2). By taking half lines out of context and stacking them to fit his own syllogism, Faustus has erred in logic, a discipline he believes that he has mastered. More importantly, his error with divinity involves the precise theological ideas with which he so desperately struggles in later crucial moments.

In addition to the ironic effect of the faulty syllogism and other partial quotations, Faustus's diction is also on uncertain ground in his use of the *erotema*, the rhetorical question. Puttenham defines the figure as "a kinde of figurative speach when we aske many questions and looke for none answere, speaking indeed by interrogation, which we might as well say by affirmation" (211). This
rhetorical pairing informs the audience of Faustus's certainty of his course. However, as Lawrence Danson points out, a speaker had better be certain that his question implies the intended response or he runs "the risk of over-taxing the audience's credulity" (4). Unfortunately for Faustus, this is precisely what his questions in the first soliloquy do. Faustus asks,

Is to dispute well Logicke's chiefest end?
Affords this Art no greater miracle?

(11. 8-9) While it is true that Faustus misquotes here by confusing Aristotle with Ramus, what is in Faustus's mind is Aristotle's own discourse on logic—the Analytica Posteriora. He says, "Sweet Analytics, 'tis thou hast ravished me" (line 6). In this book Aristotle lays out the various forms of logic, not for the purpose of disputation, as Faustus apparently thinks, but for the more profound function of discovering and knowing truth, something that likewise deeply concerns Faustus. Indeed, even if Faustus had alluded to Aristotle's analysis of disputation, included in The Rhetoric, he might have known that Aristotle separates the art of disputing and the moral purpose of the disputer when he says "what makes a man a sophist is not his faculty [of disputing well or poorly], but his moral purpose" (The Rhetoric Bk I Ch 1, 24). Thus, for the author of these texts the art of disputing "well" itself has truth as its most lofty end
or purpose. Hence, Faustus, the sophist, has mistaken the means for an end which he cannot understand and thereby has increased the risk of alienating his audience.

Faustus continues his use of the *erotema* throughout the play, but nowhere with more devastating effect than in the final soliloquy. Here, he uses the rhetorical question again, but this time without such readymade responses to his own questions. Rather, Faustus is mute; he has no answers. In the silence of his question, he reveals all that he has left is agony and anguish. Thus, his use of the rhetorical question forms a neat parallel to the development of his character. Helen Gardner traces Faustus's character development as being a progress

from presumption to despair; from doubt of the existence of hell to belief in the reality of nothing else; from a desire to be more than man to the recognition that he has excluded himself from the promise of redemption for all mankind in Christ; from aspiration to deity and omnipotence to longing for extinction.

(50)

In a similar vein, Faustus's quick responses to his own questions of the first scenes give way to increasingly belated replies until at last, Faustus has no replies at all. Certainly, these changes in character and *erotema* find reinforcement in the final scene as he employs
increasingly brevity, or brevitas and epitrochasnum, a swift movement from one statement to another. The brevity of the rapid fire lines underscores the shrinking time that Faustus has left and affords a means of expressing his increasing despair.

Other aspects of Faustus' elocution and invention create problems for a dramatic identification with the protagonist. He frequently employs words in a single sense though the words carry multiple meanings of which Faustus is apparently unaware. In his repeated use of the word "resolution," for example, Faustus does not see the word's variable senses. As T. McAlindon explains, "resolution" may "signify fixity and persistence [Faustus' connotation], but it also denotes disintegration, the breaking up of something into parts" (131-32). Certainly simplifying complex matters or dissolving fine distinctions is a marked tendency of Faustus' mind. When, for example, he gloats upon his imagined power to call upon spirits who will "resolve [him] of all ambiguities," Faustus intends the first meaning, but the audience has only recently viewed him disintegrating or devolving important texts, texts which discuss the weightiest and most "ambivalent" issues. He had abused these ambivalences, and hence, the second meaning is drawn out for the audience. Indeed, Faustus is unable to appreciate the complexity of words; the ambivalent attitude is something he is unaware of. Thus, he is again unaware of
the full import of the language he is using. This lack of awareness of the ideas of greatest importance for Faustus' destiny readily emerges in his discussions with Mephistopheles where Faustus not only misuses words himself, but he also misconstrues the words of others.

In their first meeting, indeed almost with his first words, Mephistopheles informs Faustus that demons live only for the purpose of obtaining "glorious souls" of men (1.3.46-49). Additionally, he has just informed Faustus that the magical conjuring (whose supposed power has filled Faustus's mind with enticing visions) was but the cause per accidens of Mephistopheles's appearance, underscoring the importance of men's souls to Lucifer. Shortly, however, Faustus offers a direct contradiction to these ideas when he jests about "these vain trifles of men's souls" (line 62). Set only a short space apart, these two lines reflect vastly different definitions of and values on the human soul. At this point, the "soul" for Faustus is mere terminology for "self." He is soon to gloat "Think'st thou that Faustus is so fond to imagine/ That after this life there is any pain?" (2.2.136-37) Also, he has earlier rejected medicine for its inability to make men immortal. How incorrect Faustus's definition is remains to be seen.

Similarly, Faustus misunderstands Mephistopheles's definition of hell. Faustus, following his earlier aspiration for knowledge, demands information about the
infernal beings. Mephistopheles describes their fall from heaven "by aspiring pride and insolence," (1.3.67) an idea to which Faustus himself might at least have responded. Continuing with his questioning, Faustus inquires, "Where are you damn'd?" and the "unhappy spirit" responds that he is damned in hell. Whereupon Faustus confuses the literal place with the spiritual condition of hell, asking, "How comes it then that thou art out of hell?" Mephistopheles, who seems surprised, goes on to explain, "Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it" (1. 75).

In this first discussion of hell, Faustus entirely ignores Mephistopheles's alternative definition in his scorn of what appears to Faustus as Mephistopheles's lack of "resolution." He derides the anguish of the fallen spirit:

\[
\text{Learn thou of Faustus manly fortitude} \\
\text{And scorn those joys thou shalt never possess}
\]

(11. 84-85)

However, this concern is an abiding one, for soon Faustus returns to the same topic. After signing the deed, the first task he gives Mephistopheles is to inform him about hell. When Faustus receives the same dual definition of hell as place and spiritual condition, Faustus responds, "I think hell is a fable" as he is unable to see things in a complex manner (2.1.130). Hence, Faustus compounds the errors in his use of language by misinterpreting the words of others. Mephistopheles's reply is replete with
sinister implications: "Ay, think so still until experience change thy mind" (1. 131).

This discussion of hell as place or condition involves the most important term that Faustus fails to understand until it is too late: "damnation." That Faustus disregards the various connotations of damnation is not surprising since he has earlier passed over its paired opposite near the verses he peruses in Jerome's Bible: "salvation." Such theological concerns have little place in Faustus's imagination. Rather, he proposes to reach the supernatural himself. It is interesting that to accomplish this end, he enters into a pact with the devil who is himself subordinate to the divinity whose theology has been neglected. Of course, in Faustus's mind, it is magic which has empowered him, magic which has invoked the beings which will help him achieve his goals of knowledge, pleasure, and power. However, aside from magic being the cause per accidens, which Mephistopheles immediately points out, it is also interesting that by using magic he invokes the beings that populate the world of the orthodox scheme. Those who argue for Marlowe's supposed atheism might do well to note how Marlowe faithfully employs this scheme, for the supernatural is a very real force in this play. When Faustus's blood congeals on his arm, for example, the implication is readily apparent to all save Faustus. Similarly, when Faustus blasphemously uses Christ's triumphant final words, "Consummatum est" to
conclude his diabolical bargain with Evil, an inscription appears on his arm: *Homo fuge* (line 78), causing Faustus to feel deep dismay for the first time.

Compared to the reality of the Christian supernatural, the power of magic pales indeed. To the honest answers he receives from the representative of that order Faustus either demurs or changes the subject. Ultimately, of course, the aspirer discovers the reality of the soul, of hell, of damnation. But for such a long time he remains oblivious or indifferent to the danger, for his immediate concern is with his own success. Neither does his use of devils through magical means seem illogical to him, for it is in his nature to take any shortcut he can. Indeed, when Mephistopheles promises Faustus that Lucifer "will give thee more than thou hast wit to ask," the idea that warrants underscoring is Faustus's "wit," or lack of it rather than the forthcoming gifts that Faustus anticipates.

The instances of Faustus's oversimplification or outright misuse of language are amplified repeatedly. Faustus is unaware of alternate meanings of "will," for example (Divakaruni 266). Faustus uses "will" in a way similar to Tamburlaine, at least in terms of its intended meaning, for both protagonists regard willing something as identical to achieving it. Only Tamburlaine is successful in this regard. Faustus says,

I'll have them fly to India for Gold,
I'll have them read me strange philosophy,
I'll have them wall all Germany with brass,
I'll have them fill the public schools with silk,
I'll levy soldiers with the coin they bring,

After he has met with Mephistopheles, Faustus envisions his powers and achievements: "I'll join the hills that bind the Afric shore/And make that country continent to Spain/And both contributory to my crown" (1.4.107-09). For all his plans, Faustus's sad lack of success with turning his willing into achieving illustrates the "ever-growing split between Faustus's mighty words and his trivial deeds" that so marks this play (Giammati 112). For Faustus, "will" turns out to be only "wishful thinking" (Divarkaruni 266).

The implications of Faustus's negative uses of language are manifold. As the play unfolds, there is an increasing discrepancy between what Faustus has proposed and what he actually achieves. Put another way, the gap between word and deed reinforces the fact that Faustus has misconstrued the power of his own language and his faith in magical language. Giamatti explains that Faustus
possesses the paradoxical belief that certain types of language are powerless while others have power (111). Though Faustus has rejected analytical, medicinal, legal, and religious language, for him one kind of language has virtue: the books and incantations of magic. He is certain that the language of incantation can control reality. He believes that he can control Mephistopheles through his magical words, but it turns out that his incantations have no power. In fact, he is told quite early on that his faith in magic is false when Mephistopheles informs him that he has not come in response to the incantations of a black magic. Here, Faustus limits himself by continually interpreting words according to his own desires rather than by their intended meanings. Accordingly as we have seen, Faustus misinterprets or ignores Mephistopheles's definition of hell and his sinister double entendres.

Furthermore, Faustus remains unaware or indifferent to his self-deception, the shortcomings in his use of speech. Hence, he consistently oversimplifies words, often mistaking one meaning for another, and at times disregarding connotative meanings of words that could have hindered him in his progress toward damnation. Perhaps the most important self-limiting action of Faustus consists in his rhetoric involving religion. In the first scene Faustus flippantly rejects religion, but by the last scene he is agonizingly taken off to hell. In his first
analysis of God's dispensation, Faustus rejects theology on the basis of its determinism. As he sets up the syllogism, every man is destined to be condemned. There is no freedom; volition or personal power does not figure into the religious scheme which Faustus has constructed. Herein lies the paradox of his definition: he rejects a deterministic cosmology, but must simultaneously or on some level really believe it deep down, or he would use his own perceived freedom to seek mercy as he becomes deeply aware of the nature of the bargain he has made or certainly in the final scene when the reality of the spiritual forces he has consistently denied becomes apparent to him. Rather, Faustus acts out the spirituality of one who rejects his God for being too hard, too unforgiving, but then remains faithful to that conception through the end as he cannot bring himself to sue for his God's mercy. Seen in this light, Faustus is a fool who has followed the broad path to hell. Too late he discovers "his superb urge to transcend may damn him deep" (Giammati 106).

But the analysis of the wayward Faustus should not rest entirely on Faustus himself, for the rhetoric of other characters may shed more light on the concerns of the play. In this area, the language of Mephistopheles and the Old Man informs and reinforces the error of Faustus's ways. In his first appearance, Mephistopheles is not the devil who scours the earth in search of
potential souls. Rather, he responds to one who "racks the name of God" (1.3.47). Hence, Faustus is already in danger of being damned when Mephistopheles arrives. Moreover, there exists no discrepancy between Mephistopheles's words and self-conception. His ethos is clear and his logos is not burdened with the inconsistencies we find in Faustus. He is who he says he is: "I am a servant to great Lucifer" (1.3.40). He tells the truth to Faustus when asked whether the conjuring had called him from hell. Furthermore, he gives Faustus accurate information as to the infernal region and its existence. Lucifer is "arch-regent and commander of all spirits" (1.63) "dearly lov'd of God" (1.65) who fell "by aspiring pride and insolence" (1.67). This information directly relates to Faustus's own ambitions, and foreshadows his own end. But it falls on deaf ears, unless the audience itself be included. Furthermore, Faustus, who returns repeatedly to a discussion of hell, is told from the first that hell is "being depriv'd of everlasting bliss" (1.80). To reinforce this idea, Mephistopheles a little later expands his definition:

Hell hath no limits, nor is circumscrib'd In one self place, but where we are is hell, And where hell is, there must we ever be. And to be short, when all the world dissolves, And every creature shall be purified, All places shall be hell that is
not heaven. (2.1.124-29)

To this orthodox view of hell, Faustus responds with characteristic chutzpah: "I think hell's a fable" (1.130). Whereupon, with a chilling antithesis, Mephistopheles responds, "Ay, think so still, till experience change thy mind" (1.131). Similarly, Mephistopheles provides Faustus with accurate responses to his questions about the heavens, science, and nature (2.2.35ff). In fact, Mephistopheles responds clearly to every question until Faustus begins to ask questions involving God; here Mephistopheles is silent, for, as he says, it is "against our kingdom" (2.2.74). Mephistopheles's reticence clarifies the existence of the Christian supernatural and magnifies its power, but Faustus is again blind to the implications as he angrily seeks to dismiss Mephistopheles from his presence.

Another aspect of the ethos of Mephistopheles is the irony that he so skillfully employs in his dialogues with Faustus. When they are about to sign the pact that Faustus has agreed to, Mephistopheles urges Faustus to . . . stab thy arm courageously. And bind thy soul, that at some certain day Great Lucifer may claim it as his own, And then be thou as great as Lucifer. (2.1.50-53)

The antanaclasis on the word "great" underscores the high intelligence of Mephistopheles and provides a stark contrast to the Faustus's naivete. The expression "Great
Lucifer" suggests Lucifer's vast power that he exercises over the other fallen spirits and souls in the underworld, but when Mephistopheles says "then be thou as great as Lucifer," the terrible implication is that the more significant reality is that Lucifer is fallen, lost, and in "great" spiritual pain as Faustus himself will be. For Lucifer is, as Mephistopheles knows, truly not great. Furthermore, this idea of Lucifer's lostness has just been introduced by Faustus when he asks Mephistopheles, "Have you any pain that torture other?" (1.44)

The same ominous rhetoric recurs in various speeches of Mephistopheles as when he appears to be comforting an anxious Faustus: "Faustus, I swear by hell and Lucifer/ To effect all promises between us made" (2.1.95-96). Oblivious to the import of the phrase "all promises," Faustus merely reads his conditions which Mephistopheles is all to happy to perform. Much more is implied than what is actually said in this litotes, and the use of the device lends greater power to Mephistopheles as it diminishes the identification the audience may have for Faustus.

Nowhere is the ethos of Mephistopheles more impressive than when the time has arrived for payment of Faustus's soul (5.2.11ff). His veracity, ominous irony, and spiritual power are concentrated here as he pronounces the sententia that describes and sums up the character of Faustus's past life and future condition:
"Fools that will laugh on earth, must weep in hell" (5.2.99). In this case, there is no double meaning as the import of his words is clear: Faustus must spend his eternity in hell.

But must he? The rhetoric of the Old Man who arrives to urge Faustus to repent seems to suggest otherwise. The Old Man provides a foil to every value that drives Faustus. Faustus revels in the sensual pleasures of the flesh; the Old Man regards even physical suffering as inconsequential in comparison to the pleasures of heaven. Faustus despairs of his salvation; the Old Man believes and trusts in heaven for his. Faustus has sought to achieve power by his own means, but the Old Man relies on the power of heaven. Mephistopheles can torment the Old Man's flesh as he will torment Faustus's, but "His faith is great: I cannot touch his soul" (5.2.87).

Faintly recalling the exhortations of Tamburlaine, the Old Man's speech employs Wilson's topics—praise, hope of victory, greatness of reward, and fear of failure or shame—in the hope that "gentle Faustus" (5.1.38) will repent before it is too late. Indeed, the praise is not so hyperbolic as Tamburlaine offered to Theridamus, yet to call Faustus "gentle" may be a kinder term than he has earned. He further praises Faustus for his "amiable soul" (1. 43) and assures him he has only "offended like a man" (1. 41). Furthermore, the hope of heaven and heaven itself
may still be attained if Faustus will "leave this damned art" (l. 38), and the failure to do so will certainly result in "the pains of hell" (l. 47). The Old Man traces Faustus's near damnation not to the signing of the pact, but to his persistence in practicing magic and to his unwillingness to repent. Thus, it is clear that Mephistopheles and forces of hell still have something to fear (which perhaps explains why the devils appear so suddenly whenever Faustus calls on heaven); nevertheless, Faustus's soul still hangs in the balance. Perhaps Faustus's flirtation with magic and his signing of the pact has convinced himself that he is damned, but the language of the Old Man reveals that the cause of Faustus's damnation lies outside heaven.

Finally, reinforcing the conception of Faustus as fool are the comic scenes which form a parodic subplot to the tragic main plot of Faustus's fall. The alternation of serious with comic scenes is too regular to be accidental. Faustus, the scholar sits in his study in Act I, and employs his learning only to reveal his ignorance of it. Whereupon, in the ensuing brief scene with Wagner and the two scholars, we see Wagner imitating his master's learning and failing in a similar way. In scene three Faustus agrees to sign away his soul in return for power and the pleasures of the flesh, and in the scene that follows, the Clown deliberates trading away his own soul for a shoulder of mutton and sexual pleasure. Later in
the play after Faustus has entered the pact with Lucifer, he entertains himself by relieving the Pope of his food and drink. Robin and his friends, in the next scene, attempt to steal a goblet from the Vintner.

From a rhetorical perspective, what is so interesting about the twinning of these scenes is that each comic scene provides an extended *allegoria*, or connected metaphor, that informs the meaning of each preceding serious scene. When Faustus’s highsounding definitions of the disciplines parallel Wagner’s highhanded definition of Faustus as *corpus naturale* (1.2.16), the double-edged sword of satire emerges. Faustus speaks of logic, physic, law, and theology, respectively. In the same order, Wagner is first concerned with the logic of the question put to him by the scholars. Of course, there is no “force of argument” (1.2.10) in the conversation. Wagner next confuses medical terms, mistaking the meaning of phlegmatic for “slow to wrath” (1.17). When he refers to the legal system by vowing that he will see the two scholars hanged during the next session (1s. 18-19), the similarity to the previous scene becomes more obvious. To see the master bungle his learning provides the audience with reason for discomfort, but when the servant in the following scene does the same thing in a less graceful way, the savage humor becomes more apparent. Hence, before they ever get underway, Faustus’s great ambitions are undercut.
The pairing of scenes three and four of Act I repeats this pattern as the agreement arrived at by Wagner and Robin twins the agreement between Mephistopheles and Faustus. Like Faustus, Robin is gradually seduced by the promise of power. Similar to Faustus's reaction to the arrival of Lucifer, Robin is impressed by a show of force at the arrival of the devils. What provides the satirical edge in this scene is Wagner's promise to teach Robin to turn himself into an animal. This revelation of the power of magic parodies Faustus's own desire to become a god when he eventually turns out to be less than a man. The god-animal antithesis in these two contiguous scenes provides a telling comparison of Faustus's ambitions to his achievements. Finally, each scene ends with a guarantee by Faustus and Robin to abide by their word. Faustus would give any number of souls for Mephistopheles. Robin warrants that he will be Wagner's servant, and the pacts are serio-comically sealed.

Hence, the comic scenes provide evidence of what Eliot called Marlowe's savage sense of humor as the serious concerns of the major plot are mocked in the comic subplot. Judging from the failures and foibles of Robin and Wagner, Faustus's attempts to godhead are clownish aspirations. The comic scenes, furthermore, illustrate Marlowe's adaptation of rhetorical material to suit different purposes. In Tamburlaine, the central
protagonist suffered undercutting through the manipulation of hyperbolical language by other characters. Here, however, comedy provides one means to accomplish the same end. Additionally, these scenes illustrate that Marlowe is not limited to any one type of language; he is equally adept at viewing a subject from more than one perspective. In fact, the dialectical method of rhetoric is at home in a serious and a comic world. Were these language elements of Faustus all that existed within the play, one would have to conclude the case against Faustus is clear.

The abundance of rhetorical elements that undercut Faustus may seem to obviate any portrayal of Faustus as hero. Faustus misuses language, has only a partial understanding of the disciplines he has supposedly mastered, he ignores or completely mistakes the import of clear signs both from Mephistopheles and the Old Man, and the comic subplots act to reinforce the absurdity of Faustus's intentions. Additionally, the evidence may seem overwhelming if the structure of this drama is perceived as being modelled on the medieval morality. That Dr. Faustus possesses this structure is a notion that many critics have accepted. According to the principles of the morality play, Faustus faces temptation, falls into sin, and ultimately receives his just reward. Yet, to conclude that the morality structure exactly prescribes the particular manner in
which the audience is to react to Faustus and assign meaning to the play involves quite an interpretive leap. This is equivalent to saying that all literary works possessing allegorical structures must reflect Christian values since the relation of early allegory to orthodoxy is a near one. Fortunately, we do not have to make such a leap of faith as the play is conducive to another structural interpretation as well—the classical model. Barber points out, "viewed in outline, the plot is perfectly classical in its climactic ascent: the conjuration of Mephistophilis, the compact with Lucifer, the travels to Rome and elsewhere, the necromantic evocations, and the catastrophe" (124). He continues by saying, while the middle of the play languishes, even this weakness reveals the "disparity between promise and fruition" (124).

How much importance should be given to either structural interpretation? Can we fix a precise relationship between structural elements and the portrayal of the protagonist? The fact that Dr. Faustus is so easily conducive to multiple structural interpretations suggests that the critic must be cautious before drawing what may amount to arbitrary conclusions, for Marlowe has assimilated diverse materials in the construction of his play. Perhaps, a more just view affords the machinery of the English morality and its attendant Christian theology equal footing with the
classical model as vehicles which carry the play's central concerns, the portrayal of irreconcilable tensions between competing concerns in late Elizabethan society.

Whatever structural model is used, the fact of Faustus's fall may not be the single statement the play presents. Richard Sewall explains, for example, that while Marlowe "brings the play to a pious conclusion, the 'truth' of the play goes far beyond the Chorus' final piety, just as the meaning of Oedipus transcends by far the choric summing up of that play" (59). We are afforded glimpses of just how far beyond the Christian morality play this play ventures if we look again at Faustus's first soliloquy but this time in a different way, bypassing the errors in logos and the failures in ethos that Faustus's rhetoric exhibits. If we look beneath the logic and ethics to the source of Faustus's ambition in his motivating passion or pathos, we will be afforded a glimpse at the elements of the heroic in this scholar. Judith Weil, in her analysis of the plays, suggests "that Marlowe [often] deliberately sought to gain sympathy for Faustus by means of a speech which subtly exposes him" (74). Notwithstanding his errors, Faustus may present quite another portrait of himself if we look to emotional appeal.

In the first soliloquy we find elements of Faustus the hero, as Marlowe explores more than simply Faustus's arrogance or blindness. Rabkin explains that
there are "the perplexing bits of evidence that make it possible to see Faustus either as archetypal Promethean hero--Faustian man--or as a consistent fool" (15). Indeed, the most interesting "bits" of evidence are revealed in Faustus's use of rhetorical elements of pathos throughout the play.

One of the pieces of evidence supporting Faustus as hero involves a rhetorical strategy that is employed in the first soliloquy. Cicero speaks of the effectiveness of emotional oratory:

We observe that love is won if you [the orator] are thought to be upholding the interests of your audience, or at any rate for such as that audience deems good and useful. . . . The holding out of a hope of advantage to come is more effective than the recital of past benefit. (De Oratore II.1)

Similarly, Aristotle refers to pathos as one of the modes of persuasion by "putting the audience into a certain frame of mind" (The Rhetoric Bk I, Ch 2). In the first lines of his soliloquy Faustus reveals his powerful emotional preoccupation with the supernatural, actually his preference for the supernatural over the natural. This preference issues from his deep wish to achieve "miracle[s]" (line 9), as he dismisses philosophy for its inability to produce such events. Similarly, he feels, not thinks, if physic cannot enable
one to achieve immortality (quite a supernatural feat) or resurrection of the dead, then it too is not to be esteemed highly. Faustus dismisses law as irrelevant "external trash" precisely for the same reason; it has nothing to do with the supernatural, with miracles. When Faustus rejects divinity he apparently has contradicted his aim to achieve the supernatural unless we look to the emotional appeal of this part of the speech. Faustus, as a man facing a system requiring that man humbly place his faith in the efficacy of a greater power, wishes to be more than man as defined by that orthodoxy. Certainly this wish or desire corresponds to an element of Renaissance man who found himself forced to define new limits to personal achievement and worth.

Faustus next addresses himself in his rejection of physic, saying that even if he were able by scientific means to save entire communities from the plague, "Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man" (line 23). Faustus does not wish to be but a man in the conventional sense. Rather, his aim is to achieve a greater than natural ability or power through a medium that is based on his own learned or acquired abilities, namely through magic. Hence, what many critics have pointed to as Faustus's illogic turns out to be plausible if one accepts the logic of Faustus's emotions, his desire and clear purpose—to assume the powers of the supernatural. Faustus has thrown off the
old limits, and sets out to find what limits, if any, this new avenue will establish.

Those critics who see the heroic in Faustus may be responding to the appeal of the individual who wants, wishes, and intends to "get a deity" through self-generated powers. Critics have often discounted this passionate willingness at the price of a rounded picture of Faustus. Pathos involves the ability to put an audience in a certain state of mind, and Faustus elicits a favorable response notwithstanding his subtle failings of learning and logic and the not-so-subtle waywardness of his ethics. In fact, it is this passionate quality in Faustus that reinforces the Renaissance virtue of the self-made man, the explorer. Furthermore, the pathopoeia Faustus employs reveals his use of the devices of emotional appeal. In his indignant discounting the various disciplines he makes use of apodixis, the rejection of an argument as absurdly false. Indeed, if Faustus must be faulted for not "seeing" the intellectual errors of his rejections, he nevertheless creates a dramatic identification for himself by "feeling" powerfully the desire for knowledge of a type he has not experienced. Though his indignation may not be wellfounded intellectually, allowance must be made for him in his restless casting about for justification. In short, his willingness to reject the traditional means to
enlightenment illuminates the spirit of the hero, the
Promethean firegiver whose violation of authority may
be of greater worth to himself than submissive
obedience to the old ways. Certainly, in striving to
attain to absolute knowledge, power, and immortality
Faustus suggests the advantages that Cicero alludes to
in his definition of emotional appeals.

Not only does the appeal of this soliloquy possess
its own emotional logic (though to some perhaps
unreasonable), but also it exhibits Faustus' logical
mind in his effective arrangement (through the use of
distributio) of disciplines from philosophy through
medicine, law, and divinity. He has grouped these
disciplines in a hierarchical fashion from the least
applicable to his emotional concern to the most
applicable. Philosophy involves mere speculation and
disputation as Faustus defines it. Medicine includes
more than speculation, having its natural benefits.
Yet it is more than the merely natural that he is
seeking. Law, which deals with the health of the state
as medicine with that of the individual, is of greater
social importance but ultimately beneath the aims of
Faustus. Divinity, as the last named discipline, is
also nearest to Faustus's pressing goal, to attain to
the supernatural. Yet it too must be rejected as it
requires of Faustus that he submit to a power outside
himself to reach the supernatural. He prefers to "try
Thus, in this first speech a complex portrait of the protagonist begins to emerge. On the one hand, Marlowe presents the audience with a character whose knowledge is incomplete, whose logic is faulty, whose theology is unsound. Hence, to measure Faustus by his ethos and logos an identification with him is undermined. Yet, here is Faustus with a desire, a passionate energy, that creates its own urgent logic and possesses its own appeal: to rise to the supernatural on one’s own necessitates a rejection of man’s conventional relationship to the supernatural. He claims that his break with the disciplines is on the basis of their inadequacy of providing the “miracle” he so intensely seeks. Additionally, the basis for his rejection of conventional religion consists of a view of God as tyrannically opposed to human initiative, the possibility that the merely human may not by definition be defective in nature, purpose, and power. Like the builders of the Tower of Babel, Faustus does not want to reach heaven through relying on faith because that would mean he did not achieve it himself. Perhaps for all Promethean iconoclasts, an adversarial relationship with the God of the time is a necessity. Thus, to impugn Faustus for his theological errata does not see through the blunders to what Faustus already has seen: to realize his vision of himself requires a rejection
of the contemporary vision of God. In so doing, he is Renaissance man acting out "the mysterious tragic dynamic of his times" (Sewall 61).

Had Faustus been able to foresee that the Prometheus of the future would be those who labored in the areas he rejected, particularly medicine and science rather than religion, then the glorious passionate energy he exhibits may have been better directed. Unfortunately, the highest conceivable point to which he could aspire involved an overthrow of man's conventional relationship with the supernatural. Just as unfortunate, he attempts this feat within the ethos of the Christian eschatology. Hence, it comes as no surprise that a hero who would build a tower underneath the heaven of a powerful contemporary God must ultimately appear a fool.

Judith Weil sees the dual approach of combining fault with passionate energy as part of Marlowe's "theatrical design" (175). Furthermore, Weil's own general thesis illustrates the powerful preoccupation with self and power that Faustus's actions reflect: "Marlowe's merciful treatment of his characters suggests that they are obsessively self-bound. But it also implies that all are, like Faustus, potentially amiable, open, responsible, and capable of using their extraordinary freedom to change themselves" (176). That is, while Faustus exposes his moral and
intellectual failings to the audience, he is also invested with a passionate energy which is compelling. It is the power of the emotional appeal (pathos) that sets up the conflict in the audience and renders the play so complex. Hence, Faustus, both fool and hero, has taken his proud stand with that black art and pits himself against the accepted forces in the Christian universe.

What is more difficult to reconcile with the image of Faustus as hero is his appearance in succeeding scenes in which he exhibits a lack of resolve as the good and bad angels present opposite sides of the first issue which Faustus faced: self-reliance or submission to God. As Faustus' doubts increase, he agonizes over whether he has made the correct decision. Correspondingly, as his passionate energy wanes, the absurdity of his words and actions increases. Many have argued that as Faustus becomes more entertaining, the power of his appeal lessens.

With the idea that Faustus' pleasures are trivial in mind, many have frequently asked why Faustus does not turn wholly to Christ for forgiveness. The answers from within the tradition are that Faustus has given himself up to voluptuousness, to pride, and to willfulness, with the spiritual result of a hardened heart. The Old Man says as much when he expresses the hope that Faustus' 'sin, by custom grow not into
nature" (5.1.44), and Faustus himself admits as much earlier with "my heart is hardened: I cannot repent" (2.2.18). On the other hand, a different answer, which underscores his heroism, is that his hardened heart, will, or conviction of his own damnation are precisely the elements of pathos which enhance his heroic dimension. Though not always consciously aware of it, he remains faithful to his sense original sense of things—the limitations he perceives in various intellectual disciplines and the fatalism he believes to be inherent in religion. The erroneous conclusions he has possibly made with regard to these components of his society undercut any intellectual pretensions he may have had to the truth, but they do not undermine the attractiveness of his aspiration. To change the resolute stance which he had taken in the first scene would involve relinquishing the very source of his aspiration, namely to explore and attain to the supernatural through his own powers. In resisting the strong impulse to seek forgiveness, he maintains his heroic stance against forces which may ultimately destroy him. Indeed, he cannot remain faithful to his original plan if he throws himself on Christ’s mercy. Thus, when the inscription appears upon his arm, he asks "Whither shall I fly?" because he cannot both rely upon his own efforts and plead for Christ’s mercy at the same time.
This is not to say that he does not have his doubt, for as pointed out earlier, the Christian forces, both devil and angel, are very real in the play. Faustus' purpose is not so much to disprove the validity of the orthodox view of the universe as to juxtapose his own next to it. In the terrible resulting tension between tradition (demanding submission) and aspiration (requiring faithfulness to original purpose), Faustus plays out his drama and in so doing presents his own definitio of godhead. Hence, time and again when he agonizes over the significance of what he has done, he is hesitantly, and perhaps without full awareness, asserting his right to his own freedom, even if that freedom necessitates his own eternal damnation. When he sees the writing on his arm, he notes the implication but stands against it nevertheless. "Even here is writ/ Homo fuge: yet shall not Faustus fly" (2.1.81-82).

Furthermore, Faustus' language reveals that he deeply believes that Christ's aid would be denied him even if he did relinquish his own efforts to reach heaven. It is quite possible that in his false syllogism of the first scene he has accurately portrayed the conception of God that he clings to throughout his life. Faustus does not apply this che sera sera notion without revealing a definite ethos either. He believes that since he has rejected God, that God has in turn rejected him.
Though Kuriyama has pointed out the psychological ramifications of this fact, from another perspective Faustus is being heroic in that he expects the same consistency or faithfulness to purpose from God as he demands from himself. He asked for no favors and ethically expects none. Like Tamburlaine's definition of personal honor when he cruelly sacrifices his son Calyphas, Faustus is presenting his definition of cosmic order. Cruel as with Tamburlaine or blind in the case of Faustus, these definitions are closely adhered to, and there is honor in that.

The middle scenes (after the pact and before the last hour) have been discussed variously as artistically designed to undercut Faustus, as artistic failures, and additions in part by collaborators or later contributors. Certainly, as the play progresses, the dramatic tension set up in the first scenes between Faustus' faulty logos and his powerful pathos relaxes as Faustus pursues "sweet pleasures" that for the time being "conquer deep despair" (2.2.25). I submit that in the process of enjoying "all that delights the heart of man" (3.1.60), Faustus does enjoy the life of a deity, an anthropomorphic deity, but a deity at any rate. He immerses himself in pleasures of books (2.1.), knowledge (2.1, 2.2, 3.1), pleasures of the flesh (2.1); he flies, acquires invisibility, makes ancient beauties appear (4.1. 5.1), and revenges himself upon any
who insult him (4.1). While all of these activities fly in the face of the orthodox definition of God, they do present the audience with a competing definition of godhead. Zeus has come to earth in the form of a Wittenberg scholar. An often argued point with regard to Faustus’s devotion to his pleasures is that Faustus proves to himself and illustrates to the audience the paltriness of the pleasures of the earth. On his journey into the heavens Faustus views the earth far below and surmises “the earth appeared to me/ No bigger than my hand in quantity” (3.1.72-73). The opposing argument is that for the time he is able, Faustus illustrates the perfect sufficiency of the pleasures of earth. When Faustus is enjoying his powers, he is a happy man.

Furthermore, the interlude is comic as all happy scenes must be, though invariably Faustus gradually sees that he has pitted himself against powerful forces. Indeed, his godhead found support in the supernatural abilities of Mephistopheles, not Faustus himself. He is playing amidst conventional deities more powerful than any Greece or Rome prayed to. Thus, by degrees his resolve diminishes, and he grows increasingly uncertain. Yet Dr. Faustus does not end anticlimactically; the ending is not simply a moral gloss to an otherwise immoral tale. The tension is revived and intensified as the play nears its conclusion, as both the absurdity, tragedy, and heroism
of Faustus's position become poignantly clear. Even for those who disregard the definitive that Marlowe has presented of godhead there is conflict enough in the conclusion to arouse sympathy for Faustus. Thus, it is in the final two scenes that the vision of Faustus as hero becomes most apparent.

In these final two scenes it is patently obvious that Faustus is willing to call on God for mercy. In response to the earnest advice of the Old Man, Faustus says:

O friend, I feel thy words to comfort my distressed soul.

Leave me awhile to ponder on my sins.

He regrets his earlier heroic aspirations to achieve his own miracles, his own deity, his own immortality. These lines are significant because they contain Faustus' first words of regret that are addressed to another person. Up to this point, Faustus has expressed his doubts to himself. Now the doubts are becoming public, and as such he is opening himself up to communication and possible dissuasion. However, Faustus elects to recognize only one half of the message of the Old Man who has just said that he sees

... an angel hover o'er thy head,
And with a vial full of precious grace
Offers to pour the same into thy soul.
Then call for mercy and avoid despair.
This exhortation advances by means of antithesis as the Old Man presents Faustus with the opposites of "mercy" and "despair." Faustus ignores the possibility of the "vial full of grace" as he wishes to "ponder on [his] sins." But it is significant that Faustus never ponders on his sins; he never reflects upon the insufficiency of the flesh, only upon the terrible sentence that he receives by earlier agreement. Faustus is becoming acutely aware of the horror of what is happening, and he possesses the devout wish it could be otherwise simultaneously with the conviction that anything other than what is happening is not possible. The perfect illustration of this observation is that as soon as he turns away from the Old Man, Faustus cowers before the threat of physical pain, and asks for one final sensual pleasure, the kiss of Helen of Troy.

Unfortunately, the weight of the other halves of the biblical quotes begins to assert an awesome force on Faustus' consciousness as the second half of the bargain is about to be honored. Faustus asks repeatedly the same question in different ways: "Where art thou, Faustus? Wretch what has thou done?" (5.1.55). A short time later as Faustus tells the scholars about his bargain with the devil, he reveals his willingness to repent, but he is just as certain that "Faustus' offence can ne'er be pardoned"
(5.2.42). His heart is repentant, but he cannot bring himself to say the words. Hence, another subversive element emerges as God is portrayed as legalistic, one who would require a formula of words in lieu of heartfelt contrition. Faustus cries out to God, "Ah, my God— I would weep but the devil draws in my tears" (11. 56-57). We feel pity and terror here precisely because God is so silent and all the decision making responsibility falls to him. Here, Faustus elicits sympathy, if not identification, since all the inexplicable terrors of a legalistic world are aimed at him. Hence, from one point of view the play's last scene introduces the idea of the impossible harshness of Christian logic.

Indeed, one of the most important means of depicting Faustus as hero involves the subversive role that religion plays in Dr. Faustus. Kocher sees the play as having a Christian structure within which blasphemy runs like a "seething liquid" (104). He points out that Marlowe works in criticisms of prayer, Hell, the austerity of Christian dogma though he ultimately covers them with "the usual orthodox replies" (104). A further element of "blasphemy" which Kocher does not mention is the silence of God or Christ when Faustus does call on Him.

In his final hour, he indeed calls on Christ:

O I´ll leap up to my God; who pulls me down?
See, see, where Christ's blood streams in the
firmament

One drop would save my soul, half a drop.

Ah, my Christ.

(5.2.146-49)

The force with which he grapples remains the diabolical
force whose presence is much stronger than the divine
in the play. Indeed, the silence of God in each of the
above instances represents the most striking subversive
use of religion. Ironically, Faustus becomes most
heroic when in these last moments he is at his weakest.

Stripped of his own aspirations to godhead, he stands
before the orthodox God and appears more sympathetic
than does God's righteousness.

This appeal to Christ occurs earlier than in the
final scene. The earliest instance of this appeal
occurs shortly after the signing of the pact, as
Faustus is ready to relinquish his quest for the
supernatural: "O Christ my saviour, my saviour,/Help
to save distressed Faustus' soul" (2.2.85-86). The
stage directions dictate that immediately Lucifer,
Beelzebub, and Mephistopheles appear. These potentates
of the underworld threaten Faustus with bodily harm
whereupon Faustus relents. Much later as the time of
his contract nears expiration, Faustus laments, "I do
repent, and yet I do despair/Hell strives with grace
for conquest in my breast" (5.1.71-72). As before, the
representative of the underworld is the nearest to him. When Faustus is threatened with bodily harm, once again he relents.

It is finally not his own definition of godhead but in his suffering, not in the permanent success of any attempt to achieve his own godhead, but in certain failure of any attempt that Faustus's heroism does emerge. Anyone who might see play and feel that Faustus gets what he deserves will be the few who fail to respond to the substance of Faustus's ethos. It is this suffering which creates the intense pathos of this final scene. He alone must bear the brunt of an apparently indifferent, or at the least legalistic, universe. Strangely, the syllogism which he so illogically constructed seems more sensible now in Faustus's final hour. Indeed, the arbitrary nature of God's logic supports the illogic of Faustus's original intent.

Hence, this play does present a complex choice between alternatives of Faustus as hero or as fool: the portrayal of the aspiring, sinning, and idealistic Faustus falling into destruction in a universe in which what he desires is clearly impossible from the start. Faustus aspires to godhead, signs the pact with the most powerful force that he can reach, presents his own definition of godhead through years of pleasure with all that "delights the heart of man," and then is
subsumed by the quiet but powerful theology of orthodox Christianity. Indeed, in this sense Faustus is a fool, for if one creates a story with the Christian eschatology so firmly established, then one's hero must be foolish when he rebels against it.

Yet, Faustus' pleasures and God's silence present the essential arguments for Faustus the hero. Furthermore, his unwillingness to repent reflects his essential heroism, and his damnation suggests more than the orthodox replies to the play have explained. All men, Marlowe might have said, outside the conventional hope of heaven, aspire toward godhead, enjoy their pleasures for a time, and all are claimed by death which places a limit on the aspirations of the human hero.

Furthermore, Faustus, the poor scholar and worse theologian vies with the Faustus, the passionate soul. In Faustus' divided soul lies the terror of the final scene, or as one critic maintains, this is the story of the "divided soul--soon to become the complicated modern soul of Dostoevski's analysis--torn between the desire to exploit its new mastery and freedom and the claims of the old teachings, which to defy meant guilt and growing sense of alienation" (Sewall 59). Hence, the final statement that the play makes certainly involves more than sinful aspiration, a pact with the devil, and eternal perdition. Faustus feels cut off
from this power, and true to himself he does not seek
amelioration of things as they are. In fact, these
ideas are made plain as early as the first scene of Act
I. Rather, the discoveries that Faustus makes are of
greater importance. By portraying the limits of man’s
abilities to rise permanently to godhead, Faustus
“transcends the man he was. He goes out no craven
sinner but violently, speaking the rage and despair of
all mankind who would undo the past the stop the clock
against the inevitable reckoning” (Sewall 66).
Moreover, as a frustrated freethinker our sympathies go
with him, as perhaps did more than a few of the viewers
in Marlowe’s era. His sufferings touch us so deeply
because Marlowe has presented the two sides of the
issue of man’s destiny so powerfully. For those who
remain within the tradition, suffering follows close
upon intellectual and spiritual blindness. Yet more
sadly, for those who, like Faustus, aspire to godhead
themselves, suffering and death are intimately involved
in life itself, in the very order of the cosmos. Only
Mephistopheles possesses this ironic awareness of the
nature of the cosmos; hence, as Faustus goes screaming
off to hell, his life is perhaps not ending, but only
beginning.
Chapter IV:
The Rhetoric of the Savage Farce in

The Jew of Malta

Since T. S. Eliot's characterization of The Jew of Malta as "a savage farce," efforts have been made to view the play as operating in a comic mode. However, into the green world of comedy, Marlowe has brought some bitter elixir just as his central figure here mixes poison with the nuns' porridge. The basic elements of farce—caricatured characters, improbable situations, verbal humor—are handled in such a way as to call into question the anticipated belly laughs of the audience. Though one critic has pointed out the role that humor plays in the release of antisocial feelings (Segal 69), one may still question whether a world such as Malta provides for such a release. Indeed, if The Jew of Malta be comedy, it is of a very different variety from the romantic comedies of his more famous successor on the stage.

While much of what Aristotle had to say about comedy was contained in the lost Second Book of the Poetics, he does offer this description:

As for Comedy, it is an imitation of men worse than the average; worse, however, not as regards any and every sort of fault, but only as regards
one particular kind, the Ridiculous, which is a species of the Ugly. (Poetics, Ch 4. 1449a)

Thus, the portrayal of men as worse than the average involves a conscious exaggeration of the faults which makes them ridiculous. Conversely, in Aristotle's estimation, the exaggeration of virtues invests men with tragic potential. In the quest for the proper interpretation of this play, it may be useful to determine what aspects of Barabas' character receive exaggeration. Is he a monstrous villain, a tragic figure, or in some sense a measure of both?

One curious trait that Marlowe's protagonists share is that they set about, in either a superhuman or subhuman fashion, to test the limits of some reality. In this respect, Tamburlaine's pursuit of political power, Faustus' pursuit of knowledge, and Barabas' concern with deception or wealth all represent a similar facet of the Marlovian conception of character. Furthermore, the testing of the boundaries of reality often involves acts of violence. As Stephen Greenblatt has pointed out, the energies of Marlowe's alienated heroes lead them to acts of violence for purposes of self-demarkation or self-definition (187). Thus, the line where the self meets the non-self is determined by the point at which each hero meets his failure.

Though they share several characteristics--their alienated restlessness, their reliance on violence to
achieve their ends, and their ultimate failure--Marlowe's central figures also exhibit some essential differences which bear scrutiny. We have noted that the rhetoric of Tamburlaine is significantly more hyperbolic than that of Faustus, that his boasts match or exceed reality for a longer time, and that Faustus' moral character is undercut earlier in the play through his enthymemic mistakes. Now in *The Jew of Malta*, even greater divergence arises.

On the larger scale, Marlowe employs the elements of Invention to construct Barabas, a central figure who is vastly different from his earlier creations. First, Barabas does not elicit awe or even respect from those around him through his use of language. Rather, his riches provide the basis for the respect he receives. Both Tamburlaine and Faustus demand positive regard through their persons, Tamburlaine for his military prowess and Faustus for his scholarship. Also, Barabas puts language to a different use, employing it to distort truth and deceive others. Tamburlaine exhorts others to follow him in his eloquent quest to transform reality, whereas Faustus ultimately discovers that language deceives him, not others. Finally the central figures vary in the manner they face death. For Tamburlaine, death is another dramatic moment which affords him opportunity to survey his life's achievements and yearn for more time to conquer the unconquered. Faustus finds horror in his final moments, but he too dies yearning for
the infinite. The death agony for Barabas, on the other hand, is swift and clean, and he expresses no deep sorrow or sense of his own limitation. Rather, he dies expressing one of his many *imprecatio*, or curses, as he seethes in the cauldron designed for the Turks. For him death takes the form of yet another deception, this time with himself as the butt of the cruel joke.

Furthermore, he is the personification of all the qualities that traditional Elizabethan morality would deem evil: devotion to wealth to the exclusion of all other values, blatant disrespect for order and degree, cynicism toward the church and disregard of Christian precepts, manipulation and destruction of others (including the guiltless) to achieve his ends, and monomaniacal pursuit of these ends. Barabas' *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos* become so clear to the audience because he remains unswervingly faithful to his private code as is revealed in his inner thoughts, reflections, and private jokes. The audience, unlike Barabas' victims who face his deceptiveness, gains access to Barabas' real values.

Another way to see the differences between this and the previous plays is to compare the situation of the major characters. In *The Jew of Malta* we begin with a character who has already achieved his foremost aim—vast wealth. Barabas' heart is set on his gold which he acquires with apparent ease. In fact, after Ferneze has deprived Barabas of his riches, Marlowe has Barabas newly
acquire wealth quickly, almost offstage. The boundary or limit of wealth is not the reality which Barabas is here to test; rather, he derives his great goal—a cunning revenge—only after he has been acted upon by an outside force.

Second, in this study by Marlowe of the Renaissance concern with Realpolitik, there may be less exaltation of the central figure. Barabas is a self-confessed villain, as he says to Ithamore without any intended irony: "make account of me/ As of thy fellow; we are villains both" (2.3.216). The values of strength and knowledge that Tamburlaine and Faustus personify are amplified by a corresponding rhetoric, though the evidence for undercutting of these heroes is also present. Nevertheless, there is poetry of the highest caliber in Tamburlaine's speeches and in Faustus' final agony, whereas a corollary eloquence is hard to find in Barabas' thoughts, feelings, and actions.

Third, Barabas makes use of language in ways significantly different from Tamburlaine or Faustus. According to Barabas' way of thinking, one must set and maintain boundaries between one's speech and one's self and between one's words and deeds. For Barabas, speech is the means not to achieve a higher reality but to cloak a lower, secretive one. "Speech, in short, is not a way of presenting oneself, but of re-presenting oneself; not of bridging distances, but of creating them" (Cunningham
Appearance is all. Performance follows from the requirements of the social situation. Not only are the devices that Marlowe uses remarkable in their ability to create character, but also those devices that were frequently employed in *Faustus* and *Tamburlaine* are notable for their absence. *Auxesis*, a figure of augmentation, is nearly absent in *The Jew of Malta*, whereas it abounds in Tamburlaine. *Hyperbole* is also infrequently used in this play, as when the two villains, Barabas and Ithamore, attempt to outdo each other's past evildoing (2.3.69-219). When it occurs, as it does here, the hyperbolic statement is meant ironically as the audience immediately or soon afterward discovers. Rather than setting up an identification for the protagonist, the hyperbolic statements serve to define their pride in destruction for its own sake. As Barabas himself observes at the end of the conversation, "we are villains both" (l. 216).

That is not to say that powerful, sincere emotions are entirely absent from the play, however. In fact, two instances of *pathopœoeia*, a sudden wave of strong passion, present interesting and diametrically opposed worldviews, that of Barabas and that of his daughter Abigail who are reacting to the loss of what is dear to each of them respectively. After the death of Mathias and Lodowick, Abigail anguishes for them as she generalizes, "But I perceive there is no love on earth/Pity in Jews, nor piety in Turks" (3.3.50-51). Indeed, her insight into
the milieu of Malta accurately reflects a major concern of the play. Barabas, on the other hand, regrets only the loss of his own possessions as he compares his own situation to the challenges faced by Old Testament Job. Job suffers in the comparison as Barabas emphatically concludes, "So that not he, but I, may curse the day/Thy fatal birthday, forlorn Barabas" (1.2.192-93).

From the smallest stylistic device to the largest rhetorical element, we can see these essential differences reflected in the language of the play. In the creation of the world of Malta, particularly the character Barabas, Marlowe utilized such figures as would emphasize the values and essential traits of the players. One group of rhetorical devices acts to reveal the treachery of Barabas. As befits his love of deception, Barabas, for example, often uses the same word in different senses, as when he addresses Ferneze:

'Tis not thy life which can avail me aught;
Yet you do live, and live, for me, you shall.

(5.2.62-63)

This example of antanaclasis shows Barabas playing with two meanings of "live": physical existence and servitude. Words are the weapons that Barabas uses to achieve his ends and protect his own interests; thus, his manipulation of meanings is not surprising. Another instance of such a conscious shift in meaning to gain an advantage or assert an idea occurs when Calymath discovers Barabas near his
camp after Barabas has been thrown over the wall of the town:

Caly: Whom have we here? A spy?
Bar: Yes, my good lord, one that can spy a place
Where you may enter, and surprise the town. (5.1.69-71)

Here Barabas subtly changes the sense of "spy" from an intruder to one who can be on the lookout. Without denying Calymath's accusation, Barabas proceeds to assert a definition of his own.

Similar to Barabas' use of the various meanings of words that recur in a given passage is his twisting of the meaning of a single word into a variant meaning. This device, antiphrasis, is very useful in The Jew of Malta to provide opportunities for Barabas' love of irony and sarcasm. As Barabas is about to poison the pot of porridge he will send by Ithamore to the nunnery, Barabas says,

There, Ithamore, must thou go place this pot:
Stay, let me spice it first. (3.4.81)

By the twinning of an inherently pleasant connotative word as "spice" with such a diabolical meaning, Barabas' patent evil is intensified. The Jew's love of irony reveals his cheerful malevolence toward the nuns. Indeed, Barabas' irony is employed on many occasions. Almost everyone affords him opportunity for his ironic twists of meaning. When Barabas speaks to Jacomo who, Barabas thinks, has
changed his daughter’s Jewish faith, Barabas sweetly intones:

Why, brother, you converted Abigail;
And I am bound in charity to requite it
And so I will. (4.1.109-11)

Of course, "charity" is not what Barabas intends, but revenge.

Akin to the use of a word with a variant meaning is ironia, or the use of a word when its exact opposite is intended. This device underscores the disjunction between word and meaning as well as word and intention, both very important aspects of the rhetoric in this play, particularly the rhetoric of Barabas after he has been relieved of his wealth. In his soliloquies, and at times with Ithamore, Barabas does not employ irony or any related devices, for it is then that the audience receives his true appraisal of himself and his purposes. In his relations to others, however, the device readily emerges. Furthermore, if hyperbole was the signal device for the identification of Tamburlaine’s character, it is the ironia for the character of Barabas. When Barabas says to Ithamore, "O trusty Ithamore: no servant, but my friend" (3.4.42), the literal sense of the lines is immediately qualified when Barabas appears to offer Ithamore the keys to his treasure, only to withdraw them with, "I’l give them thee anon" (line 46). For it is certain that Barabas has in his own eyes no friend in all of Malta, not even
his own daughter, whom he has sent to her death. After she has been poisoned, along with a hundred other nuns, Barabas remarks that he grieves "because she liv'd so long" (4.1.18). 4

Similarly, he says to the courting Lodowick concerning his own daughter that "I have one left that will serve your turn," but immediately in a verbal aside, he concludes, "but ere he shall have her/ I'll sacrifice her on a pile of wood" (2.3.51-53). In the same conversation Lodowick expresses his desire to "deserve" the hand of Abigail (line 69). Barabas employs the same word with a twist when he says,

Your father has deserv'd it at my hands
Who of mere charity and Christian ruth,
To bring me to religious purity

Seiz'd all I had, and thrust me out-a-doors
And made my house a place for nuns most chaste.

(2.3.70 ff.)

The speech is replete with *ironia* as Barabas uses the words "deserv'd," "charity," and "chaste" when he means precisely the opposite. For what Ferneze deserves in Barabas's mind is death rather than award of Abigail to his son since Ferneze's Christian charity is only Maltese greed, and as for the nuns that inhabit the city, Barabas is clearly of the opinion that they frequently frolic with the local monks. Hence, in a single speech he has
employed several words which he obviously intends in the opposite sense.

Litotes, also frequently employed by Barabas, occurs when more is understood than is actually said, and often in *The Jew of Malta* more is implied than is stated. When Barabas says to Lodowick, "As for the diamond, it shall be yours" (2.3.138), Barabas's implication as to what "more" shall belong to Lodowick is quite sinister. As he plays Mathias against Lodowick, he says to Mathias, "If you love me, no quarrels in my house" (2.3.273), though as the audience will see there will indeed be a quarrel outside his house which will involve the death of both suitors.

Another group of devices reveal a more appealing side of Barabas' character. Notwithstanding his cruelty, his deception, and his cheerful malice toward nearly everyone in the play, Barabas also exhibits a great intelligence and a ready wit that are instantly at his command. When Barabas uses paroemia he is presenting a dictum with clever novelty that is highly appealing to the listening audience, both on the stage and among the spectators. At the very beginning of Barabas' difficulties with Maltese authorities, when Abigail expresses dismay at their plight, he advises her

No, Abigail, things past recovery
Are hardly cur'd with exclamations.
Be silent, daughter; sufferance breeds ease.
And time may yield us an occasion,
Which on the sudden cannot serve the turn.

(1.2.237-40)

The *paroemia* in the first two lines reveals the calculating wisdom of Barabas as he encourages Abigail to cease her pointless bemoaning of their misfortune. Barabas appears here as the cunning survivor, a wary participant in the affairs of men. His strength is reflected in the forbearance he encourages in his daughter, and his core of strength is supported shortly when he reveals to her that he has wisely hid part of his wealth, the ten thousand portagues, great pearls, and stones infinite (ll. 245-46), in view of such a disaster as is occurring.

Similarly, *agnominatio*, a pleasing congruence between two or more words used closely together, is important for creating receptivity in the audience. When Barabas unites his eloquence with his understanding of human nature, the result is often that satirical humor so characteristic of him. He says of Pilia-Borza after receiving Ithamore's request for more gold, "such a rogue/ As is the husband to a hundred whores" (4.3.15). The assonance of the *h* sounds draws attention to the antithetical meanings of "husband" and "whore" as Barabas underscores his disgust for the profession of Ithamore's friends.

Perhaps the most often employed device which reflects Barabas' ready wit is *antithesis*, using opposites of words or ideas in a passage. Barabas's express wish to enclose
"Infinite riches in a little room" is the best known example of this device, yet it is by no means the single effective example of his startling wit. As Ferneze justifies the taking of Barabas's riches, Barabas responds in a similar vein:

   Fern. Content thee, Barabas; thou has naught but right

   Bar. Your extreme right does me exceeding wrong.

(1.2.153-54)

Thus, Barabas's treachery is matched with an equal intelligence as he devises his strategems to effect his revenge on those he perceives as having insulted him. Including an impressive antithesis Barabas says to his fellow Jews that he will not tolerate such abuse.

   No, Barabas is born to better chance.
   And fram'd of finer mould than common men
   That measure naught but by the present time.
   A reaching thought will search his deepest wits,
   And cast with cunning for the time to come.

(1.2.219-24)

The antithesis of "reaching" and "deepest" certainly characterizes Barabas's determination to revenge himself upon his adversaries.

   Emerging from the employment of such devices, Barabas's self-conception, his ethos and logos, is clear from his first soliloquy. Those who have maintained that
he is either a victim (the old romantic view) or a person who acts from specified causes must downplay the ethical dimensions of this first scene, for it is here that Barabas’ inner sense of self is presented. In his counting house, Barabas expresses disdain for those who pay in silver unlike the Arabs, who pay in gold. He takes great pride in his ability to amass the wealth he possesses.

Furthermore, he reasons that nothing beneficial comes from poverty, only pity. Barabas suggests that it is better to have wealth, even if gained by hypocritical relationships with others, than to be poor (ll. 108 ff). The man who is good possesses a conscience, but those with conscience are beggars. Hence, the fruits of traditional morality (good will, honesty, love, and loyalty) produce failure in economic and political terms. This argument from consequence (Aristotle 142) is one aspect of the logos of Barabas which we find recurring throughout the play. One who is poor finds himself without power, whereas one who holds great wealth has the power to ransom a king from captivity.

Another element of Barabas’ self-definition involves his awareness of his Jewishness. He is content to allow the Christians to have the key political positions so long as he can be wealthy. Barabas admits that Jews are not often kings since their numbers are few and they do not like to be violent and cannot gain the crown by
succession. The barb about violent acquisition of power is another of the many subversive comments that Barabas utters throughout the play, and it adds to his comic dimensions when he encounters difficulties at the hands of those in power whom he has criticized. This appraisal of the way in which the Christian kings acquire power reveals one of the reasons Barabas asserts for justification for his own behavior. The enthymeme he is employing here is argument from time and tradition (Aristotle Book II, Ch 23.11) as Barabas maintains that things have always been this way in the past. His logical conclusion is that they are to continue to be done this way in the present and future.

The general picture we receive from this first view of Barabas is of a proud, wealthy Jew who has no inkling of or worries over the challenges that life in Malta might present; hence, he is ripe for a fall. Nevertheless, we are apprised of his values very early on. He disdains conventional morality, though we do not see him sinning as yet. He views the acquisition of political power realistically, if not cynically. His reasoning is clear and valid; his ethics reduce to the idea that if it obtains results for him, then he will do it.

When he is not presenting himself through soliloquies, Barabas's ethos readily emerges in his use of verbal asides. The vast discrepancy between word and intention is nowhere more apparent than when Barabas is in
dialogue with a potential antagonist. Particularly, in conversations with Jacomo the friar, Lodowick, and Pilia-Borza the witty deception of Barabas emerges. In a series of asides, to gain access to his old home he feigns anguish to Jacomo all the while giving directions to Abigail (1.2.330 ff). Similarly, Barabas enters an exchange with Lodowick to involve him in another of his strategems, while revealing to the audience his real intentions (2.3.50 ff), and when he disguises himself to poison Ithamore and his compatriots Barabas's meanings also emerge. The humor involved in the mistaken identity of these exchanges will be reviewed later, but the exchange at the house of the courtesan will suffice to illustrate the character of Barabas (4.4.40 ff). In this brief scene, Barabas undertakes his revenge on Ithamore, whose betrayal has sidetracked Barabas's larger purpose. He enters disguised as a musician, wearing poisoned flowers in his hat. After Bellamira demands the flowers, as Barabas must have intended, he exults in his first aside that he is revenged. Nevertheless, he continues to dissemble by entertaining the three extortioners with music. Barabas's major value emerges in the next three asides. Given two crowns of gold to play, Barabas begins his remarks:

Bar. (Aside) How liberally the villain gives me mine own gold!

Pilia. Methinks he fingers very well.
Bar. (Aside) So did you when you stole my gold.

Pilia. How swift he runs!

Bar. (Aside) You ran swifter when you threw my gold out of my window.

(11. 51-57)

Of course, Barabas is here in their chambers to murder them, but his emphasis on gold also reveals the source of his own bliss and the justification for what he is here attempting. As in many of the human relationships in the play, there is an object of desire (flowers for Bellamira, gold for Barabas, or sexual pleasure for Ithamore) that draws people together. In their involvement, rhetoric provides the means to gratify the desire. Yet gratification always involves the deception of the person who possesses or owns the object of desire. In fact, gratification depends upon one's ability to manipulate language to manipulate others.

Following the deprivation of his wealth by Ferneze, Barabas applies his values and abilities in a series of relationships with other characters as he takes his revenge upon the persons and families who have touched his own concerns. Barabas's rhetoric in relation to these other characters also reveals his ethos, for the ethos of a speaker includes both his inner sense of self and his moral life (that is, his social relationships and the roles he plays in them). Throughout his brief career
Barabas does not spare the innocent nor those who are only remotely connected with the insult and deprivation he suffered. In fact, he spares no one who comes in contact with him. Even a partial list of Barabas' crimes is long: he kills his own daughter along with one hundred of her fellow Christian nuns, two would be suitors for his daughter's hand, two corrupt priests, his servant and consorts, as well as a host of soldiers.

Ferneze, as the first citizen of Malta who comes into contact with Barabas, establishes the nature of the relationships that will follow. To pay Malta's debt to the Turks, Ferneze has devised a policy which will not injure any of the respected citizens of Malta. He tells Barabas that there is no evil in his policy since the Jews are condemned by God for having rejected Christ. Hence, Ferneze selects the policy that suits him and then appeals to the authority of Christianity to justify it. After Barabas' demurral to the policy that he lose one half of his estate, Ferneze claims the entirety of the rich Jew's riches. Barabas rejects the basis of Ferneze's appeal with "What, bring you Scripture to confirm your wrongs? Preach me not out of my possessions" (1.2.111-12). Barabas is suggesting, quite rightly, that Ferneze is casting about for reasons to justify theft. Shortly, Barabas uses the Bible to support an argument of his own. Allowing that some Jews are wicked, "as all Christians are" (line 113), Barabas reasons that he should not be
judged by their sins. Rather, in a very rough paraphrase of Romans 1:17 he asserts that "the man that dealeth righteously shall live" (line 117). Hence, both men manipulate Scripture to justify their own ends—Ferneze to appropriate wealth and Barabas to preserve his own. But Ferneze has the final say, moralizing about the evil of covetousness precisely at the moment he is coveting the Jew's riches: "Excess of wealth is cause of covetousness/ And covetousness, 0, 'tis a monstrous sin" (ll. 124-25).

The manner of Ferneze's acquisition of Barabas's wealth suggests that Barabas' appraisal of the world of Malta in his first soliloquy was very near the truth. Ferneze moralizes to obtain his ends, and he does so regularly with his use of sententia. The sententia involves a brief statement of a universal truth about what ought to be done in life. Ferneze moralizes, "Tis more kingly to obtain by peace/ Than many perish for a private man" (1.2.25-26). And a short while later, Ferneze continues, "Better one want for a common good/Than many perish for a private man" (1.2.99-100). In both cases, however, the moral truth is used to support the unjustified taking of an estate. No Christian sacrifice is involved here as might be expected from the meaning of the sententiae themselves. Rather, in their context the moral truths are used to subvert traditional morality. Ferneze employs another sententia after the confiscation by advising Barabas to "be patient, and thy riches will
increase" (11. 122-23).

That Ferneze elicits very little positive identification is reinforced shortly as he bargains with Bosco, the Spanish Vice-Admiral. Allied with the Spanish navy, Ferneze's forces need not spend the gold recently obtained from Malta's Jews nor need they be overrun by the Spanish who likewise greedily take what they can. Rather, the Turks can be overcome and the gold retained in a newly-fashioned treaty with Bosco. Policy shifts according to circumstance; the one rule that remains unviolated is the law of self-preservation, regardless of the cost to others. The "honour" (line 56) that Ferneze refers to is an empty one since it is founded on the practical policies of might makes right and self-aggrandizement.

Words in this play, even those from a holy text, exist as tools to achieve an end. This relationship between word and action and words and self is consistent in each relationship in the play. Hence, all of the violation that Barabas experiences at Ferneze's rhetorical and political machinations, he purposes to act out on his own victims, Ferneze included, through his own strategems. In Malta, no man in relation to others is what he would seem. As Ithamore later suggests, even "the meaning has a meaning" (4.4.84). Thus, the means that Barabas takes to carry out his motivation for revenge is to employ deceptive language with a series of victims.
In succeeding scenes, Barabas dissembles to deceive various opponents. He will announce his public meanings only to subvert them in private asides either to Abigail or to himself. Indeed, in *The Jew of Malta*, each character possesses two selves—one pretended kindness, the other real malignancy. The discrepancy between social and private selves reflects a logic based upon the idea of self-preservation. Only the foolish and the uninformed are unaware of the verbal rules, and such a lack of awareness often proves fatal in Malta. Two such fools are Mathias and Lodowick, who fall prey to Barabas's ploy, but they are young and prove easy marks in Barabas's quest for complete revenge. That Abigail really loves Mathias or that Mathias is not related to Ferneze causes no concern to Barabas, who uses all three as mere pawns.

Temporarily sidetracked from his designs on Ferneze, Barabas exacts revenge on both monks and nuns after his daughter in her grief rejoins the convent, sincerely this time. While the deception of the nuns does not directly entail language, Barabas's hoodwinking of the monks parallels the pattern set up in earlier relationships. The object of desire for the monks is gold, and in their greed they fail to take adequate precaution for their own safety. Hence, joining the ranks of the uninformed, they too fail to master the language game that Malta plays.

The deception that informs all relationships in *The Jew of Malta* even extends to the master-slave pair Barabas
and Ithamore. Unlike the preceding victims, Ithamore approximates Barabas' own evil, and it is language more than action which establishes this similarity. Both offer exaggerated claims to the pain and suffering they have inflicted upon others, and Barabas, sensing a kindred spirit, purchases Ithamore as his servant. The hyperbole of their vaunts illustrates an ironical use of the type of language that Marlowe had earlier used to amplify his central protagonist. He achieves this by changing the verb tense. Whereas Tamburlaine and Faustus speak in the future tense (especially the "will" and "shall" of Tamburlaine), Ithamore and Barabas are describing what they have done. That is, the unknown but possible glory connotes a greater possible identification than the quoting of deeds already accomplished, whatever their nature. Furthermore, as Barabas and Ithamore catalogue their misdeeds, the horrible nature of their crimes becomes so extreme as to move past the serious into the comical. The killing of the Virgins compelled more horror and pathos than does the pathetic murder of "sick people groaning under walls" (2.3.178). Also, the power to cause death was one of the terrible facets of Tamburlaine's character, but with this master and his slave the power to administer suffering and death is directed largely upon the infirm. Eric Segal cites Homer's account of the delight of the Greek leaders at Odysseus' clubbing of the cripple Thersites as evidence of brutality being "first
stimulus to human laughter in the history of Western literature" (69). Thus, it is quite possible that Marlowe is intending the same end as Homer, though the humor may cause the modern sensibility to recoil (69). As in the use of verbal asides, Marlowe has created the same kind of savage humor.

After Ithamore passes inspection, Barabas and he form yet another of the play’s pacts. Just as was the case in the other agreements, one of the parties violates its terms. Ithamore proves weak at one point; his self-interest leads him to betray Barabas in pursuit of the favors of Bellamira. The world of Malta is littered with broken pacts, betrayed trust, shifting loyalties. Beginning with Ferneze’s treatment of the Jews as an act of public policy, many similar acts follow: Barabas’s betrayal of Abigail and her suitors, Ithamore’s betrayal of Barabas, and Ferneze’s betrayal of pact with the Turk’s Basso. Every character maneuvers and deceives to establish personal security. The cycle moves through predictable stages: a pact is maintained, betrayal soon follows as do threats and curses, destruction of the weaker ensues, and the most cunning or powerful survives to move on to the next deceptive relationship.

Those individuals who possess political power possess the same motivation as Barabas. Basso, asked what wind has blown him to Malta, responds with what may be taken as the central metaphor of the play: “The wind that bloweth
all the world besides/ Desire of gold" (3.5.3-4). All are motivated by desire for wealth, or what it might buy, advancement, and ultimate security, but for the private individual, acts that advance his cause must be exceptionally hidden. Barabas must kill through subterfuge since he does not have the power that the state possesses to extort publicly and openly.

If there is any presence of good in the play, it appears in Abigail, for unlike her father and his fellow gamesman, Abigail can be touched by love, though she dies for it. She can be loyal, though her fidelity brings her no advantage. She is concerned with her father's welfare more than with the loss of his wealth. She fulfills his wishes.

Also, Abigail responds to suffering with "deepened wisdom and calm resignation" (Cole 129), recalling the biblical Abigail of I Samuel xxv. Abigail's life and death testify to the power of evil in the world, the widespread use of this principle of infidelity. She is entirely abused, sacrificed in one of Barabas's machinations, and Barabas himself admits that he loves her as Agamemnon did Iphigen: Agamemnon was also willing to sacrifice his daughter for his own purposes. Furthermore, the difference between Barabas and his daughter is starkly contrasted in the juxtaposition of her own death scene with the following scene in which he rejoices over the death of the nuns. Abigail dies a Christian resolutely hoping for her
own father's conversion, whereas Barabas follows exclaiming "How sweet the bells ring now the nuns are dead" (4.1.2).

Ultimately, Abigail's goodness carries little weight in the overall concerns of the play, however. She is given so little space that her character is barely etched. Her goodness is pathetic, rather than powerfully touching, for she is subservient to a greater evil in her father. Contrary to the biblical prophecy that the meek shall inherit the earth, in Malta only the arrogant maintain any power. As she dies, the possible pathos is undermined by the tone of an antithetical statement by the monk who attends her. With her last breath Abigail beseeches the monk to "witness that I die a Christian" (line 40). Whereupon Barnardine, the monk, responds, "Ay, and a virgin too; that grieves me most" (line 41). Sexual innuendo has always remained the area for one to obtain the quickest laughter.

Thus, the play has established very little ground for any deep sympathy with or identification for any of the characters. Without a character to pull for, the play might founder if not for the fact that Marlowe is doing something very different from what he has done before. He has left many rhetorical signs along the way in ironical use of hyperbole, the manifold employment of the verbal aside, and the absence of many of the devices of pathos to list a few.
Certainly, it is true that Marlowe's comedy departs from the mythic celebration of the victory of spring over winter which may be true of much comedy. Rather, Marlowe's comedy is of the darker variety, prompting Eliot's qualifying adjective "savage" to his insight into the farcical nature of this play. Nevertheless, if as Aristotle maintained, where exaggeration exists, humor is not far away, then both the superhuman and the subhuman share a comic potential. We have pointed out the exaggeration in places, as, for example, Ithamore and Barabas's bragging about their misdeeds. That this potential is realized in *The Jew of Malta* is evident from the multiplicity of rhetorical elements conducive to the production of laughter.

Indeed, the play is farcical in many ways: we see an extremely bad man passing from happiness to misery. Aristotle warns playwrights to avoid this plot structure as it will not arouse pity or fear; rather, we may feel quite happy at this event (*Poetics* 239). Indeed, Barabas' own exaggerated strutting in the early part of the play sets him up for a reversal of fortune. Comedy may be the result when the ethos of the Renaissance Jew is added to the equation. In fact, Barabas' own reaction to his greatest and earliest loss undermines any profound concern the theft might have raised. No sooner have his fellow Jews left him bemoaning his fate and cursing his foes than Barabas is already planning revenge (1.2.215 ff), and when
Abigail expresses her anguish at her father's loss. Barabas immediately cuts short her expression of that sadness with "things past recovery/ Are hardly cured with exclamations" (1.2.238). Hence, all the hyperbole is empty. The pathos is bathetic as his reaction to loss turns too quickly to cool, calculated revenge.

The interpretations of the play which saw Barabas as a victim of the cruel, Machiavelian environment of Malta emphasize the hypocrisy and deceit in Malta as the basis for Barabas' actions and ultimately point to the scene in which he is deprived of his vast wealth. These interpretations neglect many of Barabas' own speeches and many of his own actions: he thought of religion as a toy and could have retained all his property by becoming a Christian; he could have kept at least one half of his property by not complaining to Machiavels who commandeered his gold. Certainly Ferneze, the Turks, the priests as representatives of the Church, and to some extent the Spaniards, all manipulate the principles of the Machiavel. The leaders of all camps are not as they would seem. Ferneze is not the altruistic leader, the priests not the Christian and loving caretakers of souls, and the Turks are not the patient landlords. They operate according to the same selfserving "policy" as Barabas, but their actions are condoned by a society which approves of Realpolitik by the select few and condemns similar actions by those who are arbitrarily ostracized.
The rapid juxtaposition of lines containing opposing sentiments is then perhaps the most telltale rhetorical sign that comedy is underway in *The Jew of Malta*. This pattern continues throughout the play in such situations as the above, in the verbal asides, and in repartee between Barabas and his antagonists. There is also the tone of cheerful malice with which Barabas approaches things. We have seen this operating not only with each successful murder of an antagonist but after the death of his own daughter. If Barabas were, as some romantic readings have insisted, a poor victim in a Machiavel world, then his rapid shift from what appears to be anguish to a very deliberate soliloquy would violate his character. He rises too quickly from defeat to inspire any profound concern for the loss of his wealth. He is too quick to resort to the *imprecatio*, the *ironia*, and *litotes* to inspire feelings of awe, pity, and terror. Furthermore, the manner of his death and his final speech are curiously brief for the arousal of powerful feelings. Rather, it is as though the Jew's being caught in his greatest and last stratagem was intended to evoke the heartiest (and cruel) bellylaugh that the play had provided up to that point. But cruelty has never barred laughter from farce as Ben Jonson was to show in a few short years.

That dialogue exists as a means to entrap enhances the comic effect as characters successively make and break
pacts only to find themselves at the sharp end of another's sword. For the initiated audience, however, every meaning does have a meaning, suggesting that communication actually does occur if not on the literal level of each speech. In fact, in The Jew of Malta "Communication occurs despite speech" (Cunningham 127).

And not all that is being communicated is farcical. When what serves as the moral order of Malta is reestablished after Barabas's death, the play's darkest moment has arrived. The spirited attraction of Barabas' cheerful hatred is gone, as is Ithamore's stumbling lust. When the evil characters are destroyed, only the true Machiavels remain. Catherine Minshull feels that the introduction of Barabas as the Machiavel is ironic since Ferneze is more the Machiavel because he uses piety to validate his actions (38). Ferneze, who has by turns dealt with the Turks, the Jews, and the Spanish, enters into a pact with Barabas only to break it, a standard modus operandi for all the other characters as well. With each pact Ferneze quotes the Bible, manipulates various sententia, or moralizes to create justification for his actions, whereas the motivation for Barabas is plain from the start: self-preservation. Indeed, as he says now and again, "For so I live, perish may all the world" (5.5.10). What then reclams the throne is no better than the boiled Jew who at least had the redeeming qualities of wit, cunning, and intelligence. Into into a roiling satire
and farce there is a streak of cynical tragedy intermingled. Hence, the question of subversion which we have been measuring in each of the plays emerges once again in The Jew of Malta, but it does so in an unexpected manner.

It is not so much the evil in the play that calls into question the moral order of the universe. The exaggerated world of Malta, where everyone operates under the same rule, is rhetorically designed for comedy, and where laughter and release (even of antisocial tensions) reign, subversion plays a lesser role. When the audience feels safe, humor is possible, but what is funny is the breaking of the taboo, the breaking of the social norms, perhaps even the releasing of subversive feelings or instincts. By making Barabas an evil Jew and investing him with such a witty malevolence, the audience can feel that certainly he is not like us; hence, the audience’s own greed and Machiavelian tendencies are not the object of ridicule so we can afford to laugh at Barabas. Marlowe has distanced him from the traditional playgoer and achieved his own savage humor.

We laugh at Barabas, who wishes to have the world at his disposal, but he hasn’t the power as Tamburlaine did to accomplish it successfully. Rather, his name reminds us of the criminal whom the Jewish citizenry had released during the time of Jesus’ trial. Additionally, his Jewishness and the extreme nature of his evil acts
foretell his eventual failure. Hence, the Jew's greed is a quantifiable, limited, knowable element, and we are safe to laugh, to release the bellylaugh, the heartless or hearty laugh that the rhetoric was designed to elicit. Hence, for a time, social repression and reality may be suspended while we watch each one's operations and ultimate failure. The fact that the others in the play are also Machiavels makes the play funnier, since there is no great pain at the sight of innocence suffering.

We can afford to laugh at Barabas, whose deceit has ended in self-deception, because we are so distanced from his machinations. The language which he has used to entrap ultimately has become the means of his own entrapment precisely because he forgets that in the world of Malta rhetoric and reality are disjointed. Exalted by his own sense of accomplishment, Barabas falls victim to the same use of rhetoric which he has employed throughout the play. Similarly, when other characters suffer they do so because of a misplaced faith in the conjunction of rhetoric and reality. In the shrinking world of Malta, anyone who places faith in the words of another deserves his fate. The play's humor derives from the pleasure of being privy to the deceit and in anticipating the fall of those who do not sense it.

The most humorless moment in the play, however, occurs when Ferneze resumes the throne. He has played the sophister, the secretive Machiavel, as well as Barabas,
but in the end he and his company are left standing. For his deceit Barabas has paid with his life; Ferneze, however, ascends the seat of power. Hence, the most subversive element of The Jew of Malta is not the temporary success of the amoral Jew but the ultimate success of the amoral Christian king. It is not a Christian moral order being reasserted at the play’s end. Rather, the play’s conclusion attests to the success of the Machiavelian policy set out in the Prologue. Hence, the last note is a serious one. After the comedy has played out, the remaining players may be the most antisocial ones of all.

It is important to see that Barabas undergoes no significant change throughout the play. Both his wit and malice are present from the beginning. The pleasanter aspects of his personality intertwine with his deep hatred, a hatred which is indiscriminately and wittily exercised upon the innocent and the guilty throughout the play. Hence, the devices which reflect his cruelty, treachery, and ill will redound from the first act through the last, as do those which show his consummate skill with double, twisted, and ironical meaning. On the level of the particular devices, Barabas is always aware of Ithamore’s antanaclasis: "the meaning has a meaning" (4.6.79).
Chapter V

England’s Shaken Cedar: Edward II

The basic contention of this study has been that the changing aspects of Marlowe’s rhetoric provide a solid means of analyzing how Marlowe effects a complex portrait of his protagonists. In the Tamburlaine plays the key to understanding the protagonist lies in his use of the highly elaborate devices of amplification. The central focus in the analysis of Dr. Faustus was upon the discrepancy between Faustus’ logos and pathos. Then, in The Jew of Malta, Barabas’ wit and sophistry invited an examination of his logos. Thus, it has been seen that Marlowe has invested each of his protagonists with an individual rhetoric whose power stems from an appealing emphasis upon one element of the rhetoric. With Edward II, the case is remarkably different. For one thing, Edward’s ineffectual efforts hamper any identification with him. In fact, particularly in the first half of the play, it is more difficult to find what is appealing about Edward than for any of Marlowe’s other major characters. For one thing, he is unable to make his words match his achievements. His ethos or character is weaker than any of the other protagonists we have seen. Also, the object of his emotions or passions (or pathos) is certainly questionable in terms of its violation of the Elizabethan societal prohibitions against the homoerotic nature of the
love he possesses for Gaveston. Furthermore, the *logos* of his purposes, and at times his thinking, also violates the duties of state which his peers see so clearly as being of primary importance. In short, if a complex portrayal of the protagonist is Marlowe's purpose, as has been the case before, then Marlowe has taken on a great challenge.

To judge *Edward II* from a historical perspective one might conclude that Marlowe has not answered the challenge very well, for until fairly recently, critical opinion of *Edward II* has been harsh. Critics have impugned the play for its "dullness," its "flatness," or its "lack of poetic rhetoric." Even those who have praised the play have seen in its language signs of Marlowe's increasing disenchantment with the possibilities of the individual's self-determination or of language's own limitations. Nevertheless, another view is quite possible, one that suggests that Marlowe's powers and his faith in language as an adequate medium are not fading, that in fact he is making expert choices of rhetorical style and subject matter. Though the elaborate orations of Tamburlaine do not appear in *Edward II*, that fact provides small grounds for maintaining that by the time of this play Marlowe's faith in language is waning. Actually the absence of one kind of rhetoric creates the presence of another kind by necessity. In his analysis of prose rhetoric, Wayne Booth has rightly remarked, "The author cannot choose whether to use rhetorical heightening. His only choice is of the
kind of rhetoric he will use" (116).

While many critics have pointed out the excellence of the dramatic structure of Edward II, few have offered praise for the excellent correlation of the play's rhetoric to its matter, occasion, and purpose. One such critic, J. Van Hook, argues that Dr. Faustus and Edward II reflect Marlowe's awareness of the "limited range of tones and manners an ornate style can convey" (50). Though he neglects an analysis of any speeches of Edward II (he contrasts the language of Faustus with the orations of the Tamburlaine plays), Van Hook includes the rhetoric of Edward II in his broad generalization that Marlowe's rhetoric is one that grows increasingly complex as it improves from play to play. The improvements can be seen in the choices that Marlowe makes in the play as a whole, as well as in the rhetoric of individual characters within the play.

As a history play about England's Edward II, this play compresses into five scenes the events of a thirty-year reign. Furthermore, the play records the story of a monarch who was a failure, an ineffective politician and military leader. Hence, one explanation of the play's dull, flat language is its appropriateness to Edward's own character (subject matter), his fall from power (occasion), and Marlowe's apparent purpose (an analysis of the complex political affairs of the English state). The flatness of the language then parallels and
reinforces the tone of Edward's actions and reign. J. B.
Steane argues that "to give [Edward] such verse is the
only thing to do" (29).

There is much more to the style of Edward II than its
flatness, however. The language also exhibits subtle
correspondences between Edward's words, moods, and deeds
as Marlowe exhibits a mastery of ever more naturalistic
dialogue. In fact, viewed as a whole the entire play's
rhetoric is more realistic, naturalistic. Thinking in a
similar vein, Van Hook maintains that the rhetoric of this
play is more restrained, more under control, than the
rhetoric of previous plays. Van Hook argues that
amplification and its attendant devices as well as the
emphasis upon the set speech and the formality of the
diction have given way to a new denotation of decorum. In
Edward II there is the ultimate expression of faith in a
new style of dramatic language (53-54).

Looking back to Tamburlaine I and II, critics have
variously argued over the significance of the obvious
changes in this play. In the play's first scene, for
example, a new convention is at work in Edward II.
Gaveston, a major character, is on stage reading a letter.
Neither the protagonist nor an extremely minor character
is on stage as in other plays. As a major character,
Gaveston occupies center stage and demands attention. He
is not a mere stick figure, nor is he our hero. Hence,
there is a hint that Marlowe is expanding his cast of
characters for this play, as indeed he is about to do.

Furthermore, Gaveston's use of the letter
reintroduces documents in his dramaturgy, something that
he has done before. According to Cunningham, Marlowe's
use of written documents in his plays often acquires a
symbolic significance (154), and we have seen
Tamburlaine's letters, his destruction of the Koran,
Orcanes' use of the document which legalizes the
Christian-Muslim alliance, Faustus' magic books, and
Barabas' conniving letters. Each of these characters' use
of documents relates directly to his ethos, as his
employment of them reveals himself. In Edward II Marlowe
continues this dramatic use of documents. Though at least
one critic disagrees with this contention when she
maintains the documents simply become a means of
"transferring facts" (Cunningham 155), certainly Edward's
own blind faith in language is reflected in his reactions
to the note sent to him apprising him of the executions of
the rebellious earls. Mistrusting the message that the
earls have been executed, he demands to read the note
himself. After reading it, Edward has Spencer read it
aloud again as if to confirm the reality of its news.
Supporting this idea, Divakaruni says the articulation of
the "names of the dead rebels is a form of exorcism that
gives their deaths an undeniable finality" (325). Hence,
Marlowe is using other stage devices to reveal his
characters in ever more subtle ways. Rather than documents
being mere purveyors of information, their use constitutes an increasing tendency to expand the development of character in ways that language alone is incapable of accomplishing.

But minor changes aside, critics have also pursued the causes for major differences in the language of Edward II from the other plays. These differences have been traced to Marlowe's purported declining interest in the stage, hurried composition, and declining faith in language itself. On the other hand, the language might be viewed as "the logical culmination of Marlowe's experiments with the rhetoric of the dramatic oration" (Van Hook 60). Arguing for the deep impact of the literary trend toward naturalistic drama and away from the drama dependent on the set speech, Van Hook maintains.

During the final decade of the century, principles of decorum quickly evolved by which the earlier decorative effusions were brought under control and restrained. . . . Marlowe contributed to this trend toward controlled restraint in the drama in two ways. He found techniques, in the plays which followed Tamburlaine, to make his imagery more functional and expressive, so that his characters could begin to reveal their personalities and moods more subtly; and the structure of his orations eventually became, again through his
adaptation of rhetorical features, both less static and more complex. (50)

Indeed, the rhetoric of the early plays is dominated by devices of amplification: Marlowe dwells on significant detail and either breaks a subject into parts and takes up each one (merismus) or examines a single idea and repeats it in a variety of ways (synarthroesmus). The repetitions through ploce, parison, anaphora, and similar devices of parts of single ideas necessitate a more copious style and the use of more elaborate tropes like metonymy, synecdoche, and of course, metaphor.

Though often employed in an ironic sense, as we will see, this kind of rhetoric is also apparent in Edward II. However, it is used much more selectively, as when Edward receives news of Gaveston's death (3.2.128ff). Edward, in a sudden wave of passion which recalls Tamburlaine's fiery declamations, swears by heaven, the stars, his right hand, and his father's sword to revenge Gaveston's death. The parallel construction of like phrases beginning with the same word recalls the patterned repetitions of Tamburlaine I and II. Aroused to a powerful fury, Edward vows hyperbolically that his victims will outnumber all the many "manors, castles, towns and towers" that he owns (line 133). The amplifying alliteration of the previous line is reinforced by the pleasing agnominatio of the next: "Treacherous Warwick, traitorous Mortimer." Yet another of the devices of amplification is the ploce
derived from the repetition of "will" and "may" (suggestive of "shall") as many as six times in the space of twelve lines. Wolfgang Clemen points out that the inclusion of the ornate rhetorical speech acts to slow down the fast pace of the realistic dialogue of this play (142). Hence, the old style still serves a useful function and is then rather a matter of choice than habit on the playwright's part.

However, this kind of speech is relatively rare in this play. What is found more often is the speech which has frequent internal pauses, breaks or changes in the direction of thought, enjambement, and more frequently employed imagery. Speaking of the different style of speech in this play, Clemen has said,

He put into the play an entirely different style of speech . . . adapted from Tamburlaine's passionate, highly eloquent declarations of his purposes. The speech technique . . . enables us to see that active emotion has resolved itself into tragic passivity, to correspond with the new forms of expression which have had to be created. (141)

In fact, many of the characters—not only the titular figure—have opportunities to express the inner turmoil, uncertainty, and ambivalence that can be conveyed more effectively with these rhetorical elements. This new kind of speech, which may also include elements of the ornate
style, allows the speaker more latitude, greater freedom, to follow different thoughts, different alternatives as they arise. Whereas the speech is nearly absent in Tamburlaine's rhetoric, it begins to show up in Faustus. In Faustus' final soliloquy, for example, the rhetoric conveys a wider range of psychological moods, as Faustus swings painfully between fearful hope and certain despair. By the time of Edward II, this expansion of voice reaches full maturation.

The psychological verity of this kind of speech is apparent in many of the speeches of Edward II. We see it in Isabella's first soliloquy (1.4.170ff), in Kent's agonizing soliloquy after the escape of Mortimer (4.5.10ff), and in Spencer's mocking serious advice to Baldock (2.1.31ff). Kent's soliloquy, for example, reflects the shifting concerns of Kent's unsettled mind. Upon entering the stage, Kent, who has been desperately looking for his king, regrets that he has missed Edward. Thinking of Edward, Kent reinforces the tone of regret in the next line, "Edward my heart relents for thee" (line 11), when suddenly the cause of the misery occurs to him--Mortimer. His anger flares, and in an outburst appropriate to his new mood, Kent curses Mortimer for what damage he has done by bearing arms against his king. The implied idea is that Mortimer has little respect for the social order; rather, his ambition is strong and rules his actions. Thoughts of Mortimer's "unnatural revolt" (18)
elicit fear for Edward's life: "Edward, this Mortimer aims at thy life; O fly him then" (ll. 19-20). Connected like links in the chain, succeeding lines follow and reflect the rapid, vacillating emotions that Kent experiences in a time of great stress--from regret, to remorse, anger, outright fear, and ultimate rage.

After Kent has expressed his rage toward Mortimer, perhaps his most unsettling feeling, he attempts to calm himself: "But Edmund, calm this rage; Dissemble or thou diest" (21). Kent, experiencing uncontrollable rage, reminds himself that his survival depends upon appearances or dissembling. Hence, he is withholding the expression of the violent passion he feels against the absent Mortimer in order to save his own life, but the passion is so strong that he cannot control it completely. No sooner has he warned himself about the importance of appearing loyal to Mortimer than he remembers the affair that Isabella and Mortimer are having which causes him to exclaim again: "for Mortimer and Isabel do kiss while they conspire, / And yet she bears a face of love, forsooth; / Fie on that love that hatcheth death and hate!" (ll. 21-23). Noting that even the queen affects love while being unfaithful to her husband the king, he reminds himself of the necessity of social pretensions. Yet, his unhappiness with the idea of social hypocrisy is reflected in the love-hate antithesis of the final line. His curse precedes another dire warning to himself: "Be not found
single for suspect/Proud Mortimer pries near into thy walks" (11. 25-26). The attention to psychological realism in this speech is more remarkable for the fact that it is not one of the central moments of the play. Even the internal commas correspond to pauses in thought or feeling that allow the speaker to change directions. Levin points out the inclusion of multiple commas, an addition to Marlowe's techniques, which "indicate varying pauses" (97). Hence, Marlowe matches the language to the psychological movements of the thoughts of a character more exactly in this play than in any other.

The emotionally intense scenes such as the preceding one, which slow down the pace of the play as they trace the thoughts of central characters, are often surrounded by more fast-paced scenes which convey factual information. The juxtaposition of the two very different types of language invests the rhetorically rich scenes with greater imaginative power. Thus, contrary to some critical opinion, the interspersing of more naturalistic, factual detail actually serves to heighten the effect of the more dramatic passages. Following Kent's emotional gamut, we see Queen Isabella crowning her son, hear more news of the fate of Spencer and Baldock, and listen to Mortimer justifying his wishes to Prince Edward. The dialogue consists of two or three line speeches for the most part, and several delineated characters share the stage, each receiving a nearly equal share of attention.
Hence, in two ways Marlowe has developed a rhetoric which renders dialogue more faithful to a new expression of decorum. In one sense, in Edward II there are signs of greater restraint, the opposite of rhetorical amplification, than in any other play of Marlowe's. Additionally, not only is there less amplification but also the language more nearly parallels the particular speaker's mood and thought. Finally, this restraint paradoxically creates a greater freedom which takes Marlowe's rhetoric many steps closer to psychological realism.

These broad considerations of the rhetorical strategies present in Edward II show how this play links the earlier university drama with what was to follow shortly: the naturalistic drama of Shakespeare. Hence, the differences in rhetoric are certainly significant in the history of the drama.

Additionally, in a more immediate sense, the changes also relate to the depiction of this particular protagonist in the single-minded pursuit of his will. Marlowe invests Edward with vestiges of the artificial, ornate rhetoric of Tamburlaine, but only to illustrate its impotence for achieving Edward's wishes. Indeed, in many places Edward manipulates similar devices—plece, parison, anaphora, metaphor—but all to a very different effect, for a disjunction exists between Edward's ornate language and the harsh realities which surround him.
Early in the play when Edward faces the criticisms and veiled threats of his nobles, Edward’s rhetoric is replete with the devices which informed Tamburlaine’s strengths:

Well, Mortimer, I’ll make thee rue the words; Beseems it thee to contradict thy king? Frownst thou thereat, aspiring Lancaster? The sword shall plane the furrows of thy brows, And hew these knees that now are grown so stiff. I will have Gaveston: and you shall know What danger ´tis to stand against your king.

(1.1.90-96)

The ornate rhetoric is here in abundance: the *erotema*, the use of "shall" and "will," and the grand hyperbolical metaphor. Shortly, however, Edward must send Gaveston away, and the disjunction between word and reality begins to grow. Additionally, even before sending him away, Edward uses the *interragatio*, suggesting the impotent bitterness at being overruled by his barons. Hence, the rhetoric is without the power to effect circumstance, and the social realities eventually win out over any promises or threats which Edward has to offer.

In a similar employment of such vaunting rhetoric, after Gaveston has been banished, Edward astounds the earls with the degree and intensity of his hyperbole. His words are full of the devices of *pathos*.

My heart is as an anvil unto sorrow,
Which beats upon it like the Cyclops’ hammers,
And with the noise turns up my giddy brain,
And makes me frantic for my Gaveston;
Ah, had some bloodless fury rose from hell,
And with my kingly sceptre struck me dead,
When I was forc´d to leave my Gaveston!
(1.4.311-17)

Edward’s hyperbole and violent imagery emphasize his awareness of his own desperate feelings; there is not much commiseration for Gaveston, only for himself. Furthermore, when Edward is thwarted, his imagery takes on an element of self-immolation. His violence becomes increasingly directed towards himself, rather than some dire destruction to be wreaked upon others. To these passionate lines Lancaster responds: "Diablo! What passions call you these? (1.4.318). Lancaster’s response indicates the confusion and amazement that others have towards Edward’s homosexual passion, but it also underscores the disjunction between words and reality again, for Edward’s grief elicits no fear or sympathy, but only incredulity.

In fact, the responses of other characters to Edward’s hyperbolic rhetoric reveals its impotence as well. When Edward has received the news of Gaveston’s death, he kneels and utters one of his longer speeches intending it to be profoundly dramatic (3.3.128-47). Just as Tamburlaine did, Edward swears by all the powers of the
universe that he allies with himself and his purposes: the earth, the heaven, the stars, his right hand, and the honors belonging to the crown. Similarly, he vows to revenge Gaveston's death by making the dead equal the number of his estates. The first response to this speech is Spencer's brusque interruption "My lord, here is a messenger from the barons/Desires access unto your majesty" (ll. 149-50). Oblivious to the emotional fire of the speech, Spencer's primary concern is to conduct the business at hand. Hence, Edward's power is not magnified by his speeches, and no pity or identification is won for him. Rather, his language emphasizes his inability to act appropriately as he confuses grand speech with necessary action.

In addition to the ornate rhetoric which he gradually surrenders, Edward is further revealed in the development of his ethos, logos, and pathos. Unlike any of Marlowe's other central figures, Edward does not possess a strength that transcends the force of his fellow characters. That is, Marlowe does not make Edward a superhuman figure; rather, Edward acquires his reality by being a part of the society he inhabits and by being subject to its forces. The deceptive purposes of language in The Jew of Malta that help Barabas rise above the competing forces in Malta are gone. Rather, Marlowe has devoted his energies to a depiction of a deeply flawed human being amidst other likewise flawed characters, all of which engage in a
serious conflict for survival. Gone are the superhuman figures of Tamburlaine and Faustus and the self-conscious roleplaying of Barabas and Ferneze. Now every effort is being made to portray the characters as people who are interrelated to each other in a complex web of love, envy, and hate. As one critic has pointed out, each character can act and utter essentially with the same power and effectiveness (Cunningham 151). Hence, a transformation of reality, the only means to success for Marlowe's other heroes, has been taken away as a viable alternative for Edward.

This complex web of relationships in Edward II comprises a crossection of English royal society. The king, his peers, and his court all figure prominently in the action of the play. One of the essential issues that the play presents to the audience is the relationship between the king and his nobility. In this play social order is not maintained by one significant individual. Rather, succeeding individuals present various and differing ideas about what constitutes and maintains order—the peers' talk of England, Edward's talk of divine right and of love, the peers' talk of the value of the nobility to the state. They attach themselves to their notions with stern allegiance. Hence, the characters, including the protagonist, do not look within for power or sustenance; rather they look elsewhere for some justification of self, some identity.
The conflict arises as these individuals attempt to carry out competing notions of order, privilege, and power. The tensions created by the conflicting claims of the two camps—king and nobles—remain unresolved as sympathies for or against a particular group grow more complex. Generally, during the first half of the play the audience is alienated by Edward’s failings, but in the play’s second half his difficulties create sympathy for him despite his stark failures as king. Hence, many critics have seen the play as divided neatly into halves (Levin 98).

In the early scenes of the play, when Edward generally plays the foolish king while the nobles appear very sympathetic, Edward’s rhetoric illustrates this foolishness that his nobles so despise. For one thing, Edward appears to believe that his words will have more effect or power than they actually do. In fact, all of the vaunts that he makes, which outwardly resemble those of Marlowe’s earlier heroes, are unfulfilled. His threats amount to vacuous rhetoric. Furthermore, the other characters underscore the type of empty rhetoric that Edward prefers. Gaveston himself alludes to the “sweet speeches” that Edward loves (1.1.55). Divakaruni points out that the “deeper inner tragedy of Edward rises out of his naive dependence on words, and his preference for rhetoric and shows over the more realistic world of action” (320). When a conflict arises early in the play,
Edward resorts to the rhetoric of command, which his nobles patently ignore.

The relation of Edward to his peers is introduced very early in the play, and Edward is immediately perceived by them to be an ineffectual king. Their conflict is an irreconcilable one, and their disrespect for him is strong. When Mortimer draws his sword to wound Gaveston, Kent admonishes the behavior of the nobles who have drawn their swords against Gaveston. "Is this the duty that you owe your king?" (1.4.22). Yet they feel certain they are in the right; Edward should "know his peers" (line 23). Earlier, the nobles insult their "brainsick king" for his neglect of duty, for as Mortimer informs the king, Gaveston has been lawfully banished before Edward had assumed the throne. Mortimer's threat to suspend his support of the king is based upon the oath he had taken on the deathbed of Edward's father concerning the lawful banishment of Gaveston.

Edward's response reveals the discrepancy between his words and his power to effect them:

Well, Mortimer. I'll make thee rue these words; Beseems it thee to contradict thy king? Frownst thou thereat, aspiring Lancaster? The sword shall plane the furrows of thy brows, And hew these knees that now are grown so stiff. I will have Gaveston; and you shall know What danger 'tis to stand against your king.
Recalling Tamburlaine's rhetoric, Edward makes frequent use of the "shall" and "will" that marked the rhetoric of the earlier play. The effect of the rhetoric upon his audience is a threat of violence to be done to Gaveston if he remains in England. The nobles are not directly threatening the person of the king as yet, but their opinion of his power is also clear as Lancaster characterizes him as "wanton" (line 131). The nobles also have the last word in this exchange, leaving Edward to bemoan his apparent lack of power. Characteristic of a weak character, he uses the erotema that marked the rhetoric of Mycetes: "Am I a king and must be overrul'd?" (1.1.134) Lancaster's response shows no remorse or surprise for his part, "Learn then to rule us better, and the realm" (1.35). The other nobles support him in a similar disregard for Edward's consternation.

Edward also uses hyperbole when threatened, but it acts to show the great discrepancy between his words and his capability of realizing them: "Ere my sweet Gaveston shall part from me, This isle shall fleet upon the ocean And wander to the unfrequented Inde. (1.4.48-50)

Yet shortly Edward signs the order from the Pope banishing Gaveston from England and weeps in powerless frustration and grief. After the nobles depart, Edward directs his anger at the Catholic church as he hyperbolically vows:
I'll fire thy crazed buildings, and enforce
The papal towers to kiss the lowly ground:
With slaughtered priests make Tiber's channel
swell
And banks rais'd higher with their sepulchres.
As for the peers that back the clergy thus,
If I be king, not one of them shall live.

(1.4.100-05)

These threats serve only to mock Edward and emphasize his weakness as Gaveston's lack of response indicates. Furthermore, Edward swears to Gaveston that his time in Ireland will be brief, and swears that "long thou shalt not stay" (l. 114). The strength of the assertion is immediately undercut with "or if thou dost/ I'll come to thee" (ll. 114-15).

That Edward does not realize what he reveals in the language he uses with his peers also undermines an identification with him. Overjoyed at the prospect of Gaveston's return, for example, Edward says to the aged Warwick, "These silver hairs will more adorn my court/Than gaudy silks or rich embroidery" (1.4.356-57). But it has been Gaveston's love of the rich and gaudy that has adorned Edward's court, and Edward has been indifferent to the wisdom represented by the silver hairs of his counselors with Gaveston at the court. Hence, his metaphors reflect his own lack of insight to the cause of the conflict, at least from the point of view of the
nobles. Edward reinforces this intellectual blindness (logos) when he asks Warwick to "chide me . . . if I go astray" (line 346). Warwick, not to be outdone by false generousity, responds with a false note of his own, "Slay me, my lord, when I offend your grace" (line 348), which suggests that the rhetoric of the nobles is artificial. Their words are designed to appease and flatter an inferior, not to convey any meaning or to communicate any good will to a king who elicits admiration or awe.

The strength of his feelings clouds both his ethics and his thinking. Hence, the dominance of his pathos, negatively influences his logos and ethos. Edward shows poor judgment (logos) when he bestows titles impulsively without regard for the sentiments of his peers or without any requirement for Gaveston having earned them. Indeed, Edward shows a deep disrespect for rank and birth, which are essential to the peers' definition of the social order. In a proud rejoinder to Mortimer's criticism of Gaveston's low birth, Edward counters: "Were he a peasant, being my minion/I'll make the proudest of you stoop to him" (1.4.30-31).

He shows a similar manner of thinking when he just as impulsively reclaims titles and positions as when he seizes Coventry's wealth and titles. Depriving Coventry of his position also undermines Edward within the play and with the audience since Edward now has alienated the Church without any justification. His actions lend the
nobles the support of Church and State in their fight against a foolish monarch. Edward's pathos is best defined as being a powerful preoccupation with love. Even Isabella is awestruck with the intensity of Edward's passion for Gaveston when she remarks to Lancaster to see "how passionate he is/ and still his mind runs on his minion" (2.2.3).

In a much more important way, Edward's actions reveal an intellectual blindness when he mistakes Gaveston's purposes and character for his own. That is, he confuses his own very generous nature with Gaveston's motivation by thinking of Gaveston and himself as being one and the same. When Gaveston is banished, for example, Edward declares, "I from myself am banish'd" (1.4.118). However, Gaveston's own motivations have been clear from the beginning. In the play's first scene, it is Edward's invitation that brings Gaveston to England. Reading the invitation, Gaveston, the opportunist, testifies to the weakness of the king for "sweet speeches, comedies, and pleasing shows" (line 55), showing how Edward loves and relies upon the ornateness of language and spectacle. Additionally, Gaveston, recalling Barabas, reveals how he will match his social performance to coincide with Edward's fancy in order to gain the favor of the king and perhaps some power and wealth as well. Throughout the play the portrait of Gaveston is filled out: his manner is dandyish and in his dealings with the nobles he appears
arrogant and unnecessarily abrupt. He alludes to Kent for example, as the prince who has "more earldoms than an ass can bear" (1.3.2).

Certainly the nobles believe that their king's thinking, his logos, is faulty. They believe that they are dealing with an addle-brained monarch whose motivation is beyond their understanding. When Edward rages at the banishment of Gaveston, an exasperated Lancaster remarks, "Diablo! What passions call you these?" (1.4.318) For him as with most of the nobles, the depth of Edward's passion is incomprehensible. Edward is often referred to as the "brainsick king" (1.1.124) or the "light-brained king" (5.2.2.). As for his consort, the nobles are united in their low regard for him. 

Mortimer compares Gaveston to a "fish/Which, being caught, strikes him that takes it dead" (1.4.221-22). He is also invariably compared to a "mushrump" (1.4.284), a "groom" (291), a "minion" (310), a "canker" (2.2.18), and "a flying fish" (2.2.23).

Edward's character or ethos is influenced by the intensity of his passion as much as by his indifference to the concerns of the nobles. Yet the two facets of his character are related. He thinks that England is his to do with as he wishes, and what he wishes is to give of it generously to his favorite, Gaveston. Investing Gaveston with high titles, Edward explains:

If for these dignities thou be envied
I'll give thee more, for but to honour thee
Is Edward pleas'd with kingly regiment.  
Fear'st thou thy person? Thou shalt have a guard.  
Wants thou gold? Go to my treasury.  
Wouldst thou be lov'd and fear'd? Receive my seal.  
Save or condemn, and in our name command  
Whatso thy mind affects or fancy likes.  

(1.1.162-169)

The question-answer method which Edward employs here underscores his theatricality and his predilection for sentiment, as when Gaveston and Edward exchange pictures (1.4.127).

Another aspect of Edward's ethos emerges in his relationship to the queen. Early in the play, she appears so generous and loyal to him. Yet he insults and alienates her. His epithets for her reveal the harsh extremes to which his passion can take him; he calls her "strumpet" long before there is a hint of her liason with Mortimer. Also, he assigns her the task of reconciling the lords to him after Gaveston's banishment. In short, he has assigned her the task of convincing the nobles to allow the return of the one who is the source of her pain.

Her expression of real grief both directly to him and in extended orations (1.4.170ff) distances the audience from any sympathy for Edward. Rather, the audience swings toward the woman who agonizes at the loss of the love of
her husband.

Edward’s thoughts about himself, his logos, are also revealed in his rhetoric. His self-conception reveals itself in his references to himself as the king of beasts, the lion. Edward ironically compares Mortimer to a bird, whose soaring Edward views as inconsequential to his own status. By the final scene, however, the imagery has been reversed, even in Edward’s own mind. When Edward is feeling great distress, however, he tends to view himself with a different metaphor. When Leicester, sent by Isabella, arrests Spencer and Baldock, Edward invites him to "rip up this panting breast of mine/And take my heart in rescue of my friends" (4.6.66-67). The image of the deer chased to the ground certainly deflates any image of the king as the king of the beasts. Hence, on a deeper level, unbeknownst to Edward himself, the king reveals his manner of thinking through his choice of imagery. When Edward reflects about his condition in the prisonhouse during the abdication scene, he returns to the image of king as lion. Now, however, the "imperial lion’s flesh is gor’d" (5.1.11). According to Edward, what a lion does when wounded deeply is to turn on his own wound, and savagely "he rends and tears it with his wrathful paw/And highly scorning that the lowly earth/Should drink his blood, mounts up into the air" (11. 12-14). The lion’s pride necessitates that it destroy itself by engorging on its own entrails, but Edward confuses the lion’s actions
with one of the lower cats, the hyena, who cannot resist fresh blood, even though it be his own.

Edward’s clouded and restless thinking is revealed clearly this scene. Edward first sets himself up as the imperial lion, which destroys itself out of some sense of honor. That reflection logically leads him to the source of his wound, the "dauntless" Mortimer and his own "unnatural queen" who have imprisoned him. Rising anger encourages Edward to change his metaphor to "the wings of rancour and disdain." which will take him to heaven where he will "plain me to the gods against them both" (11. 20, 22). Hence, unconsciously, he has allied himself with Mortimer who was shortly before compared to a bird. Edward’s vacillation is further underscored by a third metaphor he turns to in yet another shift in thought, as he turns away from impossible hopes of redress from the gods to his circumstances as an imprisoned king. He says,

But what are kings, when regiment is gone,
But perfect shadows in a sunshine day?
My nobles rule, I bear the name of king;
I wear the crown; but am controll’d by them.

(11. 26-29)

The rapid shift in self-conception is remarkable. The wounded lion who takes care of his own wounds by ending his life is replaced by the bird who would fly to the gods to complain. Finally, he devolves to the lowest level of being, that of mere shadow, a selfless state with no pride
or even rancour to motivate him to action. As for the proud lion, Edward is soon to give Mortimer the strength associated with this animal. He says to Winchester shortly, "Let not that Mortimer protect my son;/More safety is there in a tiger's jaws/Than his embracements" (5.1.116-17).

Levin maintains Edward's philosophy is that of an Epicure devoted more to his pleasures than to his duties as monarch. Political realities are not the concern of the Epicure who considers himself a lion. Certainly, however, by the end of the play, the political realities have become apparent as he lies tossing between wounded indignation and outright despair. The invasion of the foreign forces, which Edward had dismissed once as a "trifle" (2.2.10), has been replaced by an invasion from within, one which even the Epicure cannot ignore.

In the first half of the play, the nobles who reflect the values for social order, elicit much more sympathy from the audience. They ally themselves with legal forms as they show by their obeying Gaveston's earlier exile. They also ally themselves with the Church. But above all, they believe that the vast power of the monarch must be shared in some degree with the nobility. Edward's failure from the peers' point of view is simple: Edward has neglected his duty and done so in such a way as to make his actions exceptionally odious to them. As Levin has explained, "It is the old story so often renewed by life
and repeated by drama, of neglecting one's duty to realize one's individuality" (93). To neglect his duties of state is a serious charge made by his nobles, but the "unsanctioned nature of his indulgences" (94) renders the failure particularly unacceptable. Hence, for the nobility, the title of king carries certain obligations and duties which Edward must fulfill. As Cunningham has put it, for the nobles selfhood and the social structure are one (160).

Mortimer's dual concerns are the state and the power of the nobility within that state. Edward's purposes for his personal life violate both of these values. In the early parts of the play, Mortimer's apparent fear is of social instability in England. After Gaveston is banished, the peers are content in their knowledge that the English king needs the support of his powerful peers. They also harbor the hope that England will be safe; after all, the elder Mortimer counsels that age will teach Edward to leave behind his homosexual passion. Even Mortimer's son says that the passion does not bother him; rather, it is Gaveston's low birth which rankles him (1.4.390ff). Gaveston's rise from such a low birth violates the social order upon which Mortimer stakes his interests.

Yet as Mortimer's power increases, his ruthlessness does as well. As befits the Machiavel, he uses deceit with the letter to gain popular support. The sinister
element in his character is highlighted further, as Levin reminds us (101), when we recognize that the name of the man he sends to dispose of Edward, Lightborn, appears in the Chester cycle as a devil. Indeed, Spencer's advice to Baldock may serve as descriptive of Mortimer himself. The lines perfectly describe the social self he approximates: "You must be proud, bold, pleasant, resolute--/And now and then, stab as occasion serves" (2.1.42-43). Hence, audience sympathies must wane gradually for Mortimer until he faces his death with stoical strength. Paradoxically, his character upon his death is nowhere more admirable and his perceptions nowhere more insightful:

Base Fortune, now I see, that in thy wheel
There is a point, to which when men aspire,
They tumble headlong down: that point I touch'd
And seeing there was no place to mount up higher,

Why should I grieve at my declining fall?
(5.6.59-63)

The courage Mortimer exhibits as he vows to "as a traveller/ [Go] to discover countries yet unknown" presents an ethic that is in stark opposition to Edward's own. Additionally, his manner of facing death opens up greater sympathies for him than he receives at any time during the play. Indeed, the ultimate values suggested by the play may be the stoic virtues revealed in this death. Levin goes so far as to maintain that the play ultimately
"replaces the values of Epicureanism with those of Stoicism" (102). Yet what remains the central truth is that however strong a character appears at one moment, as Mortimer does in his final appearance, Marlowe has invested his character with qualifying attributes which render any clear identification for him impossible. Just as each competing notion of order presented in the play vies for the upperhand only to be undercut with subversive elements, so also do the characters on an individual basis as admirable traits compete with characteristics that the Elizabethan orthodoxy might disapprove.

Just as Mortimer's surface clarity of character gets "moiled" (to borrow Wilbur Sanders' term for the play) with subversive characteristics, so too does Isabella's ethos gain in complexity as she loses her sympathetic features. Isabella is a victim at first who develops into a survivor, for it is at her urging that Mortimer changes his mind and urges other peers to recall Gaveston. His reasons trace to his conversation with Isabella, who has apparently suggested what "was not thought upon" before (1.1.273), the return of Gaveston so that the nobles might have him killed. Her justification is for the safety of the kingdom, but we suspect that she is fighting for her husband's affections as much as the social order. Hence, for the first time she is depicted as a competent infighter, a survivor. After obtaining consent of the nobles, Isabella seeks the love of Edward. But toward the
middle of the play, Isabella herself urges the murder of Edward for her own safety. This complex shift of values may have been what Claude Summers had in mind when he pointed out that Isabella is more a Machiavel figure than a victim (309). It is in Isabella's name that Leicester makes the arrests of Spencer and Baldock. Indeed, not a character is spared Marlowe's probing intelligence as he portrays characters who develop, or at the least, reveal different sides of their temperament, to meet changing circumstances which threaten their existence.

The increasing cruelty and ruthlessness of his nobles and family throw Edward's own unattractiveness into a different light. Not surprisingly, as we have seen, accompanying this new image of Edward are subtle shifts in his rhetoric. That is not to say that his use of language changes completely, for even toward the end of his life, Edward retains his penchant for sweet speeches. Indeed, at the very beginning of the abdication scene (5.1.1ff), when Leicester has made some weak attempt to calm the king, Edward vows that Leicester's "speeches long ago had eas'd my sorrows/For kind and loving hast thou always been" (ll. 6-7). Any attempt he makes at such a speech is rebuffed by his captors. When Winchester asks for the crown, for example, Edward offers hyperbolic curses for Mortimer: "Heavens turn it to a blaze of quenchless fire/Or like the snaky wreat of Tisiphon/Engirt the temples of his hateful head" (5.1.44-46). Leicester's
dismayed is apparent in his response to such empty rhetoric: "My lord, why waste you thus your time away?/They stay your answer: will you yield your crown?" (11.49-50).

Nevertheless, Edward begins to wean himself of the overblown rhetoric which has obscured political realities for him. We have seen this change in one speech as Edward changes the metaphors which define himself. By the end of the abdication scene, Edward has taken even more steps toward self-realization. Washed and shaved with channel water (ironically recalling Edward's own haughty directions for Coventry, who is to be thrown in the channel), Edward has been prepared for an ignominious death. He does not face death stoically as Mortimer will, but neither does he rise to some hyperbolic expression which further undermines his character. Rather, he blankly faces the situation and flatly describes the truth as he sees it.

This dungeon where they keep me, is the sink
Wherein the filth of all the castle falls. . .
And there in mire and puddle have I stood
This ten days' space, and lest that I should sleep
One plays continually upon a drum;
They give me bread and water, being a king;
So that for want of sleep and sustenance
My mind's distempered and my body's numb'd
And whether I have limbs or no, I know not.
0 would my blood dropp´d out from every vein
As doth this water from my tattered robes;
Tell Isabel the queen, I look´d not thus
When for her sake I ran at tilt in France
And there unhors´d the duke of Cleremont.

(5.5.55ff)

Here, for once, the discrepancy between word and reality
has vanished. Likewise, Edward´s inflation of his own
abilities has evaporated. As in the case of hyperbole,
the parison, the place, the erotema are quieted by
circumstances, and Edward approaches the nearest point
toward insight that he will ever have. For the greater
part of the speech any reference to himself is muted by
the vivid description of his circumstances. The water
dripping from his tattered shoes is a particularly
naturalistic detail, for example, which underscores
Edward´s very real suffering. For once, Edward has put
aside his powerful and misleading pathos and is giving his
attention to his environment, for the neglect of which he
is paying the highest price. Another sign that he has
learned to control his passion is that Edward does not
refer to Gaveston either. Rather he begins to direct his
feelings into more acceptable channels, although he does
so in a pathetic manner. Hence, given his way, Edward
would travel back to a time when he was the young man
courting the admiration and love of Isabella.
Notwithstanding the touching naivete of his faintly flattering image of the joust, Edward never completely realizes his false reliance upon the power of his ineffective rhetoric. Yet some of the changes he does make, unconscious though they are, nevertheless act to elicit some sympathy for him.

One note missing from Edward's final speech is the self-awareness of what has brought the tragedy about in the first place. In fact, he skirts the issue of his love for Gaveston and the issue of his relation to his peers. Furthermore, there is no recollection at all of his handling of the affairs of state which raised the ire of the nobles. His insight as to the causes of his destiny stands in opposition to the clarity of Mortimer's thought about his own. Yet what sympathy Mortimer wins in forcefulness of expression, clarity of thought, and strength of character, Edward himself may also win.

If he does not raise any terror at the conditions of the world, Edward is nevertheless good at eliciting a profound pity for what the world and the self may do. When he searches for the cause of his misfortune, Edward finds only that he has shown too much forgiveness. He asks, "How have I transgressed/ Unless it be with too much clemency" (5.1.122-23). There is something of the pathetic in Edward's speech, but a new Edward is emerging nevertheless. The old Edward lingers, looking nostalgically backwards (past his crimes) to a time when
he was stronger, more impressive. But now Edward is also facing his own death by "reading [his] tragedy written in thy brows" (line 73). He, moreover, asks that he be allowed to see the final stroke so that he can live his final moments with his thought "steadfast on my God" (line 77). Also, at long last Edward begins to see the vast discrepancy between words and reality, as when he responds to Lightborn's mockery: "What means thou to dissemble with me thus?" (line 79). Finally, the dual meanings of words meant in a double sense become apparent to Edward.

However, Marlowe refuses to present a simple case of self-discovery here at the end, for Edward's character remains flawed. His own rhetoric reveals the abiding errors of thought (logos), feeling (pathos), and character (ethos) which have greatly contributed to his downfall.

For example, after confronting Lightborn somewhat directly as we have noted, Edward almost immediately returns to clouded thinking. Lightborn, who has just mocked Edward, is easily believed, as when Edward says: "Forgive my thought, for having such a thought" (line 82). Any strength or insight Edward possesses is very tenuous. Furthermore, Edward still clings to an unfounded hope as he attempts to buy his life with his last jewel, in what amounts to a pathetic plea for help, more than it is a viable alternative. Edward checks the powerful feelings that the final scene evokes by pleading with his captors as he dies. He says to the murderers, "O spare me, or
dispatch me in a trice" (line 110) as they prepare to impale him on the spit. The irony of the manner of Edward's death has been noted before as the twin forces in his life come together in an emphatic and cruel way. The monarchy symbolized as the mock scepter (the spit) and homosexual love have proven to be his downfall.

Marlowe often reserves for his tragic figures some final pronouncement which sets up identification for him. Tamburlaine's agony at the thought of dying without conquering the entire world stands out as one of his most clearly self-defining statements: "And shall I die and this unconquered?" Similarly, Faustus's terror at being dragged off to hell defines the pathos of the protagonist's final moments. Yet for Edward the pronouncement never comes. This absence testifies to the power of the state as a value in the play.

The rhetoric employed at the deaths of other characters also supports this idea. The sententiae that Gaveston (2.5.29-31), Warwick (3.3.64), Lancaster (3.3.58-59), and Spencer (4.5.80-81) use tend to reduce the experience of death to something less horrifying, to something less than life in the society or life in the social setting. That is, each character uses a proverb to "reduce death to something more manageable and self-contained than life" (Cunningham 164). Hence, the proverbs amount to trivializing the self's experience, which in Edward's case amounts to very intense horror. Or
put differently, the life of the state has assumed greater importance than the existence and death of the individual. Ultimately then, for all of his errors, Edward remains somewhat sympathetic, only to undercut that very sympathy at its most intense moment.

With Edward II the Elizabethan theatre moved nearer realism. The set speech is limited to an ironic function, and dialogue becomes more faithful to the shifting concerns of the characters. Particularly in the middle of the play, the dialogue consists of sharp retorts and exchanges between the competing forces.

On the most abstract level, the quality of the language of the play has been said to trace to the very notion of language which lies at the center of the play (Divakaruni 320). Through Edward II, "Marlowe is advancing his most nihilistic vision of language as tragedy" (320). On the most narrow level, the play represents Marlowe's expert craftsmanship, equalled only in sections of Faustus, which duplicates the "surging emotions and subconscious preoccupations" (60) of his protagonists. Whatever position one takes, some facts are generally agreed upon. For one, Marlowe elicits complex and controlled responses from his audience (Hattaway 96). Ultimately, the greatest glory of Edward II is it proved Marlowe's "ability to challenge his own assumptions" (Levin 102). The rhetorical approach is amenable to the use of
broad and narrow analysis of the play. Seen from a broad perspective, the play represents an attempt by Marlowe to persuade the audience of something. The notion of audience includes both the listeners within the play and the dramatic audience itself. In this respect, we can focus on the major issues in the play: the nature of true and false kingship, the relation of the nobles to the king, and the relation of the private sphere to public domain for such a public figure. In one sense, the play centers on the suffering that results from men’s lust for power. In another, the play illustrates the limitations on the "absolute" power of the king.

To heighten the tension between the opposing sides of these issues, Marlowe makes use of antithesis of words, phrases, scenes, and even characters. The pairing of opposites has been seen with particular words as in the contrast of Edward and Mortimer as "cedar" and "eagle." Also, the ornate language of the word-oriented Edward is the antithesis of that of the action-oriented nobles. As we have seen, when Edward employs the ornate rhetoric, the response of various characters has been unfailingly antithetical to the response which Edward has intended. At first, his language is humored, then it is ignored, and ultimately it elicits only irritation from those who oppose him. And the same is true of any other character who would employ the heightened rhetoric. When toward the end of the play, Isabella welcomes the nobles into her
presence, she does so in the grand style, only to be summarily interrupted by Mortimer with

Nay, madam, if you be a warrior,
You must not grow so passionate in speeches.

(4.4.15-16)

Accompanying this use of antithesis, Marlowe also makes use of schemes of repetition to reinforce particular issues, themes, and even correspondences between characters. For example, just as "policy" reverberates throughout The Jew of Malta, both "Gaveston" and "minion" echo throughout Edward II. Also the clash of wills is clarified and intensified by Edward's and Mortimer's repetitive manipulation of "will" (Divakaruni 365). Hence, though they may be on opposite sides of every issue, Edward and Mortimer share an essential trait—each is equally determined to impose his will on those around him. Thus, they are ironically the same.

In a more limited sense the rhetorical method looks to the particular words and phrases that characters use to glimpse how the language relates to the revelation of the character himself. In this respect, Edward confuses language with action; he thinks words are sufficient when they are not. Language is portrayed as second to the power of taking action. Thus, Edward's fall may be based on an Aristotelean conception of the tragic hero. That is, his inability to observe the discretion advised by his peers in his relations with Gaveston provides his hamartia.
Since Aristotle's tragic figure is still a good man who errs greatly, to reinforce what there is of Edward's goodness Marlowe creates evolving villains in the form of ambitious and treacherous nobles and family. Because Marlowe's political world is one where force, violence, and hypocrisy are the ultimate realities, his flawed heroes populate a world where traditional values become meaningless. Hence, for all their weakness and evil, their antagonists likewise possess equally strong failings, which complicate both the sympathy and undercutting for the hero.

The view of the universe that is presented in Edward II suggests a world that has no god, only self and the conflict of powerful wills. As the play's action shows, the result can be frightening. There is no one character with which the audience can identify. Edward, Mortimer, Isabella, Gaveston, and Kent are all presented in their individualistic and flawed ethos. Hence in this play, the logos of the society, its basic and sometimes competing values, the conflicting ethos and pathos of its members take center stage.

One of the primary issues in this world of the competing selves involves the tension between the social self and the private self. Moreover, one of the elementary requirements for the social order, regardless of what rights and privileges are included in the penumbra of a particular definition, is that the order demands that
the absolute ruler govern justly (Ribner 146). Siding with Mortimer, Ribner feels that Edward does not govern justly. Yet, as we have seen, Mortimer himself does not act justly to achieve his own ends. Certainly the play presents an effective argument against the success of any Protean self. Though Edward and (to some extent) Mortimer think of themselves as Protean figures, the audience sees how this self becomes the means to entrapment and self-destruction.

Edward, the mauled lion-king, knows the rhetoric of command, but he is never able to make real any of his threats as his hyperbole remains hollow throughout the play. Yet, Edward does represent an affirmative force; in fact, it could be argued Edward, for all his reticence on the subject in the final scene, is nevertheless able to accept the loss of his crown because he affirms love as a saving value (Brodwin 154).

Certainly, for all of his poor statesmanship and personal failings, Edward's love for Gaveston remains one of the few positives of the play. When the complex ethos of the two central figures stack up against each other, we face a difficult choice. Edward's personal weakness loses to Mortimer's strength, and his Epicureanism proves no match for Mortimer's Machiavelianism. However, Mortimer's essentially loveless nature, reinforced by his illicit affair with the queen, is overshadowed by the force of Edward's loyalty to the love of one he thought loved him
more than all the world. The hollowness of Gaveston's love underscores even further the unfortunate blindness that Edward's degree of loyalty causes. Hence, the state survives in a contest between public duties and private desires, but to maintain its power the state may employ such methods and values as to check any unalloyed identification for itself. As testimony to Marlowe's greatness, the love that would subversively undermine the state's claim to his full attention is itself a form of subversive love, and yet Edward's fall remains the single greatest loss for England in Edward II.
Chapter VI:

Conclusion

As William J. Kennedy reminds us, "since late antiquity two conceptions of rhetoric have prevailed. One defines it as the art of embellishment and ornamentation; the other, as the art of communication and persuasion" (1). Certainly Marlowe's plays reveal an incorporation of rhetoric's two conceptions, since the Marlowe known for the art of the "mighty line" is also the brooding intellectual whose sometimes ruthless dialectic exposes the failings of what Elizabethan society took to be the good as well as the elements of goodness in his subversive failures, his protagonists. The question as to what the plays are communicating or persuading has remained unresolved. In fact, if an observer were to base an opinion on the intensity of the critical controversies surrounding the dramas, then he might add a third criterion to Marlowe's use of rhetoric--to embellish, to persuade, and also to confuse.

Possibly sympathetic to this difficulty, much modern criticism discounts rhetoric for its inclusion of contradictory points of view. For De Man,

Rhetoric is a text in that it allows for two incompatible, mutually self-destructive points of view, and therefore puts an insurmountable
obstacle in the way of any reading or understanding. (131)

Contrary to the direction of a great deal of modern critical theory, Aristotelian rhetoric asserts the importance of the interrelationship of a speaker with his audience. Aristotle maintains that "of the three elements in speech-making--speaker, subject, and person addressed--it is the last one, the hearer, that determines the speech's end and object" (Rhetoric Book I Ch 2, 31-32).

One of the assumptions of this analysis of Marlowe's plays is that the plays reflect Marlowe's artistic awareness of his audience. Furthermore, within the actual scenes, the dialogue between the characters also reflects their awareness and manipulation of this rhetorical principle.

Certainly Marlowe's plays present competing points of view, as the critical controversy has shown, but to go so far as to say that because they do this they are therefore inscrutable is an unnecessary conclusion. A reasonable surmise has been offered by Stephen Greenblatt. He first reminds us that Shakespeare's texts, which are also demonstrably rhetorical, have been interpreted with "impeccable intelligence as deeply conservative and with equally impeccable intelligence as deeply radical" (Negotiations 23). However, Greenblatt finds the plays possess a powerful energia and are, in fact, reflections of the need for the state power to define itself (37). Hence, incompatible points of view do not "self-destruct";
rather, the form of the rhetorical document, in this case the dramas of Marlowe, exists "as a primary expression of Renaissance power [and] helps to contain the radical doubts it continually provokes" (65). In fact, the eloquent expression of opposing concerns may have something to do with what ancient rhetoricians called rhetoric's "civilizing function" (Vickers 11). Ultimately, it is not a question of inscrutability nor really of the existence of subversion in the plays. Rather, the perennial issue in Marlowe criticism, then, is whether subversion itself is contained.

In connection with this issue, one advantage that a rhetorical analysis of Marlowe's plays presents is the employment of a subject fundamental to the making of Renaissance dramas themselves. Hence, in using this approach I have been employing one of the basic tools which the playwright himself used to construct his plays. Furthermore, in pursuit of possible answers to this issue, I have employed Aristotle's concepts of ethos (the speaker's character), logos (the validity or invalidity of the arguments themselves), and pathos (putting the audience into a desirable state of mind) as means to analyze Marlowe's plays. Also, I have viewed each protagonist as individually possessing a unique ethos, pathos, and logos of his own. My purpose has been to analyze these elements of character in terms of identification (amplification) and undercutting (irony) so
that the answers to the subversion issue may be structured in rhetorical form.

Overall, what the plays suggest in terms of character, issues, and values may arrive in a very complex form, yet the messages do arrive. Rather than being radically indecipherable, the plays present the audience with difficult choices involving the orthodox and subversive elements of Elizabethan culture. Before a consideration of these choices, a few general observations about the changes in Marlowe's employment of rhetoric may be offered.

Assuming a rough chronology of the plays as organized in this paper, Marlowe seems to have foreseen the limitations of the copious style, as he was one of the first poets to begin to use embellishment with what J. W. Van Hook terms "dramatic appropriateness" (50). Hence, one result of this study has been to show that Marlowe exhibited an increasing control over his style as it developed from the devices of amplification used to create the set speeches of Tamburlaine to the naturalistic dialogue and a more selective use of the copious style seen in Edward II.

Furthermore, as Marlowe developed his style, he began to reveal the personalities of his characters in more subtle ways, through imagery, for example. Specifically, the figures of amplification gave way to those of a more dialectical nature. Hence, ploce, parison, and other
figures of repetition and emphasis are replaced, at the other extreme, with stichomythia. Many of the tropes of the *Tamburlaine* plays remain in use in *Edward II*, but they are used with more restraint. For example, as Edward’s speeches show, there is a tendency for him to change directions in thought and mood.

Additionally, Marlowe’s employment of rhetoric fulfills the classical definition of rhetoric as persuasion and ornamentation. Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric as an attempt at the discovery of all the available means of persuasion may provide a rough approximation of what Marlowe has done in his major plays.

While Aristotle himself wrote both a *Rhetoric* and a *Poetics*, suggesting that he conceived of the two as separate, by the time of Horace the functions of literature had become dual: to instruct (persuade) and to delight. In order to persuade and entertain, Marlowe made use of and in many cases transformed the available rhetorical materials. On the most specific level, Marlowe’s plays show an abundance of rhetorical devices from *elocutio*—particularly, the presence or absence of patterned repetitions and multiple uses of antithesis. The various arguments and enthymemes he gives his characters as well as the tripartite structure of character (pathos, logos, and ethos) are taken from *inventio*. The arrangement or structure of his plays he takes from *dispositio*. The specific rhetorical devices are
not a great help in determining an identification for or against a character since a villain can use anthropomorphosis as well as any hero can. However, the broader aspects of inventio have proven very helpful. Taking into account the logic or illogic, the feelings and ethical character of individual characters, we have more evidence to describe that character and its effects upon an audience. I have attempted to describe the rhetoric in each play as a whole, the rhetoric of each individual protagonist, and finally the relation of the protagonist's rhetoric to the audience's possible identification with him.

Tamburlaine I and II reflect an ornate rhetoric that is used to establish a strong protagonist who can transmute the world into forms serviceable to his wishes. For Tamburlaine, linguistic amplification coincides with military aspirations. The power of Tamburlaine, however, as appealing as it makes him, is complicated by an ethos that subjugates everything and everyone in his path to his own purposes. Yet we have found that others with similar values and purposes increasingly employed a similar rhetoric, and also that the effect of Tamburlaine's rhetoric in Part Two was diminished at least insofar as Calyphas responded to it. Ultimately, the fundamental illogic of this behavior is illustrated when toward the end of Part Two even Tamburlaine must admit that there is a power beyond his own awesome capabilities.

No closet dramas, these Tamburlaine plays must have
had a profound effect upon the Renaissance audience if for no better reason than the brilliance of Tamburlaine's own language. Hence, for precisely the same reason when the effectiveness of Tamburlaine's rhetoric is diminished in Part Two, the audience must have suspected that some new view of the hero was being portrayed.

In *Dr. Faustus* the key to Faustus' rhetoric lies in the disjunction between the patent illogic of his thoughts to make himself a deity and the sympathetic power of that desire to be more than but a man. Hence, the tension between Faustus' *logos* and *pathos* provides the key to this interpretation of the play. Faustus is sympathetic because he powerfully linked his passions to his thinking, though the outcome was decided before the logical errors of the first scene had ever been expressed. The Christian world order proved to be a larger vehicle for the play's action than Faustus' purposes could ever provide. However, the intensity of Faustus' desire and his final suffering (not to mention the silence of the deity) cast some doubt as to the efficacy of this order, too.

Both Tamburlaine and Faustus share a sincerity of purpose, thought, and feeling that Barabas does not possess, and I feel that this difference is essential to the creation of the comic tone of the play. In *The Jew of Malta* Marlowe allows the audience into the confidences of a con-man. The excellences of Barabas' strategems that provide a source of dark comedy also insure that he will
ultimately fail. Language's potential for manipulation and deception provides the means for Barabas' strategems. That he is self-deceived in the end only adds to the play's sharp humor. However, I found this play to be the most subversive of all the plays since a final twist is added that almost destroys the comic tone. When Ferneze the Machiavel resumes the throne, the justice of the world order is seriously questioned. Tamburlaine and Faustus fail because there is something outside themselves that is stronger than they are, and justice is ultimately, if tenuously, affirmed. In The Jew of Malta, however, one excellent amoral villain gives way to another, who merely bears the outward vestiges of the approved world order. Hence, in an ironical way a sympathy for Barabas is set up, if only because in a world without justice our sympathies will go with the schemer whose confidence we have enjoyed.

Edward possesses an ornate rhetoric similar to Tamburlaine, but each time he employs it, he miserably fails. The key to this failure traces to Marlowe's investment of Edward with a deeply flawed ethos and logos. Similar to Faustus, Edward is guided by the strength of an overwhelming passion. It is not the language of Tamburlaine that is being criticized as much as the impotence of a king who cannot reconcile his private desires with his public duties, as perceived by the powerful nobles who vie with him for control of the state.
The gradual corruption and demise of Mortimer and Isabella reinforce the notion that the individual is less trustworthy and ultimately less significant than the state. As Edward III assumes the throne, he reasserts what was lacking when his father ruled, a social order based on justice. His presence reinforces the idea of the obligations of king and nobles to see that order maintained. Hence, Edward is poles apart from Tamburlaine whose life served to illustrate the idea that the state's importance is subject to the powerful individual's will. Indeed, as Levin has said, one of the greatest things about Edward II is Marlowe's "ability to question his assumptions" (182).

In true Marlovian character, generalizations about the canon are difficult to make, for the complexity of the characters and their individual circumstances require a high degree of ambivalence. Every statement is accompanied by its qualifications. Having established that difficulty, one generalization that can be made is that Marlowe's major characters receive an increasingly complex portrayal. Assuming (and this itself is a large assumption) an order to the plays in the way I have discussed them, I suggest that there is an increasingly ambiguous treatment of the protagonist. Tamburlaine elicited a highly sympathetic response, judging from the various positive references recorded by Richard Levin who reports that "Tamburlaine was perceived as a triumphant
figure who possessed and wielded tremendous power" (56). The unity that Tamburlaine possesses in terms of his ethos, pathos, and logos as well as the effect that his personality and rhetoric had on the external world all act to set up this positive response. With Faustus, disjunction emerges between competing elements of the character's own psyche. The discrepancy sets up in the audience a divided response to the divided character. With Barabas, the rules are different; comic characters do not elicit deep identification. Their purpose is to entertain, though in this case the laughter is quite abrasive. The complex response to Barabas traces not to any division within the character's psyche, nor to the fact of his demise, but to the unfortunate fact that Ferneze resumes the throne. Hence, I find The Jew of Malta quite unsettling as a comedy, but unfulfilling of any of the requirements of the tragedy.

With Edward, the complex treatment of the protagonist reaches its zenith. Edward's rhetoric never matches his ambitions for it. His ethos violates accepted Elizabethan standards of conduct, and his thinking violates the same norms. Yet Edward refuses to become a caricature of a king; he retains a vestige of dignity, enough presence for us to suffer when he suffers. Indeed, his death scene may be more painful than any scene in all the English dramas preceding this one.

A second general observation might be that as his
heroes acquire a greater complexity. Marlowe's own style grows in complexity as well. From the set speeches at one end to the intermixture of ornate rhetoric with naturalistic dialogue at the other end, the audience is exposed to an evolving art, not a static one. Far from being merely accidental or unconscious, Marlowe's art is the result of choices he has made. The stylistic changes that have been observed in the plays suggest a brooding intelligence, a skeptical temperament, and at times a deep passion, too. Hence, the choices that Marlowe has made ultimately stem from his own complex ethos, logos, and pathos, only part of which remain entirely conscious. Like his heroes, who in their choices and refusals create a self that is in stark opposition to but entwined with the world around them, Marlowe has created plays which "dissemble to deceive" the inattentive eye and ear.
Notes: Introduction

1 In a recent annotated bibliography Ronald Levao summarizes the abiding issues in Marlowe studies as involving Marlowe's orthodoxy. He lists several pertinent questions which still evoke varying answers: "Is convention reinforced or subverted? Is subversion itself contained? Are Marlowe's overreaching protagonists Icarian or Promethean? Is the ambiguity of his stance the willed aesthetic of a great tragic dramatist or the mark of his neurosis and the irreconcilable pressures of his culture?" English Literary Renaissance 18 (1988): 337.

2 Indeed one of the commonplace observations of one early critic was that Marlowe's power derived from "single situations rather than in cleareyed development of the plot" Bullen, qtd. in Kenneth Friedenreich, Christopher Marlowe: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism Since 1950. London: Scarecrow, 1979. 12.

3 For support for this idea about the violation of traditional Elizabethan morality critics turn to Marlowe's biography. Most of the Victorian critics (Bullen, Symonds, Dowden) saw Marlowe's creations as part of Marlowe's own biography. He was the precocious bad boy whose unruly passions found expression in his plays. Leslie Hotson's discovery of the Coroner's Inquest which exonerated Ingram Frizer from responsibility in Marlowe's death confirmed the bad boy image. Twentieth century critics followed this interpretation. F. S. Boas, in Christopher Marlowe and His Circle (1928), allowed that Marlowe did pioneering in the drama but he "presents a figure of passionate intellect, quick at word and blow, equally ready with the dagger point" (136). J. M. Robertson, in Marlowe: A Conspectus (1931), describes him as the "genially reckless man of genius" (55). In a later book, Boas states that Marlowe's "life record forms a drama as absorbing as any of the tragedies" (Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study, 1940, 308). Even John Bakeless in his two volume study The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe (1942) maintains "Marlowe is the least adept of dramatists in concealing himself" (I, 140).

Of course, there are those who argue the opposite that Marlowe's plays defend traditional values. Among those who argue that the plays defend traditional Tudor morality are Battenhouse in Marlowe's Tamburlaine; W. Moelwyn Merchant in "Marlowe the Orthodox," Christopher Marlowe, ed. Brian Morris (New York: Hill, 1968); Douglas Cole in Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962). Paul Kocher

In an influential essay in anthropological criticism, "Marlowe and the Will to Absolute Play," from Renaissance Self-Fashioning From More to Shakespeare (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981) Greenblatt argues for the existence in the late Renaissance of an increasing awareness about the "fashioning of human identity as a manipulable artful process" (2). He is concerned with the relationship between the character's self-fashioned identity and the rhetoric he manipulates to construct the identity. Greenblatt admits that the plays do suggest violations of Tudor morality but that in their immorality, Marlowe's characters reflect responses to this new sense of freedom from old constraints as new boundaries are attempted.


Ms. Weil is not the only critic who sees Marlowe as an ironic, objective artist. Michael Hattaway states that Marlowe "is far from being a subjective dramatist; his characters from many points of view, they gain in complexity as an actor crossed lighting gains solidity, and to enter into a merely empathetic relationship with them is to deny Marlowe's artistry." ("Marlowe and Brecht" Christopher Marlowe, ed. Brian Morris, 101).


Waith explains that Tamburlaine may be faithful to the classical Herculean hero in his possession of good and bad qualities. Tamburlaine "does not belong entirely to either earth or heaven. Though he has distinctly human characteristics, both good and bad, he has something of the magnificence and incomprehensibility of a deity" (68).

A great classifier Aristotle found three essential parts to rhetoric which he defined as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion." See Rhetoric, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (New York: Modern Library, 1954), 24. These three parts he discussed as the thought-element of rhetoric (analogous to invention), the style, and arrangement. See Book II, Chapters 23-26 for Aristotle’s discussion of invention and Book III, Chs. 1-4, 13 for style and arrangement.

In Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (2nd ed, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980) M. C. Bradbrook discusses the general conventions for gesture and delivery, stating "the acting was probably nearer to that of the modern political platform or revivalist pulpit than that of the modern stage" (21). Bradbrook explains that emotions were extravagantly shown. Grief was expressed by one’s throwing oneself on the ground while joy was expressed by cutting capers (22-23). This information notwithstanding it remains difficult to read intent from such extravagant posturings.

As for the importance of elocutio to Renaissance rhetoric William G. Crane states "style (elocutio) came to be almost synonymous with rhetoric in the Renaissance. Consequently, treatises appeared which reduced nearly all that was considered of significance in rhetoric to tables of tropes and figures" (57). See Wit and Rhetoric in the Renaissance (Gloucester, Mass: Smith, 1964).

Charles O. McDonald explains that Aphonius' Progymnasmata became "the grammar-school textbook of composition in England" (78) and he sets out the fourteen exercises included in the book which the students used as models for writing essays. The important point here is that all of these compositions were also considered "ministure orations (78). See The Rhetoric of Tragedy:
Russell H. Wagner numbers these contributions in an aptly named article "Thomas Wilson's Contributions to Rhetoric." See Papers in Rhetoric, Donald C. Bryant, ed (St. Louis: Washington UP, 1940). In addition to its completeness, its use of native English, its reassembling diverse rhetorical materials, Wilson's book is essential because it presented rhetoric as the art of discourse, or oral persuasion. Perhaps it is not so naive to think that Marlowe found this book, which was designed for aspiring courtiers and government servants, useful for his own dramatic purposes of persuasion.

As indicative of Aristotle's completeness, he analyzed the various emotions which might enter into a persuasive occasion. While Aristotle emphasized the display of good character (Ethos) and truthfulness or validity of arguments (Logos), he included the idea of the appeal to the emotions (Pathos) as one of the three means to win an argument. While Tamburlaine predominantly makes use of the first two of these, those characters he opposes do employ appeals to emotion.

J. R. Mulryne and Stephen Fender argue (without using my terminology of amplification and irony) essentially the same idea that Marlowe brings contradictory views of characters and experience itself together. These opposites "are brought together and left unresolved: the ideal and the common sense; the hint of a comprehensive order and the rejection of all order; the moral and the libertine" (50). See "Marlowe and the 'Comic Distance'" in Christopher Marlowe, Brian Morris, ed. (New York: Hill, 1968).
Notes:
Chapter One

1 As Harry Levin points out, the emphasis placed upon language may be noted very early even from the Prologue's description of Tamburlaine who will threaten the world with his "astounding terms." Levin explains, "We are invited to listen, to hear the threats and scourges of war. The invitation is addressed explicitly to our ears, and subsequently to our eyes" (30).

2 The texts that are referred to in the paper are those in The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe, Ed. Irving Ribner (New York: Odyssey, 1963).

3 Levin also offers as an appendix in the seminal study The Overreacher (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952) the percentage of total lines that the major characters have. Marlowe's title characters utter more than thirty percent of the lines in each of his major plays with the exception of Edward in Edward II. These high percentages reflect the focus upon these characters as well as the emphasis upon language as the primary medium to form that focus (Levin 186). As Levin points out, even when these characters are not speaking their third of the time, they are "spoken about during much of the remainder" (42).

4 In their analysis of this encomium Davidson and Davidson describe the portrait of Tamburlaine drawn by Menaphon as "lush and Bernini-like" (21) with its hyperbole piled on hyperbole. It is precisely this near visual effect that the richness of Marlowe's language creates. The Davidsons go on to compare Marlowe's "forcible" poetry to musical techniques such as the crescendo (23). It is testimony to the power of his lines that such comparisons to painting and music are attempted.

5 Harry Levin points out in this regard that Mycetes "habitually depends upon the eloquence of others" (44). Also, J. B. Steane supports this idea when he suggests that Mycetes' speech "is the parody of kingly utterance." See Marlowe: A Critical Study (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1964), 94. Kocher posits that Marlowe has built the character upon a "fantastically naive misapprehension of the world of fact. See Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1946. 268).

In Chapter 3 of The Rhetoric Aristotle refers to the three kinds of rhetoric: political (deliberative, in which one attempt to exhort or dissuade a group from acting); forensic (judicial, in which one accuses or defends one who is on trial); and epideictic (the ceremonial display of rhetoric during which a famous person who is dead is praised or condemned). 31-34.

Concerning this identification that the contemporary audience had for Tamburlaine, Richard Levin sets out many references both to the character and the play which represent "testimony that Tamburlaine evoked a positive response in the contemporary audience." See "The Contemporary Perception of Marlowe's Tamburlaine." Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, Ed. J. Leeds Barroll (New York: AMS, 1984), 54. See also Bakeless (201-03) for similar information supporting Tamburlaine's positive reception.

Puttenham calls this type of rhetorical question an erotema: "a kinde of figurative speach when we aske many questions and looke for none answere, speaking indeed by interrogation, which we might as well say by affirmation." Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie (1589), eds. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1936), 211. Hence, as Lawrence Danson, who discusses the rhetorical question in connection with the moral idea of the play, maintains that Marlowe uses the erotema to illustrate both Tamburlaine's naive nature and the wonder of his strength simultaneously. "Marlowe does not take away the wonder by pointing the moral" (15). See Christopher Marlowe: The Questioner" English Literary Renaissance 12 (1982).

Aristotle, The Rhetoric, 143.

Aristotle, The Rhetoric, 164. Aristotle lists the three means of making an effective speech as the means of producing persuasion (inventio in Cicero), style, and arrangement.

Cicero's De Inventione, Book I, discusses each of these at length.
Hence, by revealing these qualities Tamburlaine is fulfilling the task of arguing for his own character (ethos). The Rhetoric, 164.

Chitraleka Divakaruni explains that "shall" and "will" are the "commonest verbs in Tamburlaine's speech, helping to create a certain atmosphere" (52). And again, "admittedly these verbs are not uncommon in the English language, but their reiteration in the speeches of Tamburlaine is no coincidence, especially since they are comparatively absent in the language of the other characters" (52). See "'For Danger is in Wordes': Changing Attitudes to Language in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe." Unpublished Diss. (Berkeley: U of California, 1984). 8512800.

Indeed, I am employing an erotema of my own, since as Danson has already stated of Tamburlaine's fate, "A person who believes himself to be immortal is probably not to be trusted with strenuous philosophizing" (12). Perhaps we do not believe that Tamburlaine "holds the fates in adamantine chains," but the power of his rhetoric causes us to wonder with Charles Masinton whether Tamburlain has indeed transcended morality and mortality (24). See "Marlowe's Artists: The Failure of Imagination," Ohio University Review 11 (1969). C. L. Barber has gone so far as to say that Tamburlaine I suggests the "writer's identification with his protagonist" (16). See "The Death of Zenocrate: 'Conceiving and Subduing Both' in Marlowe's Tamburlaine." Literature and Psychology 16 (1966).

Notes:
Chapter Two

1 Many critics have discussed the issue of the coherence or unity of Tamburlaine I and II. Among those who have argued against incoherence are Levin, The Overreacher 34ff., Waith, The Herculean Hero 63ff., Steane 99, and Daiches 53-60.

2 M. C. Bradbrook argues that Tamburlaine II is an inferior play since Part Two had to be "either a variation of Part One (the four kings being substituted for Bajazeth) or a series of irrelevant incidents, such as those connected with Olympia" (Themes and Conventions (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1952) 146. Christopher Leech,
on the other hand, has argued for the particular merits of the play in "The Structure of Tamburlaine." TDR 8:4 (1964): 32-46.

3 There have been many differing interpretations of Tamburlaine's attitude toward religion in Part Two. Of course, Paul Kocher sees in Tamburlaine an extension of Marlowe the rebel and atheist. Hence, when Tamburlaine is struck with his fatal illness, Marlowe is merely bringing the play to its conclusion rather than illustrating some divine retribution to Tamburlaine's burning of the Koran. See Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1946) 90. Similarly, Irving Ribner sees in Tamburlaine's sudden illness the playwright "showing the futility of Tamburlaine's attempt to master the power of the universe which no man can master" rather than a sign that we are to take "his death as divine punishment for blasphemy." Note "Marlowe's 'Tragicke Glasse,'" in Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama, Ed. Richard Hosley (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1962) 95-96.

Bradbrook argues that the soliloquy is an essential element of Elizabethan drama. The soliloquy constitutes one of the primary "conventions of speech" of that day (134).

4 The elements of pathos are viewed by Tamburlaine as signs of weakness; hence, that he employs pathos from time to time may suggest, as Kuriyama explains, that for Tamburlaine "love and weakness are synonomous" (14).

Contrary to my reading of the play, Divakaruni maintains that Marlowe "begins to question whether rhetoric can create and maintain a reality adequately, or whether what it portrays must ultimately be self-referential, and he becomes aware of the destructive possibilities of language" (97).

Notes:
Chapter Three


3 C. L. Barber, "The Form of Faustus' Fortunes Good or Bad." TDR 8 (1964): 59-76.


8 It is quite possible that each of the critical interpretations of Faustus' fall is correct in its own way. Each explores a different terminology and relates
that terminology to Faustus' rise and fall. Notwithstanding the plethora of answers, however, the question remains unresolved.


12 Divarkaruni points out that Faustus' misconstruction of various texts is only one source of error for him. He additionally misunderstands the levels of meaning of particular words he uses as well as the language that others present to him. See "'For Danger is in Words': Changing Attitudes to Language in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe." Unpublished Dissertation, 1984. U of California, Berkeley. 263, 266, 268.

13 As the play progresses Mephistopheles and his attendant demons become increasingly real. Critics have pointed out either or both the theological or psychological implications of this fact. Among those critics who see some theological significance, although with different emphases, are Cole, Mahood, and Mizener. Giamatti primarily explores the psychological theme of self-transformation which he regards as the essential issue in the play.

Several critics argue that Faustus' damnation traces

Notes:
Chapter Four


2 Kuriyama points out that the world of this play has shrunk compared to that of the Tamburlaine plays (80). She notes that for all of Barabas' evil, he "inhabits a small and static world" (80). See Hammer or Anvil: Psychological Patterns in Christopher Marlowe's Plays. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1980.

3 Abigail is the only selfless character in the play, and one of the most cruelly abused. The first four words she speaks conveys her ethos: "Not for my self" (1.2.229). Barabas sacrifices his daughter not to knife or poison, as he does with other obstacles to his designs. He uses the seductiveness of words, and when she discovers the ploy, Barabas loses her completely.

4 Divakaru suggests that Marlowe's attitude towards "the punishment of those who thus misuse language is not a clear-cut one, for Ferneze does triumph at the end as a direct result of his dissimulation. but those who transgress against language suffer too often for it to be a coincidence" (396). I must confess that the view of Marlowe the moralist is an unclear one for me. That Ferneze's ascension to the throne is a bitter note, I agree; nevertheless, if the world of the play continues to operate as it does for Barabas' life, then I suspect that
Ferneze's own turn is on the way, for Marlowe spares no one from the swath of his questioning intellect and skepticism. See Divakaruni 'For Danger is in Words': Changing Attitudes to Language in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe. Diss. U of California, Berkeley, 1984. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1988. 8512800.

More than one critic has pointed out that Barabas is not the true Machiavel in the play. See the article by James Smith (13) in Christopher Marlowe: Mermaid Critical Commentaries. Ed. Brian Morris. New York: Hill, 1968. Also note, Kuriyama (161), and Greenblatt (55).

Notes
Chapter Five

1 Many critics have undertaken to analyze the differences in the verse from this play to the other plays and many have described the character of the weak king. Wolfgang Clemen has noted the play's verse adaptability in English Tragedy Before Shakespeare (London: Methuen, 1961), 156. F. P. Wilson describes the weakness of the character of the king in Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953), 91. Douglas Cole undertakes an analysis of the weak king in Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962) 161ff, and Harry Levin also analyzes the weak king idea in The Overreacher (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952) 85-91.

2 Two recent dissertations analyze the language of the play from somewhat different perspectives. Karen Jean Cunningham studies the "relationship between speech and embodiment" (vi) in the plays in "The Spectacle of the Self: Language and Embodiment in Marlowe." Diss. U of California, Santa Barbara, 1985. Chitrakshita Divakaruni argues that the plays reflect Marlowe's progressively disenchanted attitude toward language. Her thesis is that the plays show Marlowe's growing mistrust towards language, a medium that he regards as corrupt and dangerous, and proves that in each of his plays he sees it as the root cause of his protagonist's tragedy" (i).

3 Unlike Edward, the nobles rely more on action than on words. Whereas Edward is given to lengthy utterances when circumstances frustrate his desires, the nobles almost immediately turn to force. Even when Mortimer's plans fail and he faces his death, he is not given to the extended utterance; rather, in the vein of the stoic, he
accepts his fate. Mortimer, in particular, epitomizes the rejection of language which all the nobles generally reflect.
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