



Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. XI, No. 2, Fall 1991

MSA ANNUAL MEETINGS SAN FRANCISCO, 1991

Marlowe Society Workshop

Friday, December 27, 5:15-6:30 p.m. Monterey A, Hilton. Presiding: Sara M. Deats, University of South Florida.

1. "Self, Other, and the Role of Demonic Parody in Doctor Faustus," Pompa Banerjee, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
2. "History and Fantasy in Marlowe's Edward II," Viviana Comensoli, Wilfrid Laurier University.
3. "Economic and Ideological Exchange in The Jew of Malta," David H. Thurn, Princeton University.

Marlowe's Theatrical Contexts: Stage and Society

Saturday, December 28, 7:15-8:30 p.m. Tiburon B, Hilton. Presiding: Constance B. Kuriyama, Texas Tech University.

1. "Bridges 'through the Moving Air': Some Theatrical Spaces in Marlowe's Plays," Ruth Lunney, University of Newcastle, Australia.
2. "Faustus as Satire; or, The Doctor 'Damb'd' in the England of Donne's 'Godfathers,'" Janet Blumberg Knedlik, Seattle Pacific University.
3. "Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Revision of Stereotypes," Emily C. Bartels, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

MARLOWE SOCIETY RECEPTION

The Marlowe Society will host a reception for members and our guests and speakers following the December 28 meeting. The site of the reception will be announced at the meeting. We hope to see you there.

MESSAGE TO THE MEMBERSHIP

Dear Colleagues:

As the time draws closer to the quadricentennial of Marlowe's death, I would like to encourage members once more to give thought to the Third International Marlowe Conference, which we plan to hold in Cambridge during the summer of 1993. Some of you have already indicated your interest in participating in the conference, and I would be happy to hear at any time from those of you who are definitely planning to attend, or seriously considering it. Proposals on any topic relevant to Marlowe are welcome. I also encourage suggestions about possible speakers, panels, workshops, seminars, or other features you think would enhance the program.

I am pleased to report that our membership is increasing, partly thanks to the efforts of Laurie Maguire, who has prepared and disseminated attractive brochures describing the society's goals and activities at several professional meetings. It is also gratifying to see that many young scholars who participated in MLA programs in recent years are publishing their work. With the support of the membership, we will continue to encourage and promote Marlowe scholarship of the highest quality.

Once again, I invite proposals for papers to be presented at the next MLA. I assure members that I am interested in any critical approach which illuminates Marlowe, and that I do not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, age, nationality, or institutional affiliation.

Very best regards,
Constance B. Kuriyama, President

CALL FOR PAPERS

For the Marlowe Society's 1992 sessions at the MLA convention in New York (Dec. 27-30), submit abstracts or papers of fifteen-minute length by Feb. 20 to Professor Constance B. Kuriyama, President, Marlowe Society of America, Department of English, Box 4530, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409.

MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Constance B. Kuriyama, President
Sara M. Deats, Vice President
Laurie E. Maguire, Secretary
Robert A. Logan, Treasurer
Bruce E. Brandt, Membership Chairman and
MSA Newsletter Editor
Paul W. White, MSA Book Reviews Editor

All business and organizational correspondence except for memberships should be addressed to the President:

Professor Constance B. Kuriyama, President
Marlowe Society of America
Department of English
Box 4530
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

New memberships and renewals should be sent to the Membership Chairman:

Professor Bruce E. Brandt
Membership Chairman
Marlowe Society of America
English Department
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007

MSA Newsletter publishes reviews of Renaissance, and especially Marlovian, drama; notices of recent and forthcoming publications; announcements; and brief articles or notes of interest to Marlovian scholars. The opinions expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect that of the MSA. The editor reserves the right to refuse items, to ask for revisions, and to make stylistic changes that he deems appropriate. MSAN reviews are usually around 800 words long, but may occasionally be longer. The beginning of a review should identify the company, the dates of performance, and the director. MSA members are encouraged to announce publications and other items or meetings of interest to the membership. Materials for the next issue of MSAN should be received by May 31, 1992. Send inquiries, announcements, and submissions to Professor Bruce E. Brandt, Editor, MSAN, at the above address.

MSA Book Reviews publishes reviews of books on Marlowe and his period. Reviews, suggestions for reviews, and inquiries should be sent to the Reviews Editor:

Professor Paul W. White, Editor
MSA Book Reviews
Department of English
Baylor University
Waco, Texas 76798

© MSA: All rights reserved to authors.

SUBMITTING TO HISTORY: EDWARD II AND THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF MEANING

An abstract of the paper presented at the MSA Meeting, Chicago, 1990, by Judith D. Haber, Tufts University.



Marlowe's presentation of the brutal, iconographically "appropriate" murder of the king in Edward II has often posed a problem for critics. Those who wish to avoid an orthodox interpretation of the play frequently appeal to some version of ambiguity, occasionally using Mortimer's "unpointed letter" as support (see esp. Garber, in Two Renaissance Mythmakers, ed. Kernan). In my paper, I argue that the dialectic between the two possible interpretations of the letter (and of the play) is subsumed and ultimately negated by a dialectic between socially constructed, causal meaning and complete meaninglessness--a dialectic (in the play's terms) between "point" and "pointlessness."

I first examine how the idea of "pointlessness" is embedded within the play; I argue that it is used to unsettle the category of the natural and to subvert significance itself. I then consider Edward who, in his endless self-contradiction, in his impotence, in his theatricality, in his sexual ambiguity, and in his undirected, homoerotic play (which is opposed to the [re]productive, heterosexual business of the kingdom) is the embodiment of "pointlessness" in all its senses. (I use recent research on Renaissance constructions of sexuality to trace the connections between these ideas.) By "playing [the] sodomite" (P. Stubbes), Edward threatens to uncover the possibility that there is never any (sexual, political, logical) point to see at all. The reading I have proposed so far would seem to support Edward's position--except,

of course, for the fact that Edward is incompletely self-conscious about his own pointlessness (making him the perfect embodiment of the idea) and, as a result, he gets the point in the end.

Edward's incapacity suggests that it is impossible effectively to escape socially constructed, determinate meaning. And this idea is emphasized throughout the play. Evocations of non-meaning are carefully presented in emblematic form; while interrogating conventional moral structure, they simultaneously show their indebtedness to it. The play makes much of the unpointed letter, but in fact, no one has any real difficulty construing it. Neither do we have any difficulty construing the end: not only does Edward get the point here, we all do; we are unable, finally, to escape it. Critics have appealed to "the complex, sympathetic, human feeling[s] evoked by the play (Greenblatt, *Renaissance self-fashioning*), but the only character who effectively articulates and enacts those feelings (Edward III) supports by his very existence an orthodox interpretation of the play (in fact, he does so precisely because he articulates and enacts those feelings).

The play as a whole, I argue, represents a submission to history. Its (relatively) coherent, linear structure reflects that submission; and this structure finds its origin and its end in the "logical," causal (and historical) figure of Edward's death. The play repeatedly suggests, but cannot effectively counter, its own inadequacy; it leaves us, instead, with an image of submission--of forced, imperfectly conscious submission to something that is presented as brutal and violating, that is clearly perceived as fictional, but that is nevertheless represented as unavoidable.

A NOTE ON TEACHING MARLOWE'S THE JEW OF MALTA

In the fall of 1990 I taught an upper-level undergraduate course titled "Renaissance Skepticism and Jacobean Tragedy" at Saint Mary's College of California. Early in the semester, my students and I spent nine or ten class sessions on three plays by Marlowe--Doctor Faustus, The Jew of Malta, and Edward II--before moving on to a group of later plays which included Hamlet, Troilus and Cressida, The Revenger's Tragedy, The Duchess of Malfi, The Changeling, Women Beware Women, and 'Tis Pity She's a Whore. My purpose in organizing the readings this way was to help my students understand that the skeptical, ironic, and macabre elements of Jacobean tragedy did not appear ex nihilo, and I intended to use the Marlowe plays--along with Machiavelli's The Prince, Montaigne's Apology for Raymond Sebond, and Donne's Anniversaries--as a contextual ground against which to place the later works. What I found, perhaps not surprisingly, is that many of my students resisted the idea of moving rapidly through one group of texts only to arrive at a different and arbitrarily privileged group through which

we would travel at a more leisurely pace. Nonetheless, in addition to learning that a course solely focused on Marlowe might be an attractive offering in an undergraduate curriculum, I chanced upon one class exercise dealing with The Jew of Malta which proved remarkably fruitful, both in terms of its immediate interest to students and its potential to serve as a valuable point of reference in discussions of other plays.

Toward the end of our first day's discussion of The Jew, I asked for volunteers to read aloud the parts of Barabas and Abigail at 1.2.229-315 (Penguin edition of The Complete Plays, ed. J. B. Steane, 1969). My suspicion was that such a reading would raise the question of the degree to which the play encourages empathic identification with characters plotting revenge--particularly given their status as Jews in a virulently anti-Semitic society. But in fact it quickly became clear that the center of interest for my students lay in the more specific question of the significance of Barabas's speech to Abigail after her protest that by entering the nunnery as a novice she shall "much dissemble":

Tush!

As good dissemble that thou never mean'st
As first mean truth and then dissemble it:
A counterfeit profession is better
Than unseen hypocrisy.

(1.2.99-304)

After a momentary digression regarding the pronunciation of "Tush!" (does it rhyme with "mush"? "bush"?) and an attempt to find current idiomatic equivalents (the principal candidates being "Big deal!" "So what!" and "No shit!"), we wrestled for a while with possible explications of Barabas's words. We wondered if the actions distinguished in lines 300-1 were the same as those distinguished in 302-3, and if so, why they were equal in the former case and unequal in the latter. We wondered what "unseen hypocrisy" was, and by whom it was "unseen," and how it differed from a "counterfeit profession." We wondered about the sphere of reference of Barabas's speech--how narrowly or broadly we were meant to take it. Inevitably, before we could discuss any of these questions in detail, the period ended. But for the following class session, I asked each student to bring a written paraphrase of the "dissemble" speech, and I specified that any and all outside sources, including dictionaries and scholarly editions of Marlowe, were fair game for consultation. The plan would be to share our paraphrases, explain how we derived them, and debate their relative merits.

The results were impressive. One student went to the library at U. C. Berkeley and unearthed the 1870 edition of Marlowe's works by Francis Cunningham, which substituted "meant'st" for "mean'st" and "unforeseen" for "unseen," thereby achieving an effect of semantic determinacy quite foreign to the original 1633 Quarto version. Her paraphrase, based on Cun-

ningham, read as follows: "Pretending to mean something that you never really meant is just as good as initially meaning that thing and then only pretending it; a false religious promise is better than unplanned hypocrisy." Another student noted that both the Regents (1964) and Revels (1978) editions of *The Jew*--in addition to our Penguin version--accounted for "profession" solely as a religious vow, without suggesting that the word had a broader contemporary applicability and resonance, as the OED amply demonstrates: a "profession" in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as today, can be any "action of declaring, acknowledging, or avowing an opinion, belief, intention, practice, etc." Thus, this student's paraphrase emphasized the potential breadth of "profession": "It's as good to start with a deliberate deception as to begin honestly and then slip into trickery. A dishonest declaration is better than an honest one that turns false through hypocrisy."

Perhaps the most interesting paraphrase, however, centered on the discovery that "dissemble" need not necessarily imply a conscious and deliberate disparity between appearance and true intent. The OED's second (and obsolete) definition of the verb is "To be unlike, to differ from, resemble not"; and the illustration provided--from a passage in the translation of La Primaudaye's The French Academy (2nd ed., 1589)--clearly suggests that conscious intent may, in some cases, be dissociated from the act of dissembling: "His end dissembled not his life. For, being hated of all and sought for to be slaine, he [Nero] killed himselfe." According to this reading, dissembling from an originally meant "truth" need not be a conscious choice--and this fits well with an understanding that "unseen hypocrisy" may refer to the condition of acting in contradiction to one's professed aims or ideals without, for whatever reason, being aware of it. Here is my student's paraphrase of Barabas's speech: "You might as well disguise your purpose from the start as begin with good intentions and then veer away from them; self-knowing hypocrisy is superior to unseeing hypocrisy." What I particularly like about this paraphrase is the clarity with which it proposes self-knowledge as the critical difference between a "counterfeit profession" and "unseen hypocrisy"--phrases that otherwise have a tendency to suggest two dimensions of the same phenomenon, thereby rendering a comparison between them incoherent. A "counterfeit profession" is clearly an act of hypocrisy, so it can only be "better" than (and distinct from) "unseen hypocrisy" if it involves no self-betrayal.

Our debate over the possible meanings of Barabas's speech took up an entire sixty-minute period and could easily have lasted twice as long. It proved, as the course progressed, to be a key moment in our ongoing discussion, a touchstone to which we frequently returned. For example, in addition to providing a lucid commentary on the behavior of Maltese Christians elsewhere in the same scene (1.2),

Barabas's distinctions help us to think about Ferneze's rhetoric of providentialism (5.1) and Barabas's own ability to manipulate others through the deployment of conscious duplicity against unconscious hypocrisy. Questions arising from a consideration of Barabas's speech might include 1) Does Ferneze remain an "unseen hypocrite" to the end? and 2) How does the relation between Barabas's eventual downfall and his delight in "policy" and vicious machinations connect to his preference for "counterfeit profession"? But going beyond The Jew of Malta, my class and I found that Barabas's speech resonated interestingly in our discussions of a variety of questions and issues prompted by subsequent plays; among these were the moral obliquity of the Duke and Leantio in Women Beware Women and Beatrice-Joanna in The Changeling, the evolution of Ferdinand's and Bosola's self-awareness in The Duchess of Malfi, and the problem of Gertrude's guilt in *Hamlet*. No doubt it is a common phenomenon for the success or failure of a particular class session to color an instructor's memory of an entire course. But I do believe that our close attention, early in the semester, to the issues raised by Barabas's speech--degrees of hypocrisy, the value of self-awareness, the legitimacy of deception--invigorated many of our later discussions in the course, and proved a valuable, if largely inadvertent, strategy of engaging us with Marlowe's play

William M. Hamlin

Idaho State University

THE REVENGER'S TRAGEDY

1. The Revenger's Tragedy. Drama Theatre, Sydney Opera House. Sydney Theatre Company. Directed by Jules Wright. February 13-March 23, 1991.
2. The Revenger's Tragedy. Drama Theatre, University of Newcastle. Drama Department, University of Newcastle. Directed by Mark Gauntlett, assisted by Caroline Stacey. July 16-27, 1991.

Like many other minor Renaissance plays, The Revenger's Tragedy (c.1606) is performed only occasionally. The opportunity to see and compare two productions within six months was not one to be missed.

Minor, but memorable. As its title suggests, The Revenger's Tragedy is concerned with the morality of private revenge, but its intriguing is more cynical than that of Hamlet (the inevitable comparison), and its ending more of a shambles. As the hero proclaims, "When the bad bleed, then is the tragedy good"; and he too, tainted by the carrying out of his revenge, must eventually be executed for the good order of the state. Most of the characters behave quite unpleasantly: there is enough lust and violence, treachery and revenge for a television mini-series.

In making sense of the play for a modern

Australian audience, the two productions were as different as any reviewer could have hoped for. They even ascribed the play to different authors: Sydney to Thomas Middleton, Newcastle to Cyril Tourneur. The Sydney production, by a leading professional company, took an approach that was earnestly realistic; the Newcastle production, by the University Drama Department with (for the most part) student actors, was just as resolutely theatrical. The results would have pleased anyone who believes in the underdog and the unexpected: the small city amateur version was consistently more effective, and more rewarding for the playgoer, than the big city professional one. There are lessons here, I believe, for other productions of Renaissance plays.

In Sydney the play was viewed as serious social commentary, as still relevant today because of our continuing resort to violence to solve problems, whether domestic or international (rehearsal and performance coincided with the Gulf War). The audience was discouraged from sympathizing with Vindice, the Revenger, whose revenge was seen as too delayed to be excused as the passion of a moment. The earnest approach extended to the play's misogyny, which was also the subject of protest, with "particularly odious" comments on women collected for a special section of the printed programme. All in all, there was no reason to doubt the director's testimony that nobody had been laughing in the rehearsal room.

In Newcastle, laughter was accepted as indispensable, as the first stage in response. There was less anxiety about "relevance." The audience were led to question the validity of private revenge by recognizing their complicity with the revenger. Partisan sympathies were encouraged, with the play's opening clearly identifying each character's virtue, or lack of it. The production emphasized the artistry of Vindice's revenge, and the use of controlled violence to achieve various ends, whether revenge or ambition or lust. The production did not cringe at the misogynist lines but played them directly to the audience; the effect was both funnier and more confronting than that achieved in Sydney.

Both productions aimed to distance the audience from the action, but this was attempted in quite different ways: in Sydney, by a realistic but somewhat remote setting; in Newcastle, by the style of playing.

The Sydney production set the play in Sicily in 1905, permitting reference to family honor, revenge, and small-"m" mafiosi. The stage presented a realistic winter landscape (to reflect the characters' inner desolation), complete with a central snow-covered "mountain," seventy-five real poplar trees (donated by a real estate agent), the shell of a summerhouse (which afforded some shelter for fornication), sculptures "muffled in polythene" (in 1905?), a Citroen car for the Duke, a pig roasting on a spit, and a generous amount of fog. The effect was essentially cinematic, and the setting did allow some compelling and spectacular moments: a hunting scene with

shotguns, a gangland execution in the snow, and much leaping, dodging, and peering around the real trees.

More often, however, the set in Sydney did not cope with the flexibility of action the play demands. Movement on stage was restricted by the "mountain," which in effect threw most of the action forwards onto the narrow strip of forestage. Too often characters were simply strung out along the front, taking turns to deliver their lines. The sense of unease was compounded by the dimensions of the stage. The Drama Theatre stage is wide and high; viewed against hill and seventy-five trees, the human figures often seemed to be dwarfed by the sheer volume of space above their heads.

The Newcastle production rejected setting in a specific period as too reductive, opting instead for an uncluttered acting area in front of stylized columns (these, like the trees in Sydney, were useful for lurking around). Simple black boxes became seats, platforms, and a bed as required. For the delivery of asides, a one-meter thrust was added to the proscenium-arch stage (fire regulations would not allow more). This set was flexible, allowing for the play's constant shifting between narrative and commentary. During asides, action froze. Characters changed their tone of voice or, more often, simply walked out of the narrative space to appeal to heaven, or address the audience. The acting was energetic, and the brisk pace of the production ensured a constant flow of action on stage.

The Newcastle production accepted the characters as denizens of the theatre. They were presented as the embodiments of qualities, lacking psychological complexity or motivation. They were simply themselves: revenge, chastity, lechery, ambition. Distinctive costumes helped the audience identify them and follow the twists and turns of the plot. The Duke's son was menacing and arrogant in white and black and gold, with a knife at the ready. Vindice as Piatto was decadent in gold net and armbands and cod-piece. Castiza was innocent in softly flowing white and mauve.

Perhaps the most striking visual effect was the mask-like makeup worn by the members of the ducal court, in contrast to the more "human," expressive faces of Vindice and his family (when Vindice came to court, his makeup too became more mask-like). The "masks" aptly suggested the essential emptiness of court life, as well as the game-playing that tried to conceal savagery and lust. They anticipated the violent masques at the end (played in masks with a demonic red glitter) that become the cover for mass murder. When Vindice held a golden mask in front of the poisoned skull of his beloved, disguising it from the Duke before he murders him, the action linked all the masks with the skull, and became a telling image of the play's obsessions: death and the corruptions of the flesh.

In Sydney the characters looked neither bizarre nor grotesque, but "real." The costumes were for the

most part drably 1930-ish, with fur coats for the Duke and Duchess (they at least were dressed for the snow); the one bright spot apart from Piato as a punk homosexual was the Duchess in red dress and precariously high heels. In attempting to establish realistic motivations for the characters, the production foundered. The actors resorted to idiosyncratic interpretations: the Duke arrogant, the Duchess remote and melodramatic, Castiza passionless but realistic, Vindice (on whom so much depends) too often bland.

In the end, the production in Sydney was confused, and the audience uncertain when and whether to respond. A few days after the season opened, it was considered necessary to provide theatergoers with a handout which detailed the relationships between the characters and "the story so far." That, despite the earnest intentions of the director, is a fair indication of the production's inadequacies. In Newcastle there was no such need.

Ruth Lunney

University of Newcastle
New South Wales, Australia

JEAN VAUTHIER AND THE MASSACRE AT PARIS

With its mixture of the comic and the cruel, Marlowe's The Massacre at Paris is a disturbing drama. Although modern critics generally agree on the farcical nature of this unusual and badly-preserved play, they usually deplore rather than praise the fact.

On May 19, 1972, the director Jean Vauthier presented a French adaptation of The Massacre at Paris in which he readily exploited, and even extended, the farcical elements in Marlowe's play with great success. In the scene depicting Mugeroun's assassination, for instance, Vauthier emphasizes the low comedy character originally present in the English play:

LE SOLDAT, bavard genre Popeye. Son mousquet à la main:

Je l'aime. Je l'aime. C'est ma petite femme. Je ne la lâche pas; elle veille sur mon corps terrestre, et maintenant elle a décidé de me rapporter de l'argent.

C'est une mignonne qui, en ce jour, va s'occuper d'un mignon.

Elle réussira, c'est sûr, -- it faut te faire confiance, ma chérie ----- . Et nous aurons une petite maison avec un petit jardin près d'un bois et nous vivrons retirés de la guerre --- mais je promets de t'astiquer quand même de temps en temps, pour la bonne forme et parce que tu es jolie.

(Il donne encore quelques petit baisers à son mousquet.)

Et l'autre, quand il sera de rencontre, tu sauras que c'est lui dès que je te dirai de le regarder entre les deux yeux/, et bien vite

tu le reconnaîtras: C'est un joli garçon, le plus joli vraiment, donc pas de risque d'erreur/ -- et c'est très bien comme ça qu'il soit jeune et bien fait/ parce qu'il a assez vécu. Finir en beauté c'est bien mieux que de devenir moche, pas vrai?

-- Oui mon garçon, votre mignonnerie c'est pour ma mignonnette, voilà qui est convenu -- et rapidement et sans bavure/, et vous aurez été un luron: je suppose que vous allez dans la chambre de Monsieur le Duc et de Madame la Duchesse quand Monsieur le Duc n'y est pas, et que celui-ci ne vous reproche pas d'en sortir porteur de choses qui, certes, vous appartiennent... pardonne-zmoi -- mais d'apporter ces choses-là en entrant! -- ce qui pose un problème mais ne vous est pas pardonné. Je suppose donc que vous vous introduisez dans la petite affaire du Duc. -- Plait-il? Le Duc s'occupe-t-il assez lui-même de sa petite affaire?... Possible! mais moi je ne suis éclairé que pour vous faciliter le rapport avec ma mignonnette, c'est-à-dire mettre un terme à vos inconséquences -- je veux dire vous zigouiller. Le Duc le veut, c'est donc comme presque fait.

De plus, le Duc paie très bien, c'est donc comme déjà fait. (A son arme:) -- As-tu bien entendu et tout retenu, toi? Oui? -- Alors tu vas bientôt faire ton métier, petite salope.

Viens avec moi, allons nous promener.

(Entre Maugiron.)

LE SOLDAT: Quoi? Déjà? Non...? Vous le faites exprès?

MAUGIRON: Est-ce à moi que tu parles, imbécile?

LE SOLDAT: Pas du tout mon charmant, c'est à un camarade qui est en l'air au-dessus de moi -- vous n'avez qu'à lever les yeux pour le voir. Il épaupe et tire. Maugiron tombe mort. -- Voilà pour toi, juste entre les deux yeux ----- (A son arme:) -- Merci ma chère.

(XVIIe séquence, scène 24).

[All references are to the printed version of Vauthier's adaptation: Marlowe. Le Massacre à Paris, Théâtre du Monde Entier (Paris: Galimard, 1972).]

Vauthier sustains the staccato structure of Marlowe's play by using swiftly moving séquences, thus heightening the "snapshot" effect noted by F. S. Boas (Christopher Marlowe, Oxford, 1940). Some of these séquences contain no acting part as such, but constitute an extremely rapid dumb show:

XIXe séquence

Scène 26

Aussitôt, bref effet:

Le mur des troupes de Navarre, déjà en route, avançant face à nous.

XXe séquence

Scène 27

Aussitôt: château de Blois. Entrent Henri III et d'Épernon.

In the XVIe séquence, the pace of action is increased by further additions to the number of murders taking place on the stage: the Admiral's servant and Sérone's wife are also killed.

Other scenes infringe upon one another in such a manner that some of these murders occur almost simultaneously: while we are still gazing at Guise's corpse lying on the floor, we witness the murder of his brother, Cardinal Lorraine, in the other corner of the stage.

Vauthier pays particular attention to the ritual elements of the Massacre, elements which he highlights and elaborates. In most cases, the bodies of the brutally murdered victims are raised and held over the shoulders of the bearers for a few seconds, and then brought off stage with a solemn march. The only exception is Lorraine, who is simply dragged away. This decorous, ceremonial removal of bodies (following immediately after grotesque and clownish death scenes) occurs nearly twenty times in rapid succession, turning the deaths into ridiculous jokes. Lorraine's unceremonious exit, the penultimate of the play, occurs just before the Guise's own body is brought to church in pomp, and increases the comic effect of the whole play.

At the end of the published text of his stage adaptation of The Massacre à Paris, Vauthier adds this interesting comment:

J'avais repoussé certains passages de Massacre à Paris, voulant marquer des différences dans l'évolution interne des personnages autant que dans le déroulement dramatique par rapport à Marlowe, comme aussi eu égard au rythme nouveau et scènes neuves que j'introduis -- c'est-à-dire tel quel, le présent ouvrage.

Dernièrement, à la demande de la mise en scène, les passages qui se trouvent ci-après ont été rétablis et je les ai transposés afin qu'il en soit fait usage au gré de la réalisation (p. 93).

Some of Vauthier's colleagues apparently preferred the original plot to Vauthier's slightly altered adaptation of Marlowe's Massacre, and wished that he had furnished an unaltered version. Vauthier accordingly prepared a short note where he signaled which scenes had been altered, printing them in their original version. Obviously, Vauthier had no objection to presenting the original version of Marlowe's play on stage, because he would interpret it in the same farcical manner as his adaptation. In fact, a close

scrutiny of the French text reveals that there are very few alterations, one being the scene of Mugeroun's assassination reproduced above in its entirety and the other being Guise's death scene. Other changes are minor.

Vauthier's version was adapted for radio and given the title "La Mort Facile." This title appears in the stage production as a subtitle for the scene of Guise's assassination. Thus, the only death scene which is given some sense of dignity is implacably undermined. Vauthier simply makes more explicit the potential for farce that is already inherent in the English dramatist's work.

Francine St-Onge

University of Taiwan

FRIENDS AND LOVERS IN THE TRAGEDIE OF DOCTOR FAUSTUS

An abstract of the paper presented at the MSA Meeting, Chicago, 1990, by Ruth Stevenson, Union College, New York.



Readers and viewers of Doctor Faustus have inevitably felt its subversion; but critics have almost unexceptionally assumed and often demonstrated, with both traditional scholarship and poststructural analysis, the inevitable triumph of orthodoxy over the character Faustus. My paper argues otherwise. The text as whole, including Faustus's damnation, is as subversive as its protagonist and effectually contests the play's powerful morality structure through an unusual exploration of desire.

To begin with, the drama exposes and rejects what Christian culture itself desires--namely, power

itself. Faustus does not, in effect, desire the spiritual power of heaven. He does not, despite his initial ambitious proclamations, yearn for the secular power of the state. Nor does he wish the power of cultural knowledge, which he eventually tires of and dismisses. In fact, Faustus replaces the desire for knowledge as objective goal with desire for the subjective experience of desire; that is, he dismisses a desire for knowledge in order to gain a knowledge of desire.

He seeks this knowledge first by developing a gift for friendship. Throughout his career he is amicable, turning initially to his friends Valdes and Cornelius, enjoying his comrades who could "bear his absence but with grief / I mean his friends and dearest companions," endearing himself to Wagner, who offers to him "My life and lasting service for your love" and to whom he leaves his entire fortune. He enjoys the Scholars "at supper . . . where there's much belly cheer," and they, in turn, wish that "happy and blest be Faustus evermore." Faustus lovingly calls these men his "sweet chamber fellows," and urges them to save themselves. And he himself passionately rejects the Old Man who seeks to dissolve his bond with Lucifer.

Through his use of a potent sign, the circle, Marlowe explores and develops the form as well as the content of desire, an exploration that culminates in Faustus's relationship with Mephostophilis. The devil and Faustus join in a circuit of emotion when Mephostophilis responds to Faustus's words of conjuration because of the intensity he feels in them. This intensity becomes passionate. Mephostophilis asks Faustus "if thou lovest me," and Faustus gives himself to the devil: "Had I as many soules as there be Starres, / I'd give them all for Mephostophilis." They become bound to each other. What they share is hell. Their relationship becomes progressively oral, physiological, sadistic, and erotic. It culminates in the final forty lines of the play. Even as these present the B-text morality of terrified damnation along with the A-text emphasis on Faustus's poignant suffering, they celebrate the ecstatic, irresistible, and subversive promptings of Faustian desire for Mephostophilis, for their final but eternal union in the burning mouth of hell (positioned on the Elizabethan stage with outstretching teeth), and, indeed, for hell itself. [Quotations from the edition by Fredson Bowers.]

Recent Studies in Marlowe

- Bakanova, E. R. "Marlo i Empedokl: K probleme antichnykh vliianii v dramaturgii Marlo." Filologicheskii Nauki 3 (1990): 41-54.
- Bartels, Emily C. "Authorizing Subversion: Strategies of Power in Marlowe's Doctor Faustus." Renaissance Papers (1989): 65-74.
- Belt, Debra. "Anti-Theatricalism and Rhetoric in Mar-

lowe's Edward II." English Literary Renaissance 21 (1991): 134-160.

- Bose, Mishtooni. "'On kai me on': A Tension in the Ramist Manuals." Notes and Queries 38 (1991): 29-31.
- Brandt, Bruce. Christopher Marlowe in the Eighties: An Annotated Bibliography of Marlowe Criticism from 1978 through 1989. West Cornwall, CT: Locust Hill Press, 1992. [Available December, 1991.]
- Bruster, Douglas. "'Come to the Tent Again': 'The Passionate Shepherd,' Dramatic Rape and Lyric Time." Criticism 33 (1991): 49-72.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Marlowe: An Elizabethan Witness." L'Artiste, témoin de son temps (?). CARA: Actes du Centre Aixois de Recherches Anglaises 11. Provence: Univ. de Provence, 1990. 39-51.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. Tamburlaine and the Body." Criticism 33 (1991): 31-47.
- Dabbs, Thomas. Reforming Marlowe: The Nineteenth-Century Canonization of a Renaissance Dramatist. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press/Associated University Presses, 1991. [See offer below.]
- Fleissner, Robert F. "Dr. Faustus as a Source for Hamlet." Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht 13.1 (1990): 68-71.
- Fleissner, Robert F. Shakespeare and the Matter of the Crux: Textual, Topical, Onomastic, Authorial, and Other Puzzlements. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991. [Includes discussion of the authorship of Arden of Feversham.]
- Sales, Roger. Christopher Marlowe. New York: St. Martin's, 1991.
- Shapiro, James. Rival Playwrights: Marlowe, Jonson, Shakespeare. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Stull, William L. "Marlowe's Adlerian Tragedies." Soundings 73 (1990): 443-464.
- White, Paul. Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming in 1992.

SPECIAL OFFER

Reforming Marlowe (see above) lists for \$29.50. The publisher has offered a special price to members of the society of \$23.60 postpaid (a 20% discount). If ordering, please state clearly that you are a member of the Marlowe Society of America and that you wish to take advantage of the price offered in the Fall 1991 Newsletter: Associated University Presses, 440 Forsgate Drive, Cranbury, New Jersey 08512.

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS

Submissions for the Spring 1992 issue of MSAN should be received by May 31, 1992.