**Religio-political Imagery in Marlowe: Rome, Babel, and Islam**

Wednesday, 29 December, 10:15-11:30 a.m., Grand Ballroom Salon J, Philadelphia Mariott. Presiding: Roslyn L. Knutson, University of Arkansas, Little Rock.

1 “Vatican-on-Thames: Marlovian Romes and Their Dramatic Uses,” Brett C. Foster, Yale University.

2 “‘As Many Several Languages As I Have Conquered Kingdoms’: Tamburlaine 2 and the Babel Topos,” Per Sivefors, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden.


**Issues of Literacy and Narrative Strategy in Marlowe**

Thursday, 30 December, 12:00 noon-1:15 p.m., 309 Philadelphia Mariott. Presiding: Bruce E. Brandt, South Dakota State University.

1 “Meanwhile, Peruse This Book’: Marlowe, Literacy, and the Gutenberg Father,” Douglas A. Brooks, Texas A&M University, College Station.

2 “Profit and Delight’: Locations and Politics of Literacy in Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus,” Kathryn M. Giglio, Syracuse University.

3 “Desunt Nunnula: Same-Sex Intimacy and Narrative Outcomes in Hero and Leander,” James M. Bromley, Loyola University.

---

**CALL FOR PAPERS**

The Marlowe Society solicits papers for its December 2005 open-topic session at the MLA Convention in Washington, D.C. Send abstracts or papers of fifteen-minute length (e-mail attachment or hard copy) to Bruce Brandt, Marlowe Society of America, English Department Box 504, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD 57007-1397; bruce_brandt@sdstate.edu. Deadline: March 1, 2005.

---

**FROM THE EDITOR, MSAN**

This issue is the first to contain MSA Book Reviews, providing a forum for new and established scholars to express their views on recently published scholarship. Duke Pesta at Oklahoma State University continues as Book Review Editor, and contact information remains unchanged. (See p. 2.)

**MSAN** continues to publish at the University of Alberta, Canada, with me, Rick Bowers, as Editor. Wherever you see Marlowe happening, do let the society know. **MSAN** provides a forum for reviews of films or theatrical productions of Marlovian drama as well as other brief articles and notes of interest to Marlovians. My contact information also remains unchanged. (See address and deadlines p. 2.) Inquiries are always welcome:

rick.bowers@ualberta.ca

Meantime, I look forward to combining efforts with Duke and welcoming:

**MSA BOOK REVIEWS**

Edited by Duke Pesta
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LUCAN, LUCRECE, AND THE COUNTER EPIC OF EMPIRE: THE AFTERLIFE OF MARLOWE’S REPUBLICAN AUTHORSHIP
by
Patrick Cheney
Penn State University

Patrick Cheney

Critics have long paired Venus and Adonis with Hero and Leander, without recognizing that Marlowe predates Shakespeare in penning a second narrative poem: Lucan's First Book. Just as we may read Venus with Hero, so we may read Lucrece with Lucan.

While Lucan may seem to have little in common with Lucrece, they share a specific Elizabethan context: young authors of the same sex and generation, born in the same year and of the same middle-class environment, compose mid-length narrative poems on Roman political topics, at the same time (1592-93) and under the same cultural circumstances of the closing of
the theaters due to plague. Above all, both Lucrece and Lucan represent a Roman political narrative divided across the government line separating monarchy and republic. Whereas Marlowe follows Lucan in using the Civil War of Pompey and Caesar to represent the death of the Republic, Shakespeare uses his principal source texts, Ovid and Livy, to show how sexual strife between Tarquin and Lucrece represents the birth of the original Republic. Consequently, we may wish to re-classify Shakespeare’s work not simply as a second narrative poem but as a specific version of the Elizabethan genre Marlowe had invented: a Lucanian counter-epic of empire, opposing the primary Virgilian epic of Elizabethan empire, Spenser’s Faerie Queene.

I will support this argument by looking at specific intertextual moments linking Lucan and Lucrece. For instance, the two poems represent a gender dynamic within a nationalist context. In the two works, of course, this dynamic does differ, but that in itself seems important. Perhaps tellingly, Marlowe narrates a competition between two men while Shakespeare narrates a competition between a man and a woman. Eros lies at the center of Lucrece in a way that it does not of Lucan. And yet, Marlowe’s military poem foregrounds a female icon, both at the beginning and at the end: at the beginning, Julia, perhaps Marlowe’s most neglected representation, and at the end the Bacchic Roman matron.

While Lucan does not refer to Lucrece, he supplies potential origins to some of Shakespeare’s most memorable moments. Shakespeare’s military metaphors, singled out by critics, are consonant with Lucan’s military battle. Yet it is Shakespeare’s photography of the “crimson blood” “bubbling” from Lucrece’s “breast” that looks Lucanian in all its macabre detail, betraying a shared fascination with violence to the body’s deep interior—a fascination Lucan no doubt inherited from his uncle but one for which even Seneca could find no match.

Finally we may need to situate the rivalry between Lucan and Lucrece within a larger nationalist context, one in which authors at this time were competing to compose the nation’s foundational myth. In The Faerie Queene, Spenser had followed tradition in locating this myth in the monarchical legend of Brute who, like Aeneas, escaped Troy to found a new nation: not Rome but Troyovant, London itself. In Lucan’s First Book, Marlowe had countered Spenser’s imperial myth with that of the Roman Civil War between Caesar and Pompey, the very event that killed the Republic and turned it into the Empire. Shakespeare in The Rape of Lucrece selects an alternative myth for the foundation of the nation: that of another Brutus—Lucius Junius Brutus—who gives birth to the Republic itself.

Unlike Andrew Hadfield, however (in his forthcoming book Shakespeare and Renaissance Political Culture), I do not argue that either Marlowe or Shakespeare is a “republican writer” but instead concentrate on the literary principle of republican representation: the author’s representation of a republican frame of art within its monarchical context. Shakespeare’s poem, like Marlowe’s, does not clearly engage government so much as the representational terms for national art. His real project is not to dislodge Elizabeth but her national poet—or more accurately, Spenser’s falsifying foundational myth. In doing so, he fulfills the goals of Marlowe’s original work.
only the different groups represented in the play, but also those involved in the production and enjoyment of the drama itself, since the public theatre of Marlowe’s day was a space in which new forms of fellowship, of social, sexual, and economic fraternization, were emerging with striking vitality and punch, and on ground cleared both physically and symbolically by the Reformed Church.

“THE RUINE OF THE MULTITUDE”: MARLOWE AND RADICAL POLITICAL THOUGHT
by
Graham Hammill
University of Notre Dame

Julia Reinhard Lupton

*The Jew of Malta* stages different forms of fellowship—of social, religious, and economic association—that match and rematch the different characters of the play in tendentious and fragile alliances. The word “fellowship,” prominent in the New Testament and borrowed from the language of Greek social life, evokes forms of social affiliation that occur outside of or in dialogue with more official modes of civic participation such as citizenship. In a play so dominated by the survivalist egoism of its central character, the focus on fellowship may seem counter-intuitive—unless, that is, we think about social relations in terms of the liquid play of self-interests in tandem with the strange attractors of religious identity. By looking at intersecting circles of fellowship in the play, we may avoid simple oppositions between Self and Other in favor of a template of multiple memberships and shifting allegiances in a public sphere characterized by ethnic, religious, and economic fragmentation and by a complex layering of legal, political, and social institutions. These circles expand to include not

Graham Hammill

Although critics have argued that a number of Elizabethan poets and dramatists were engaged with contemporary political thought, Marlowe is only just now emerging as an important figure in these discussions. Marlowe was the first poet to translate into English Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, which David Norbrook calls the central poem of the republican imagination. Exploring Marlowe’s uses of Lucan throughout his plays,
Patrick Cheney has very recently worked to situate Marlowe as central poet in the development of an English republican imaginary. In ways that are complementary to Cheney’s project, I shall explore Marlowe’s engagement with absolutist versions of Machiavellian political thought. I do not mean to suggest that Marlowe was sympathetic with the concepts of absolutism that late sixteenth century Counter-Reformation readers of Machiavelli developed. Rather, I hope to show that Marlowe engaged Counter-Reformation absolutism to turn it against more aristocratic versions of republicanism (the sort that interested both Sidney and Spenser). David Riggs has shown the intellectual and social conditions that produced Marlowe as an oppositional figure. By exploring Marlowe’s engagement with political thought, I hope to flesh out some of the terms of that opposition.

My presentation focuses on Marlowe’s use of the word “multitude,” which occurs six times in the first act of The Jew of Malta. Since “multitude” is not a common word that runs throughout Marlowe’s works, its repetition deserves some critical attention. I shall argue that with this repetition Marlowe is engaging with a central problem of late sixteenth century Machiavellian political thought—the state’s relations to wealth and to the populace. Machiavelli tends to think of “the people” as an unstable collective that therefore must be ruled by force. Since men are “ungrateful, fickle, liars, and deceivers” who never keep their word, the prince must commit acts of extreme cruelty in order to produce a “bond of gratitude” out of fear. That is, the prince must impose qualities that inhere in each individual—ingratitude, unpredictability, deception, and so forth—as if from the outside in order to keep those qualities from destroying civic bonds.

Later, Counter-Reformation political thinkers recast the relation in terms of production. In his widely read treatise Ragion di Stato, Botero considered the people to be a “population,” a collective inextricably bound to absolute sovereignty because of the prince’s investment in “things necessary for life.”

Working explicitly from The Prince, Botero argues that “a prince . . . must introduce every kind of industry and craft by attracting good workmen from other countries and providing them with accommodations and everything convenient for their craft, by encouraging new techniques and singular and rare works, and rewarding perfection and excellence” because “nothing is of greater importance for increasing the power of a state . . . than the industry of its people and the crafts they exercise.”

In his uses of “multitude,” Marlowe splits the people into those ruled by the state and those (Jews) not under state control, and he—in terms that are quite specific to Counter-Reformation political thought—goes on to explore the complex relations that result between this wealthy multitude outside state control and the state that attempts to control it. The result is a form of political thought that tries to imagine collective being outside the paradigm of aristocratic republicanism and the absolutist state. For this reason, I hope to suggest, Marlowe belongs to a counter-tradition of radical early modern political thought that runs from Machiavelli to Spinoza.

THE ADVENTURES OF PERICLES


Two words spring to mind when assessing the Stratford Shakespeare Festival presentation of Pericles: strange and fantastic. The program notes begin with Pericles’ line, “What world is this? Is it not strange?” and the play connotes
“strange” in several forms. First is the puzzle of authorship that pervades any discussion of this play. Many critics suspect that either Shakespeare is not the author of Pericles or that he had a collaborator—willingly or no—leading us to question the play’s uncertain place in the Shakespeare canon. Next are the exotic locales (six in all) in which Shakespeare sets his romance and that inspire Pericles’ question given above. This production exploits both the dramatic and spectacular possibilities inherent in these locations to produce the maximum theatrical effect. Also, this play abounds in the bizarre, hardly believable coincidences, campily emphasized in this production, on which the late romances are constructed, imbuing Pericles with a wondrously strange quality.

This element of wonder leads to the next descriptor: fantastic. The production embraces the fantasy or fairy tale elements of the play, delighting the audience with broad hints of the Snow White and Cinderella legends. The production also rates “fantastic” marks for its lavish sets and costumes and for its talented cast and director. The production played to packed houses and rave reviews (in the local press), both well deserved.

Director Leon Rubin delineates each of the six eastern locales with distinct societal and cultural attributes, enhanced by appropriate dance, music, costumes, and sets. The elaborate staging not only differentiates among the various scenes and provides the spectacle so loved by early modern and contemporary audiences alike, but also emphasizes Shakespeare’s creation of an extreme form of human behavior (the best and the worst) found in each location. This convoluted tale has its hero visit some locales more than once during his adventures, and these visual and auditory demarcations aid the audience in following the story and adapting to the brisk pace that Rubin has set for the production.

Following Shakespeare’s text, the play opens in Tyre, staged with the trappings of ancient Greece and featuring an ideal form of governance. This section highlights the doctrine of obedience and introduces the ideal courtier, Helicanus, who reluctantly assumes power as Pericles goes in search of a suitable mate. The mood turns festive in Antioch, where an Arabian Nights theme displays handsome turbaned knights and sensuous belly dancers. However, this glamorous set and a beguiling riddle (that wins the hand of the King’s daughter) hide a dark secret: incest between King Antiochus and his willing Daughter. To escape the wrath that accompanies the solving of the incriminating riddle, Pericles next travels to Tharsus, set in a Middle Eastern venue, where he finds starvation, literally and figuratively. A famine has destroyed the crops and economy of the land, which Pericles miraculously relieves with supplies from his ship. The Governor Cleon later ironically repays Pericles’ generosity by watching helplessly as his wife Dionyza in a subsequent scene, plots the murder of Pericles’ daughter Marina because of her jealousy of Marina’s beauty and virtue. Leaving Tharsus (for the first time), Pericles, soon shipwrecked, lands in Pentapolis, presented in all the splendor of a Japanese imperial court, replete with gorgeous kimonos, fans, and an exquisite Thaisa, in the form of the Oriental actor, Karen Ancheta. Here the benevolence of the just king Simonides, whose beautiful court setting underscores the beauty of his noble life, restores the fortunes of Pericles by rewarding him with his daughter in marriage, but not before the smitten pair undergo a love trial at the hand of the King to test their affectionate bond. Soon peril ensues again as the storm-tossed Pericles loses his wife in childbirth and must surrender her supposedly dead body to the sea to appease the superstitions of the ship’s crew. Miraculously, Thaisa’s coffin washes up on the shore at Ephesus, depicted as Siam (modern-day Thailand) with its elaborate head dresses, costumes and dancing, where Cerimon employs the mystic healing powers associated with the East to raise the lovely Thaisa from the dead. Finally, the scene shifts to Mytilene, depicted as a polyglot of middle and far eastern (Arabian, Japanese, Indian, and Turkish) sets and costumes. All of the strange and fantastic elements of the foreign lands coalesce in this
scene. This appropriate landscape delights with adventures occurring within a comically inspired brothel where the enslaved Marina is held captive but where her strength and virtue make converts of her captors and would-be clients. Here, father and daughter are reunited and, guided by the goddess of chastity Diana, eventually discover the now-priestess Thaisa in a scene of rebirth and renewal that will foreshadow similar scenes in Shakespeare’s three later romances. Perhaps the only jarring effect of those eastern settings comes when their appropriately dressed inhabitants invoke the names, and in one instance the personage, of the Greek gods. But these minor inconsistencies are easily forgiven as one enjoys the spectacle, miracles, and wonders of the East.

Into this roller-coaster tale of near tragic and bittersweet miraculous proportions, Shakespeare weaves the opportunity for highly comic moments, which this production dramatizes with fantastic results. Most memorable is the brothel scene during which the Bawd assesses the virtues of particular women in the audience and then solicits them for professional activity. The Bawd then recruits male audience members to serve as customers. This unexpected interaction of performer with audience leaves no spectator safe in his or her seat, and the shock yields highly comic results. Another break in the barrier between stage and seat comes when Pericles, upon discovering that his lost wife Thaisa is alive, shares this amazing moment with his appreciative audience as he turns to the spectators with a dumb-struck expression that keeps this remarkable scene from being—I’ll say it—too corny.

One of the more intriguing treatments in this production is that of the narrator/choral figure, John Gower, who guides us through Pericles’ tangled adventures. In the Stratford production, this central character appears more spirit-like than the great medieval poet that Gower actually was. He wears no costume or carries no prop that could identify him with a specific time or place, but rather performs painted white with a bald head and nondescript loin cloth. Thus, the god-like spirit stands above time and place to relate much of the play’s action with central scenes presented as dumb shows and with puppets manipulated by Gower. Thom Marriott’s stellar performance is essential to Rubin’s interpretive link between Gower and Diana, goddess of chastity, who appears to instruct Pericles to go to Ephesus where he completes the romance by finding Thaisa alive, having lived as a priestess for fourteen years. Gower, as an empowered narrator who guides much of our interpretation of the play, and Dianna, as deus ex machina, are linked by their entrances and exits to the stage. Both the narrator-poet, who celebrates the power of words, and the Goddess, who celebrates the power of the spirit, invert the traditional staging by not being lowered and raised from above, but rather by ascending out of and descending into a trap door surrounded by mist. This strong visual connection elevates the poet, with his ability to create worlds, to the level of the gods, who, in like manner, have power to control or direct the lives of mortals, a linkage of which Shakespeare would approve.

This exceptionally strong, large cast (29 named characters) imbues the production with an infectious zest for the play, which relies upon spectacle and verve to compensate for the lack of rhetorical power found in Hamlet and King Lear. Worthy of particular praise is Nazneen Contractor, the young actor who undertakes the difficult role of Marina. During a relatively brief stage appearance, this character must exude a purity and virtue that converts her captors to her vision of chastity. Contractor’s rendition may become a standard for the role. Equally strong performances by Jonathan Goad (Pericles) and Thom Marriott (Gower) make this a memorable cast who was rewarded with a standing ovation from an audience who had been transformed into the strange and fantastic world of Pericles.

Lagretta Tallent Lenker
University of South Florida

The central claim of Mary Beth Rose's *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature* is both simple and startling: over the course of the seventeenth century in England, a heroics of action, which has historically been associated with—and indeed defined—masculinity, was replaced by a feminine heroics of endurance, one whose lineaments become apparent later in the emergence of the novel. An original scholarly contribution to both feminist and early modern studies, *Gender and Heroism* revisits the conclusions drawn from the historical analysis of the seventeenth century as the period during which the gradual hardening of the distinction between the public and private “spheres” occurs. Without contesting this historical trend that saw the confinement of women to the domestic arena, Rose argues that the private sphere was not simply a devalued social space but an increasingly privileged “arena for human heroism” in England’s cultural imaginary. Rose demonstrates the turn toward both a feminine heroics of suffering and female heroism in her chapters on Queen Elizabeth and seventeenth-century women’s autobiography. But the decreasing cultural value placed on heroic (military) action is also apparent in the period’s literary representations of male heroes, as Rose illustrates in her first chapter, on early modern drama, and in her last, on Milton, Behn, and Mary Astell.

Her treatment of Marlowe, Jonson, and Shakespeare contrasts the “unmitigated masculinism” (2) of the first two playwrights with Shakespeare’s critique of aristocratic male heroism as “criminal violence” in *Macbeth* (25). Paradoxically, Rose reads Tamburlaine, Dr. Faustus, and Volpone as inhabiting “female positions” in the performance of male heroic identity and thus as endeavoring to “monopolize all subject positions, which are, inevitably, gendered” (7). Tamburlaine, for instance, does not only objectify Zenocrate in consolidating his heroic identity but is actually at his most awesome when constructed as an aesthetic object himself (5). While this point about Tamburlaine-as-object is hardly new, by presenting it in relation to the transformation of heroism, Rose sheds fresh light on Marlowe’s play. Drawing on Christopher Pye’s study of the politics of spectacle, which theorizes the dependence of the sovereign on his or her subjects’ gaze, Rose notes that Tamburlaine mourns not his own departure from the world but his subjects’ loss of him as their treasured object of desire (“Your sweet desires deprived [of] my company”) (7). In addition, his invocation of the golden showers of Danaë at the very moment that he aims to demonstrate his invulnerability to Theridamas enables Tamburlaine to “present himself as the god’s charmed darling in the figure of a raped woman” (10). Faustus too enacts this oscillation between the active and passive, as his identification with Paris gives way to a figural conflation with the beloved and victim Helen, among other female mythic figures (Semele, Arethusa) (13). In Rose’s reading of *Volpone*, which depicts heroism comically as “a solipsistic process” and the hero, Volpone, as “a grotesque parody of the beloved mistress in a Petrarchan sonnet” (16, 17), she argues that Jonson’s pessimism about heroism matches Marlowe’s. In contrast, unlike any of these male heroes who “appropriate female subjectivity,” Macbeth achieves heroic identity “by seeking to eliminate any association whatsoever with the female, to escape entirely the condition of being ‘born of woman’” (22).

In Chapter Two, Rose contributes to scholarly interpretations of Elizabeth the idea that while the Queen privileges male subjectivity to a certain extent (as numerous critics have discussed), she also deploys a specifically female rhetoric of authority in her speeches (as critics have also discussed, though in slightly different terms). Adapting Constance
Jordan and Maureen Quilligan’s argument that recourse to lived experience constitutes an explicitly female claim to authority, Rose shows that Elizabeth enacts an “heroics of survival” by “invoking the unique facts of her personal biography,” particularly in her later speeches (40). In Chapter Three, Rose develops this analysis in her treatment of four seventeenth-century Royalist women writers, Margaret Cavendish, and the less-canonical Anne Halkett, Ann Fanshawe, and Alice Thornton, each of whom depict themselves as full heroes in their own domestic worlds. Rose’s readings in this chapter sometimes have the feel of being pressed into service for an argument which they may not always support. Cavendish, for instance, as Rose herself demonstrates, deploys a masculine rhetoric of heroism through her style of “urgent self-assertion” that seems to clearly overwhelm any rhetoric of self-denial, rather than to be in conflict with her self-denial, as Rose claims. The book’s larger point, however, that the seventeenth century witnesses a relocation of heroism to the private arena is largely borne out in this chapter and in her last. Assuming as background Milton’s transfiguration of epic heroism in Paradise Lost, its celebration of Protestant companionate marriage, Rose persuasively posits the feminized heroes of Samson Agonistes and Behn’s Oroonoko as evidence that the heroics of action has become ineffectual and outdated by the second half of the century.

Rather than celebrate the new heroics of endurance, however, these texts depict it as at best “ambivalent and compromised” (111). Rose thus aims to avoid glorifying this historical shift toward the feminine, recognizing the frequency with which both heroic models “issue in violence” (116). And yet, for all of its elegant close readings and important historical work on gender and women’s writing, Gender and Heroism is limited in moments by a feminist politics that subtly reinscribes the male/female binarism it aims to trouble. The book’s central argument about the transformation of heroism, after all, relies on the ostensible fact of an originary, unadulterated masculinity and male heroism that seems more likely to always already have been only a phantasmatic structure. (Even Aeneas, archetype of the epic hero, is contrasted in Virgil to the hyper-masculine Turnus.) This study begins with a treatment of Marlovian ambiguity that is curious in light of Rose’s hypostatization of masculinity. Yet this choice of a starting point also suggests, however implicitly, an analysis of gender that is farther reaching than that which this book so eloquently substantiates.

Hilary Binda
The Evergreen State College


The fourteen essays that comprise Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture offer detailed re-readings of Marlowe’s dramatic and poetic works that foreground the complexity of the cultural contexts within which those texts developed. Selected from contributions to a 1993 conference at the University of Canterbury in Kent, the essays testify to the “turbulence and contradictions” (vii) that characterized Renaissance politics, religion, trade, theatre, and sexuality, probing and problematizing the ways in which Marlowe’s works emerge from and respond to such contexts. The breadth of topics that editors Darryll Grantley and Peter Roberts include in the collection is impressive. The essays range from analyses of Marlowe’s childhood and his political and theatrical connections to explorations of sexual ambivalence, atheism, and the “subversive representation of political and theocratic power” (ix) in his plays. Indeed, the primary strength of the volume lies in the sheer scope of its approach.

The collection begins with Andrew Butcher’s and Peter Roberts’ intriguing analyses of Marlowe’s formative years. Butcher focuses on
the Marlowe family’s “process of social and economic integration and [. . .] social mobility” (5) that characterized their experience as immigrants. Coupled with the rapid religious changes in Canterbury between 1550 and 1580, this constant “social negotiation” (9) became a feature of Marlowe’s dramatic writing. Similarly emphasizing Marlowe’s upbringing, Roberts focuses on Marlowe’s student days at Canterbury and Cambridge, examining Marlowe’s varied exposure to drama and positing that his Cambridge political connections likely prompted his involvement in espionage.

Charles Nicholl’s examination of Marlowe’s 1592 journey to the Low Countries provides a fascinating glimpse into the activities surrounding that intelligence work. Evaluating the printing of the undated first edition of Marlowe’s Elegies, Nicholl posits that the Middelburg imprint on the title page is genuine, rather than a “decoy [. . .] designed to conceal [. . .] an unlicensed printing, in England, of poems considered too salacious” (41). Nicholl unfortunately does not include bibliographical evidence that would lend vital weight to his argument. However, his conjectures convincingly link Marlowe with the “conspiratorial circles” (48) that surrounded Lord Strange and with agents “trying to crack the Catholic book-smuggling routes” (47) to England.

Three of the volume’s most innovative essays foreground Marlowe’s reliance on early modern discourses of trade, expansion, and geography. Nick de Somogyi compellingly argues that Marlowe’s plays exhibit the early modern “vogue for cartography” (96). Maintaining that “geographic methods and commodities proved essential in waging sixteenth-century war, while war sponsored the advances in surveyance-techniques that revolutionized the period” (98), de Somogyi offers a lucid analysis of Marlowe’s “linguistic topography of war” (107) in Tamburlaine. Thomas Cartelli’s “Marlowe and the New World” builds on these tropes of geographic conquest by examining the references to the New World in Tamburlaine and, to a lesser extent, The Jew of Malta. Cartelli contends that Marlowe associates the New World with “the fantasy of effortless acquisition” (110) exemplified by Spain. While Cartelli somewhat exaggerates Marlowe’s “unqualified approval” (115) of Tamburlaine’s military advances, his argument judiciously identifies the “imperial resolve” (116) shared by Marlowe’s contemporaries. Finally, Richard Wilson traces the influence of Russian trade on Tamburlaine. Tamburlaine himself stands as a version of Ivan the Terrible, governing a world in which “raiding and trading were modes of the same enterprise” (58).

Like Wilson, David Potter and Lawrence Normand explore the relationships between Marlowe’s dramatic characters and contemporaneous political figures. Despite a weak introduction, Potter’s essay helpfully outlines Marlowe’s ambiguous characterization of Henri III, an ambiguity that accurately reflects public accounts of Henri’s pietism, religious hypocrisy, sexual deviance, and involvement in the occult. Normand, on the other hand, examines the likely influence of James VI’s relationship with the Duke of Lennox on Marlowe’s portrayal of Edward II and Gaveston. Normand’s analysis is particularly valuable for its nuanced treatment of the varied meanings of early modern same-sex eroticism that emerge in his reading of Edward II.

Exemplified by Nicholas Davidson’s reading of Marlowe’s atheism in the light of pre-Enlightenment anti-Christian tenets and Gareth Roberts’ investigation of the impact of Agrippa’s occult philosophy on Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus, a significant number of essays in the collection foreground the subversive discourses that infuse Marlowe’s plays. Michael Hattaway, Roger Sales, and Darryll Grantley, for example, each explore the relationship between subversion, orthodoxy, and the theatre. Michael Hattaway fuses “the themes of theatricality and absolutism, ‘theatocracy’” (201), in order to assess the extent to which Marlowe’s protagonists resist established authority. Hattaway differentiates between dissidents, “those who reject a whole political or theological order,” and delinquents, “those who violate its codes” but who “have probably internalized [those] codes” (209). He persuasively concludes that Marlowe’s texts reveal “dissident ideologies” while his protagonists
“constitute a gallery of delinquents” (212). Sales and Grantley, in contrast, point to the ironic function of orthodox ceremony. Examining the “links between the drama of the stage and the drama of the scaffold,” Sales maintains that Elizabethan public punishments and executions “choreograph power,” yet always risk “disrupting [. . .] the royal monopoly of violence” (119). Grantley likewise argues that when “orthodoxy is embraced and even celebrated, [it] ultimately becomes a subversive strategy” (224). He highlights the theatricality that pervades The Jew of Malta and Doctor Faustus. In both plays, Grantley argues, “power is [. . .] articulated through theatre as a way of ordering and regulating perception, and is exposed as such” (234). In the final essay of the collection, Alexander Shurbanov underscores Marlowe’s reliance on such ironies in structuring his dramatic texts.

Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture stands as an innovative contribution to Marlovian studies, not only emphasizing the importance of cultural context for accurate readings of Marlowe’s texts but foregrounding the breadth of those contexts and the contradictions and complexities that often pervade them. Although the volume is weakened by a disconcerting number of typographical errors, an inconsistent quality of writing, and a surprising absence of female scholars, Christopher Marlowe and English Renaissance Culture provides compelling re-readings of Marlowe’s works grounded in careful analyses of Renaissance culture.

Katherine R. Larson
University of Toronto


The editors of this volume divide the book into four sections: “Gendered Bodies,” “Occupational Bodies,” “Mystical Bodies,” and “Bodily Otherness.” Each broad category contains essays that attempt to add “new dimensions to fantasies, rituals and regulations in marriages (‘fictions’) of the body as the identification of forms of knowledge unique to the early modern period” (2).

The first section, “Gendered Bodies,” provides different perspectives on how somatic and semiotic views of the body conflate. The second essay in this section, Doris Feldmann’s “Gendered Bodies in Marlowe’s Plays,” examines the ways that select Marlovian plays disassemble constructs of masculinity and femininity. Feldman argues that Marlowe’s characters gender their bodies to signify their positions in the hierarchic context of the plays at large. Male characters define their “manliness” by trying to “fix” their bodies into gendered symbols of power and authority. Tamburlaine, for example, achieves his authority (and thus, his masculinity) by using his sword/phallus to “express the construct of masculinity of male authorship, a construct modeled on the self-contained phallus as the determining signifier” (26). This reliance on symbolic association eliminates any true substantial meaning to masculinity and femininity, as the “heterogeneous process of interpretation” that forces gender upon a body necessarily creates a “crisis of referentiality and authority” (29). Feldmann contends that Edward II provides the best example of problematic gendering, citing the play’s androgynous characters and sexual role-reversals as evidence of this phenomenon. The body’s dependence on social or ideological constructs to determine its gender forces the body (especially the female body because of its precarious fluid nature) to transcend any semiotic constructs of classification, thereby allowing it to serve as “the vanishing point of legibility and authority” (6). Furthermore, Feldmann astutely observes that because texts themselves are constructs generated by editorial conventions and patriarchal critics, we
must perceive Marlowe’s body of works as itself
gendered. In the last essay in the “Gendered Bodies” section, “O Hamlet, thou hast cleft my heart in twain’: Violence and the Mother’s Body,” Felicity Dunworth argues that the maternal body emblematizes violence while being “simultaneously inscribed as predatory and victim” (6). As Dunworth notes, representations of the mother’s body on stage have “always tended to be associated with narratives that also depicted violence” (51); this association incites a “pity and pleasure” that reached its greatest development in late sixteenth-century revenge plays (53). Dunworth focuses on William Alabaster’s adaptation of Grotto’s La Dalida (the Latin play Roxana), Kyd’s The Spanish Tragedy, Shakespeare’s Titus Andronicus, and Marlowe’s two Tamburlaine plays. She notes that despite the carnage in both Tamburlaine plays, Zenocrate has a remarkably non-violent role. The contrast made in Part I between the serene, chaste Zenocrate and the volatile, sexual Zabina reflects the two different roles maternity has in maintaining patriarchic authority. The emphasis placed on Zabina’s successful mothering of children as warlike as their father makes her “the emblem of the established, apparently unassailable, political structures that the upstart Tamburlaine repeatedly challenges” (60). Tamburlaine praises Zenocrate for her pale, pure beauty, honoring her potential for a motherhood that will successfully continue his patriarchic line. While Zabina’s mad speech and subsequent suicide “operate to dismantle the concept of successful maternity and queenliness” earlier established by Bajazeth’s laudatory verses (61), Zenocrate’s failure to produce “manly” children in Part II undermines Tamburlaine’s premature celebration of her motherly virtues. These feminine male offspring function as “an ironic reconsideration” of Tamburlaine’s achievements, “so spectacular and yet ultimately so precarious” (62). Tamburlaine’s children upset his plans for dynastic conquest, thereby illustrating the mother’s ultimate authority over patriarchy. Maternity thus proves simultaneously “essential for the continuation of the patriarchal line” and “its greatest liability” (63). The mother’s body serves as both the “signifier” of violence and, in its own self-destructive suffering, its “emblem” (63).

Other essays in this volume examine a wide range of ways in which bodies impact/are impacted by their social, political, and ideological surroundings. The authors draw upon various post-modern critical approaches, some more successfully than others. The index is quite thorough, especially in regards to texts and proper names. The two essays that discuss Marlowe’s works are rooted in sound scholarship. Feldmann and Dunworth examine the text with keen critical eyes, and both remain aware of the sundry pitfalls in analysis and interpretation. Their work has the potential to provoke compelling future research about gender roles in the Marlovian corpus.

Genevieve Romeo
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill


The principles of copyright, fair use, and intellectual property, as delineated by the international Berne Convention of 1886 have been violated in recent years by the digital revolution. Joseph Loewenstein suggests that modern society’s concept of property is formed by the simultaneous consideration of several issues: legal, economic, political, and social. As the book’s title suggests, it is the prehistory of copyright, particularly in Early Modern England, that interests Loewenstein. Moreover, as society’s definition of property evolved, its views on copyright evolved along similar lines. However, this is not a book about the history of copyright. Loewenstein claims he is concerned with “what kind of thing the creative effort brought forth, who controlled it, who deserved credit for it” (40). The claim must be made earlier, for one is left to negotiate the first forty pages without the benefit of a sufficiently narrow focus. In fact, Loewenstein devotes little space to pursuing the question of what the creative effort
brings forth, but he does spend much time meditating on “who controlled it” (40).

The chapters do not proceed chronologically. “The Reformation of the Press: Patent, Copyright, Piracy” explores the charges of sedition surrounding John Wolfe’s 1599 publication of John Hayward’s Life and Raigne of King Henry VIII. “Monopolies Commercial and Doctrinal” covers the time period from the 1530s to 1710, and deals largely with licenses granted to publishers, the printers guild, and the Statute of Ann. Subsequent chapters examine Ben Jonson’s attempts to establish a “continuing and inexhaustible property” (93), and “The Author as Publisher,” which is a subsection of “Monopolies Commercial and Doctrinal,” which traces the history of patent laws from the late sixteenth to early seventeenth century.

In “Personality and Print,” Loewenstein suggests that posthumously expressed authorial will is not possible unless writing is property (184). Here written material is both an extension of the self and a child, which amounts to a rather skillful narrative shift from historical fact to historical, if not literary metaphor. Loewenstein refers to the analysis as a “figurative extension” (184). Edmund Spenser’s “Goe little booke, thy selfe present / As child whose parent is unkent,” (185) redefines printed material as “a body part” (185). Presumably, the author should have the same legal rights over his text as he does over his own physical appendages. In John Keats’ “Look, I hold it toward you,” the text becomes a child of a persona (185). It should also be noted that Keats is conspicuously absent from the notes and index, which are otherwise well done.

But what is one to make of the references to books as though they are body parts and children? Indeed, readers may be troubled here by the fact that Loewenstein’s analyses and metaphors stop just short of making any firm claims and connections, for the investigation concludes by paraphrasing, very loosely, a passage from John Milton’s Areopagitica: according to Loewenstein, books are “[n]ot quite property and, similarly, not quite children” (185). Taken strictly at face value, it would be difficult to know what to do with such a claim. However, Loewenstein shrewdly avoids the potential problem by making it clear that his larger argument remains at stake: the printed text and its copyright is an extension of the self that perpetually exists in freeplay between what the author can lay claim to; public domain material that no one (or anyone) might lay claim to; and a sentient extension of the self. Hence, “[n]ot quite property and, similarly, not quite children” (185).

The single reference to Marlowe is his “rendering of the last lines of the first book of Ovid’s Amores. Jonson here does homage to Marlowe’s homage to Ovid’s conjoined figure of literary reputation as perdurable and of one’s writing as a soul that survives the mortal body” (173). Loewenstein effectively demonstrates his vast knowledge of English law, literature, and history in general as well as the history of printing, copyright, and patents. Yet, it is interesting to note the concern he frames early on: “I wonder if it's not the case that the longer the book, the more unfinished it feels. It becomes a report on continuing meditations and, best, ongoing conversations” (x). Even though his narrative tends to muse over possibilities there is little doubt that his argument is fresh and will give rise to new and ongoing conversations.

John Richard Stevens
Oklahoma State University
ROMA GILL PRIZE

The Marlowe Society of America is pleased to announce co-winners of the Roma Gill Prize, awarded for the best critical study of Marlowe published in 2002: Constance Brown Kuriyama’s Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life (see description below under “Recent Studies”), and Ruth Lunney’s Marlowe and The Popular Tradition: Innovation in the English Drama before 1595 (see description under “Recent Studies” in last issue). Both studies significantly illuminate Marlowe’s life and work within the social and dramaturgical complexities of Elizabethan England.

DOCTOR FAUSTUS IN CHICHESTER

This year’s Chichester Festival in Sussex, England, includes a production of Doctor Faustus. Running September 8 to 25, 2004, this production combines the Festival Ensemble, the Youth Theatre, and the local community in a promenade performance that will begin at the Minerva Theatre, move through the streets of Chichester, and finish in Chichester Cathedral. The show is directed by Martin Duncan, Edward Kemp, Steven Pimlott, and Dale Rooks. Performers include Steven Beard, Michael Feast, Vicki McManus, and Samuel West. Box Office phone: 01243 781312
RECENT STUDIES IN MARLOWE


Greenfield, Matthew. “Christopher Marlowe’s Wound Knowledge.” PMLA 119 (March 2004): 233-246. [An earlier version of this article was presented at the MSA panel in New York, December 2002, organized by Duke Pesta and chaired by Robert A. Logan.]


Kuriyama, Constance Brown. Christopher Marlowe: A Renaissance Life. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002. [This biography balances objective documentary data with realistic interpretation. Documents relating to Marlowe’s life are all freshly transcribed and translated, with some items published for the first time. Kuriyama reconstructs a de-romanticized but ultimately more complex Marlowe than the sensational figure that often haunts the popular imagination.]

Rozett, Martha Tuck. Constructing a World: Shakespeare’s England and the New Historical Fiction. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003. [This book studies the way that figures such as Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Queen Elizabeth I have been depicted by such writers as Anthony Burgess, George Garrett, Patricia Finney, and Rosalind Miles.]
