FOURTH INTERNATIONAL MARLOWE CONFERENCE: A PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

Dear Colleagues:

The Fourth Annual International Marlowe Conference will be celebrated as scheduled at St. Catharine’s and Corpus Christi Colleges from June 29 to July 3. The program includes 20 provocative sessions with 33 presenters from 33 different institutions and countries, which makes this the largest and most diverse conference that the Marlowe Society has ever sponsored. Our plenary speakers are Leeds Barroll from the University of Maryland, David Fuller from Durham University, and Stephen Orgel from Stanford University.

In addition to the many stimulating papers, seminars, and panel discussions to be presented at the Conference, the program will include sprightly madrigals by the Orlando singers accompanying dinner at Corpus Christi on Monday, June 29; a walking tour of Cambridge with colloquies by an escort of costumed historical characters, including Christopher Marlowe, on Tuesday, June 30; a production of Dido Queen of Carthage performed in the dining hall of Corpus Christi on Wednesday, July 1; and a formal banquet also in the grand dining hall at Corpus Christi on Thursday, July 2. For those who are spending the weekend in London, there will be a group tour of the Globe Theatre and attendance at a production of As You Like It. We thus hope that our Conference will both teach and delight, providing both pleasure and profit.

This will be the last International Marlowe Conference of the millennium and we hope to make it a memorable experience. Our Conference may not become a household word, but I foretell that gentle scholars in academe then abed will think themselves accursed they were not there.

Sincerely,

Sara Munson Deats
President

CONFERENCE SESSIONS

Following is a list of the sessions for the Fourth International Conference. We will be using two conference rooms, and in most cases two sessions will be presented simultaneously.

Session I: Marlowe and his Contemporaries
Session II: Reception Theory and Marlowe
Session III: Marlowe, Performance, and the Dramatic Tradition
Session IV: Intertextuality and Marlowe
Session V: Marlowe and Early Modern Culture
Session VI: Marlowe and Renaissance Skepticism
Session VII: Costume and Spectacle in Marlowe
Session VIII: The Admiral’s Men and Marlowe’s Plays on Stage
Session IX: Relationships and Power in Edward II
Session X: Marlowe’s Women
Session XI: Doctor Faustus: New Perspectives
Session XII: Postmodern Approaches to Marlowe
Session XIII: Doctor Faustus and Cultural Contexts
Session XIV: Marlowe and Early Modern Subjectivity
Session XV: New Perspectives on Dido Queen of Carthage
Session XVI: Biographical Studies of Marlowe
Session XVII: Abigail, Marlowe’s Forgotten Heroine
Session XVIII: Edward II in Performance
Session XIX: Hero and Leander: Familiar Questions, New Answers
Session XX: Performance, History, and Edward II: A Seminar Discussion
Session XXI: Marlowe’s Lives

ROMA GILL PRIZE

The Marlowe Society’s Roma Gill Prize for 1995-96 has been awarded to Paul Hammer for his article “A Reckoning Reframed: The ‘Murder’ of Christopher Marlowe Revisited,” English Literary Renaissance 26.2 (1996): 225-42. The essay is a careful and informative assessment of a primary historical document (Skere’s letter to Meyrick). By considering the
socio-historical implications of terms like "servant," Hammer persuasively disavows the romanticized notions that have surrounded the "familiar" of a great man, challenging the credibility of the Essex theory (that Skeres was Essex's familiar) and clarifying not only the likely role of Skeres but also the likely relationship of such a man to his "master." In so doing, Hammer brings to light some of the subtleties of class relations in Marlowe's time. In addition, his reminder that not every remark or charge against Marlowe needs to be connected with his death is worth remembering, as is Hammer's own speculation about the conspiracy: namely, that having committed murder over a disagreement, the survivors put as good a face as possible on their actions when dealing with the authorities. Hammer's cautious, common-sense approach is a valuable leaven to widespread current speculation about conspiracy theories, and his reading of the historical record is a model of the way in which such documents need to be approached.

MSA SECRETARY

Viviana Comensoli, who has been serving as Secretary of the Marlowe Society of America, will be stepping down this year. Her service to the Society has been exemplary in every way, and we regret losing her in this position.

Professor Laurie Maguire has been chosen unanimously by the Executive Committee to fulfill the remainder of the term, and we welcome her back to an active leadership role in the Marlowe Society of America.

NOTICE OF REFERENDUM

At the last annual business meeting of the Marlowe Society (December 1997, Toronto), a motion to amend the by-laws to change our election of officers from every three years to every four years was approved unanimously. Such a motion will require ratification by the membership (a two-thirds majority of those voting). A ballot for this purpose will be mailed to the membership later this summer.

NEW WEBSITE ADDRESS

The Marlowe Society website address has been changed to make it more accessible to search engines. The new address is http://wwwsla.purdue.edu/academic/engl/marlowesoc
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MARLOWE GOES WHALING IN
ALL THE BROTHERS WERE VALIANT

All the Brothers Were Valiant (MGM 1953) is a sea adventure film combining bits and pieces of Moby Dick, The Sea-Wolf, and Typee in an action-packed tale of whaling, fraternal rivalry, Pacific island hopping, and redemption through sacrifice and death. It was directed by the prolific and reliable Richard Thorpe, whose career spanned from 1923 to 1967. Among his many films are Tarzan movies, a “Thin Man” film, and a series of medieval adventures, Ivanhoe (1952), Knights of the Roundable (1954), and Quentin Durward (1955), which starred Robert Taylor.

Robert Taylor also appears as the heroic sea captain Joel Shore in All the Brothers Were Valiant, with Stewart Granger as his swashbuckling and escape grace brother Mark. Captain Mark has been disgraced by his inexplicable desertion of his ship and crew during a voyage. Joel has continued to defend his brother’s behavior, even though he really does not know what happened to Mark. During his prolonged absence, Joel falls in love with and marries Mark’s sweetheart Priscilla (Ann Blyth) and takes her on his whaling ship so she can learn about his occupation. During this voyage, Joel is reunited with his brother, who spins a tale of sickness, the love of an island girl, escape from death, and untold riches.

When Mark was sick and delirious, he left his ship and encountered hostile natives, whom he somehow managed to frighten away, except for a beautiful native girl (Beta St. John) who, despite remaining anonymous and incomprehensible, became Mark’s loyal love interest. Subsequently, she was kidnapped by pirates, but Mark heroically rescued her. However, he joined with two of the pirates in a pearl expedition.

The three men struck it rich with a bonanza of pearls, but the temptation of such great wealth proved too strong and Fetcher (James Whitmore) stabbed his partner Quint (Kurt Kazar) to death, thus leaving only Fetcher and Mark to share the pearls. As they divvied them up, Fetcher asked Mark to estimate how much money they would bring. Mark quickly answered, “About half a million.” Fetcher responded, “That’s an awful lot of money to put into two little bags.” Mark, somewhat contemptually, said, “That reminds me of something I read in school—‘Infinite riches in a little room.’” Fetcher concluded that “that guy must have had us in mind when he wrote that.”

But Fetcher tried to have all the wealth by attacking Mark, who killed him in the ensuing struggle. Mark and the native girl pushed off on their little raft, but they were attacked from the shore by spear-throwing natives who killed the native girl. As she died, she dropped the bag of pearls into the water where it sank to the bottom. Mark was forced to flee alone and without the treasure, and that is how he ended up being rescued by his brother.

Mark’s larger-than-life presence on Joel’s whaler touches off nautical and marital mutiny: his promise of riches for Joel’s crew if they help him retrieve the pearls creates immediate unrest, and Priscilla falls under Mark’s spell again to the point where she is almost ready to leave Joel. However, during the subsequent violent mutiny, Mark helps his brother to subdue the mutineers and in the process loses his life saving Joel’s.

The allusion to Barabas’ opening speech in The Jew of Malta establishes a generalized Marlovian context of cruelty, exploitation, and internecine greed. When the brutish Quint loses at cards to Fetcher, he immediately becomes incensed with his native servant for his refusal to obey a foolish order. Quint stabs him to death, taking out on him his anger at the gambling loss. Later, after Quint beats Fetcher at cards and taunts him, Fetcher instinctively kills him. Finally, when Mark describes how he will take Joel’s ship and wife from him, he reminds his younger brother that during their childhood whenever he wanted Joel’s toys he merely took them, and he promises to do so now.

Another pervasive Marlovian theme is the deadliness of overreaching greed. The oysters contain infinite riches in their little shells, and the pearls that Fetcher and Mark gleefully place in their bags constitute similar riches in a small, enclosed place. Similarly, Barabas exults in his possession of Bags of fiery opals, sapphires, and amethysts, Jacinths, hard topaz, grass-green emeralds, Beauteous rubies, sparkling diamonds, And seld-seen costly stones of so great price (25-28)

which he has heaped up “in his house . . . like pebble-stones” (23). In the play and the movie, the insane attempt to enclose vast wealth in a confined and defended space—to control the uncontrollable—results in violence and death.

The use of this line and motif in All the Brothers Were Valiant prefigures its appearance in a similar context in the Burton/Taylor Dr. Faustus (1968). When Faustus is shown the seven deadly sins, Gream appears as a miserly, wizened old man suspended in a golden cage who guards and plays with his money. Faustus asks: “What are thou in thy cage of gold? What keeps you so barred up?” Greed responds, “Infinite riches in a little room. Bars do not keep me in, they keep thee out.”

NOTE

1 This dialogue indicates the pecking order in Hollywood cinematic allusions to Elizabethan writers: first there is Shakespeare and then everybody else. More often than not (in
Mediterranean match, reviving Jew in May 1601 and Mahomet in August (Moby Molloco and Mahomet either are, or are clones of, The Battle of Alcazar). The Admiral's Men appear to have cloned The Massacre at Paris in the four-part Civil Wars of France in 1598-99. The two-part Tamar Cham, a clone of the Tamburlaine plays, was staged by Strange's Men in 1592-93; it was acquired by the Admiral's Men and played alternatively with the Tamburlaines, 1594-96. Additionally, the Admiral's Men staged a two-part Hercules play in conjunction with Tamburlaine; in one amazing week of 1595, the Admiral's Men literally framed performances of the Tamburlaine plays with the Hercules plays (May 20-23).

MARLOWE RERUNS:
THE REPERTORIAL CONTEXT OF
MARLOWE'S PLAYS IN REVIVAL

An abstract of the paper presented by Roslyn L. Knutson, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, at the 1997 MSA Session "Marlowe and Performance."

The thesis of my presentation is that plays by Marlowe were staged in conjunction with plays that complemented, or exploited, or exaggerated certain of their features (I focus on The Jew of Malta, The Massacre at Paris, the two parts of Tamburlaine, and Doctor Faustus because their stage history, 1594-1603, is relatively well known). The staging of Marlowe's plays in conjunction with duplicate and echoing plays was done not only at the Rose and Fortune by the companies owning Marlowe's plays but also at other playhouses by other companies. The frequency with which revivals of Marlowe's plays appear coordinated with duplicate and echoing plays suggests an industry-wide marketing strategy by which companies used their repertory to promote their own holdings as well as capitalize on each other's successful holdings. This commercial feature is evident in data from the diary of Philip Henslowe, who started keeping records of theatrical activity at the Rose playhouse in 1992 (and at the Fortune, 1600-1603). For the most part, Marlowe's plays appear in Henslowe's Diary in revival, thus my focus on "reruns."

My first point is that the Rose companies referenced Marlowe's plays with each other as well as with other offerings. Obviously, the Marlowe reruns were a context for themselves; for example, one Marlowe play or another was on stage at the Rose for five straight years, 1592-1597. Also Marlowe's plays were echoed in non-Marlowe offerings. Strange's Men, who staged The Jew of Malta in 1592-93, offered Machiavel and Moby Molloco in that same repertory. Machiavel surely echoed the prelude figure in Marlowe's play, Moby Molloco shared its exotic Mediterranean setting. The Admiral's Men appear to have continued the

Doctor Faustus appears initially in Henslowe's Diary on 30 September 1594. The Admiral's Men soon introduced also The Wise Man of West Chester, which they played along with Doctor Faustus for the next eighteen months, scheduling them either consecutively or a day apart on five occasions.

My second point is that other companies also referenced Marlowe's plays in repertory items, also scheduling their offerings with an apparent knowledge of the Marlowe revivals. In making this point, I am hampered not only by the huge number of lost texts but also by the absence of
information on other companies’ repertories. Nonetheless, I draw a few inferences from what little data there is. Orthodox opinion already links the balcony scene in Marlowe’s _Jew_ with Shakespeare’s balcony scene in _Romeo and Juliet_, which the Chamberlain’s Men had on stage at the Theatre when the Admiral’s Men had the _Jew_ in production at the Rose in 1594. Also orthodox is the pairing of the _Jew_ at the Rose in the spring of 1596 with the Chamberlain’s _Merchant of Venice_ at the Theatre in the fall. Less familiar is the pairing of French political disorder in _The Massacre at Paris_ with plays about English civil war (War of the Roses). Strange’s Men began the association at the Rose, introducing Massacre into a repertory in 1592-93 that included _Henry VI_. The Chamberlain’s Men continue it, playing the _Henry VI_ plays in 1594-95. Derby’s Men join the echo-game with the two-part _Edward IV_ in 1599-1600; Worcester’s Men join with _Shore’s Wife_ in 1602-03. Some company owned the Tamburlaine clone, _The Tartarian Cripple_, in 1599 (I think it was the Chamberlain’s Men). Another “lost” play in the Chamberlain’s repertory, I think, was an item I call _The Labors of Hercules_, which would not only have advertised the sign of the Globe but also capitalized on the _Hercules_ and _Tamburlaine_ plays at the Rose and Fortune. In addition to the _Friar Bacon_ play owned and played by Queen’s Men from 1589, the clearest echoes of _Doctor Faustus_ in the repertory of another company are late ones: _The Merry Devil of Edmonton_, Chamberlain’s Men 1603, which seems to follow the revival of Marlowe’s play with additions by Bird and Rowley in November 1602; and Barnes’s _The Devil’s Charter_, Chamberlain’s Men 1607.

By considering the repertorial context of Marlowe’s reruns, I wish to make a point not only about Marlowe but also about commercial strategies of the Elizabethan repertorial system: namely, that the playing companies competed with one another by offering similar products and that Marlowe’s plays, being so often rerun, were a continuing influence on the kind and substance of new plays being acquired by their owners and their owner’s competitors.

STAGING DOCTOR FAUSTUS: THE A AND B TEXTS

An abstract of the paper presented by David M. Bevington, University of Chicago, at the 1997 MSA Session “Marlowe and Performance.”

The A- and B-texts of _Doctor Faustus_ (1604 and 1616), as Eric Rasmussen and I attempt to show in our 1993 Revels edition, differ substantially in that the A-text is set from an authorial manuscript composed of interleaved scenes by two dramatists (not a memorialistically constructed “bad” quarto as argued by Kirschbaum and Greg), whereas the B-text incorporates the revisions added at Philip Henslowe’s request by William Bird and Samuel Rowley in 1602. Theoretically, the two versions differ accordingly. When the two texts are essentially in common, the staging is alike, as when Faustus appears “in his study” at the start of the play and presumably comes forward after having been discovered by the Prologue. On the other hand, the B-text additions call for new staging techniques. Stage directions are more plentiful. They call for explicit use of the gallery or upper acting area, especially when Benvolio the Knight appears at a window and is horned by Faustus’s magic. In other scenes, the upper acting area may be employed as well, especially when Lucifer and other devils appear at the start of the play’s final scene (as they do not in the A-text). The B-text features a throne that descends in the play’s final moments to display before the terrified Faustus the joys of heaven that are eternally denied him.

Other vivid staging effects are characteristic of the B-text additions, suggesting that they were provided to meet audience demand for theatrical pyrotechnics. The physical dismemberment of Faustus becomes a major feature of the play’s ending, and, though the play text does not make clear how much of the verbal descriptions of dismemberment are to
be actually visualized, such an effect would have been quite possible with painted scenery and seems indicated by the B-text's increasing use of the Faustbook source. Earlier, we see the A-text's visual effects augmented or doubled. To match Faustus's losing his leg, for example, the B-text now comes up with a scene in which Faustus loses his head. In another scene, the learned doctor seems capable of making trees move onstage to baffle his victims.

In many ways, then, the B-text puts us in mind of that evocative story about a performance of Doctor Faustus when the actors suddenly looked around and realized that they had one more devil onstage than was called for in their script.

**NAVARRRE BEFORE AND AFTER:**
**THE MASSACRE AT PARIS**
**AND OATH-BREAKING.**

An abstract of the paper presented by Paul J. Voss, Georgia State University, at the 1997 MSA Session “Rabbits and Ducks: Dual Perspectives In Marlowe’s Poems and Plays.”

French King Henry of Navarre reconverted to Catholicism on 23 July 1593. Navarre’s conversion effectively ended the publication of news quartos advocating his Protestant cause to English readers. The abrupt halt to the reports, once so visible and replete with the very latest international news, silently registered the dismay of thousands. Navarre’s coronation some months later received only scant attention in the English press. Navarre’s apostasy, however, did not go unnoticed in England; nor was it quickly forgotten. Three of Elizabethan England’s finest writers, Christopher Marlowe, William Shakespeare, and Edmund Spenser, each fictionalized Navarre into their work—the only historical figure used by all three writers—providing a strong testament to the continuing intrigue of the erstwhile Huguenot. Marlowe’s treatment of the mercurial Navarre in The Massacre at Paris not only allows for, but insists upon, a manifest rabbit/duck perspective on the fictional Navarre.

Marlowe obviously completed The Massacre at Paris before his own death on 30 May 1593. At this time, Henry of Navarre continued to fight the Catholic League for control of France. During this period, Navarre’s reputation in England reach near-mythic dimensions as thousands of news quartos, ballads, poems, and prayers lionized the embattled king. Marlowe’s play, initially performed by the Lord Strange’s men at the Rose Theater in January 1593 (grossing 3 pounds 4 shillings, the highest take of the season and three times the average taking), also testifies to Navarre’s vast popularity. Navarre’s reconversion to Catholicism in July 1593, however, irrevocably changed his reputation in England and the very nature of the play with it.

Navarre emerges as the framing character, both literally and figuratively, for the entire play. His oaths, for example, begin and end the drama; he stands, moreover, as the lone survivor in a play of death. As a result of the historical Navarre’s reconversion, the ending of the Marlowe’s play, dramatizing the fictional Navarre’s final oath praising Queen Elizabeth while promising to destroy Catholicism, acquired a much different meaning: the ending of the play actually changed without changing. When spoken again in 1594, the oath, once acted by the heroic and admired Henry of Navarre in 1593, suddenly became a public staging of the now “broken oath” uttered by the inconstant and mutable Navarre. The actions of a recently discredited Navarre greatly altered the words and deeds of the fictional Navarre as well. As a result of the broken promise, the same play produced a much different reaction among the diverse audience, creating a profound and immediate rabbit-duck experience for Elizabethan playgoers.

**MANLINESS AND SEXUALITY IN**
**EDWARD II: TAKING A PERSPECTIVE ON**
**“HIS WANTON HUMOUR”**

An abstract of the paper presented by Robert A. Logan, University of Hartford, at the 1997 MSA Session “Rabbits
and Ducks: Dual Perspectives In Marlowe’s Poems and Plays.”

The consensus among contemporary critics and cultural historians is that, during the early modern period, however much same-sex activity took place, neither a concept of homosexuality nor the identity it characterizes existed. James I could write an unmistakably homoerotic letter to his favorite, Buckingham, and, without our postmodern sense of contradiction, also write to his son condemning “sodomy.” Perhaps the most developed early expressions of postmodern notions of homosexuality occur in the works of Christopher Marlowe, and, most extensively, in Edward II, which may be the first text to dramatize, as one historian-critic puts it, “the beginnings of a specifically homosexual subjectivity.” Yet the harder one looks at the playtext, the less clear the specific attributes of Edward’s homosexuality become.

Centering the discussion on Edward II, the essay begins by questioning some of the depoliticized psychological assumptions currently made about Marlowe’s depiction of the king’s homoeroticism. The answers provide evidence of how little we know but how much we assume about the issue of homosexuality dramatized in the play. The question the paper raises next is, “If we are limited in how far we can, with specificity, psychoanalyze and even characterize Edward’s homoerotic actions, can we, instead, see in late sixteenth-century England why their portrayal, for all their ambiguity, might be considered politically significant?” Specifically, given early modern definitions of manliness (as, for example, the one represented and also subverted by the figure of Tamburlaine), can we understand the portrayal of homoeroticism in Edward II, as well as that in Dido Queen of Carthage and in Hero and Leander, as serious attempts to undermine notions of conventional morality and political order and to undermine the forces of authority promoting these notions? Put differently, not only do these texts question the truth of what people are made to see but also the validity of the strategies by which they are made to see it.

In treating homoerotic feeling as an unremarkable, wholly natural expression of one’s personality and as a behavioral characteristic that cuts across social classes, Edward II, Dido Queen of Carthage, and Hero and Leander all raise questions about the validity of conventionally constructed sexual differences and gender roles. (In a different way, the Tamburlaine plays do the same.) In Marlowe’s works, the portrayal of homoerotic feeling, valorized as natural, is never an end in itself. Whether the results are comic or tragic, homoerotic behavior is characteristic of a psychology that chooses to disregard the firmly fixed, conventional ideology of manliness and, thereby, undermine the power of the controlling forces of orthodox thinking in late sixteenth-century England.

recent studies in marlowe


Charney, Maurice. “The Voice of Marlowe’s Tamburlaine in Early Shakespeare.” Comparative Drama 31.2 (Summer 1997): 213-23


**MARLOWE, HISTORY, AND SEXUALITY**


**NEW EDITION OF EVERYMAN MARLOWE**

MSA member Mark Thornton Burnett’s *The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe* will be published by Everyman in June 1998. Replacing the existing Everyman edition edited by E. D. Pendry and J. C. Maxwell, it features freshly edited texts of all of Marlowe’s plays, including both the 1604 and 1616 versions of *Doctor Faustus* as well as a full-length introduction, a chronology of Marlowe’s life, substantial notes, a detailed glossary, plot summaries, an essay on “Marlowe and the Critics,” and an annotated list of further reading. This paperback edition will be available in the US through Charles E. Tuttle, 28 South Main Street, Rutland, Vermont, 05701; and in Britain from Everyman Paperbacks, Orion House, 5 Upper Saint Martin’s Lane, London, WC2H 9EA.

**A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S DREAM**

Dorothea Kehler’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream: Critical Essays* (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1998) may be of interest to MSA members. *MSAN* is pleased to note that this anthology includes Robert Logan’s review of the Branagh production of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, which was first published in *MSAN* 10.2 (Fall 1990).

**PARERGON**

MSA member Christopher Wortham is the editor of *Parergon*, the journal of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies. He wishes to make it known to MSA members that *Parergon* is recognized as a refereed journal and that it would welcome contributions on Marlowe, *et al.* He notes that the journal now attracts a substantial number of articles from overseas. His address is Prof. Chris Wortham, English Department, University of Western Australia, Nedlands 6907, Western Australia; e-mail: cwortham@cyllene.uwa.edu.au