

The Marlowe Society of America

Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. 34, No. 1, Fall 2014



Beth Eyre as the Duchess of Guise in *The Massacre at Paris*, October 2014, Rose Playhouse, London.
Photograph by Robert Piwko



FAUSTUS : REMIXED

A FILM & SPOKEN WORD ADAPTATION WITH
EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH PROJECT

In the 450th anniversary year of Marlowe's birth, our aim is to highlight the timeless relevance of the themes of *Doctor Faustus* in an original and exciting format, in order to engage modern audiences - and particularly the younger generation - with this classic play. As well as a film festival tour and online / broadcast distribution, we intend the finished film to have an educational outreach strategy that will involve Charlie Dupré leading *Doctor Faustus* workshops at schools around the U.K., as he has done previously to great success with his Shakespeare-related piece *The Stories Of Shakey P.*

Our mission is to produce a short film adaptation of Marlowe's celebrated play *Doctor Faustus* - with a riveting contemporary slant of spoken word dialogue and a present-day setting on an East London housing estate. Acclaimed spoken word performer Charlie Dupré (www.charliedupre.com), who will also play the role of Faustus, has written the film's original spoken word content—you can listen to a teaser here:

<https://soundcloud.com/charlied/faustus>

We are currently in the crucial fundraising stage of the project, and are keen to hear from individuals or organisations who may be interested in supporting our project's artistic and educational aims - be that financially or via other equally important avenues of support. No donation or offer of support is too small! To find out more, please contact Stephanie Robinson (Producer) at stephanie.robinson@live.com

STEPHANIE ROBINSON
stephanie.robinson@live.com

+44 (0) 7887 986 691

MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Paul Menzer, President; Robert A. Logan, Vice President; Lucy Munro, Secretary; Kirk Melnikoff, Treasurer; Sarah K. Scott, Membership Chair; David McInnis, Editor, MSA Book Reviews; Ann Basso, Performance Editor; M. L. Stapleton, Editor, *MSA Newsletter* and webmaster

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

Paul Menzer email: pmenzer@mbc.edu
Mary Baldwin College
MLitt / MFA Program / Rose Terrace
Staunton, VA 24401

New memberships and renewals: 1) Use the PayPal option on the [Membership web page](#), or
2) send your check, payable to The Marlowe Society of America, to:

Sarah K. Scott email: sscott@msmary.edu
Department of English
Mount St. Mary's University
16300 Old Emmitsburg Road
Emmitsburg, MD 21727 USA

Membership Fees: We can accept checks for U.S. dollars drawn on U.S. banks or checks in other currencies drawn on a bank in that country.

1 year = \$30 · 3 years = \$75 · Students = \$15 · Lifetime = \$100 (with 20 years of MSA membership)

MSA Newsletter publishes reviews of Renaissance drama, especially related to Marlowe; notices of recent and forthcoming publications; notices of recent and forthcoming performances related to Marlowe; announcements; and brief articles or notes of interest to those who study Marlowe. The opinions expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect those of the MSA. The editor reserves the right to refuse items, to ask for revisions, and to make stylistic changes that he deems appropriate.

Any and all inquiries, announcements, or submissions regarding the website or *Newsletter* should be sent to:

M. L. Stapleton email: stapletm@ipfw.edu
Department of English and Linguistics phone: 260.481.6772
Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne
2101 E. Coliseum Blvd.
Fort Wayne, IN 46805

MSA Book Reviews publishes reviews of books on Marlowe and his times. Send suggestions for reviews and other inquiries to the Reviews Editor:

David McInnis email: mcinnisd@unimelb.edu.au
MSA Book Reviews Editor
University of Melbourne
Victoria, Australia

MSA Performance Reviews publishes reviews of performances of Marlowe's plays. Send suggestions for reviews and other inquiries to the Performances Editors:

Ann McCauley Basso email: ann.basso@gmail.com	Eoin Price email: Eoin.Price@swansea.ac.uk
Performances Editor (USA)	Performances Editor (UK)
University of South Florida	University of Swansea

MSA web site: www.marlowesmightyline.org

© 2014 Marlowe Society of America. All rights reserved.

Only Lovers Left Alive
Written and directed by Jim Jarmusch
Sony Pictures Classics
DVD, 2014

If I were asked to name one living figure from our present age who resonates most with Christopher Marlowe's life and works, I think I would say Edward Snowden, the former NSA analyst who is now in exile in Russia for disclosing secret documents relating to domestic and international surveillance operations. His actions, whether you valorize or condemn them, have given us a glimpse into a vast, active system meant by its nature to remain undetected, "a shadowy world," as Margaret Atwood put it in a *New York Times* opinion piece, "of which you, innocent taxpayer, understand nothing. It is better that way." So far, Snowden seems to be faring better than Marlowe did with his transgressive, secret intelligence activity, the kind of which one's superiors soon grow tired. Given the central computing and media components to Snowden's story, Marlowe scholars may too easily imagine it all as a meeting between Francis Walsingham and Thomas Pynchon. (Now wouldn't that be something!)

However, if I were also asked to provide a runner-up candidate, I might just select the longstanding outsider director and indie darling Jim Jarmusch, for decades now as much associated with a cinemagraphic avant-garde as with a voluptuousness, lyrical filmmaking. He is a director of cool who revels in the techniques of his craft. Sound familiar? Thus a happy, Marlovian convergence occurs in Jarmusch's latest film, now available on DVD, *Only Lovers Left Alive*. It is a vampire film, whose goth-glamorous undead couple is played by Tilda Swinton and Tom Hiddleston, but don't write it off quite yet. These lovers are too artful and elegant to go in for the biting of necks; Adam, played by Hiddleston and living in a dilapidated mansion in one of Detroit's abandoned neighborhoods, procures his sanguinary foodstuff from a black-market doctor and drinks it from a dainty aperitif glass. When he dresses up in medical scrubs to make his visit to a hospital less noticeable, Adam's nametag reads "Doctor Faust." And Eve, played by Swinton, receives her blood supply from an all-night café in Tangiers. The supplier will be of interest to *Marlowe Newsletter* readers: it is Christopher Marlowe himself, who in Jarmusch's homage-giving imagination transforms our playwright into an older, tired-looking, messy-haired vampire, played charmingly by John Hurt. (At first I mistook him for Ian McKellen, speaking with a higher voice than I expected.)

At first I thought this review would be merely a short note alerting Marlovians to this curious inclusion of Marlowe in a film cameo, but in fact he plays a bigger role. He remains a minor character – the vampire couple in many ways is the film – but he appears in multiple scenes throughout the film. Marlowe is Eve's main artistic confidant in Tangier, and when she travels to Detroit to comfort her depressive husband Adam, Marlowe's prior presence is countered by the far more problematic arrival of Eve's combustible sister Ava (Mia Wasikowska). Marlowe, in contrast, is a benign inspirer and intellectual friend to Eve when she is at home in Tangier, a kind of early-modern version of Paul Bowles. Eve in her own right is a supreme literature lover. (And, incidentally, wouldn't the formidable Tilda Swinton make a terrifically cold Isabella in some hoped-for future production of *Edward II*?) We see her speed-reading

old books in various languages, and sense that she has been a vampire in the living world for a long, long time). When she is packing to visit Adam, she brings two metal suitcases, both loaded with books. I noticed *Don Quixote* and *Infinite Jest* among them.

In their first scene together, Marlowe arrives at the café and delicately places before Eve a "pharmacie" bag – her grocery shopping, we might say. When she addresses him, he nervously says, "Never call me that name in public," as if Marlowe's lethal Deptford company may be vampires, too, and still on his trail. She soon asks Kit (as she affectionately calls him), "We're never going to let the cat out of the bag?" and speaks of the "most outrageously delicious literary scandal in history." This signals Jarmusch's mischievous interest in not only including Marlowe as a kindred-spirit vampire to the lovers, but also the familiar if fanciful story, which he alludes to throughout the film, that Marlowe was the actual author of Shakespeare's plays. On her flight to Detroit, Eve recites lines from Shakespeare's sonnet 116, and upon finishing the poem, exclaims "Ah, Marlowe...!" Jarmusch also uses the Marlowe-as-Shakespeare story to indicate that Marlowe, like the vampire lovers, is at heart an expatriate. He may be in Tangier now, but at one point he informs Eve he once resided "in Italy actually, but that was four hundred years ago."

One of the final scenes, when the lovers have returned together to Tangier, finds Marlowe, alas, on his deathbed from having drunk contaminated blood. "What a piece of work is man," he says upon Adam's arrival, and I'd like to think there is some sickly ogling going on here. Adam replies, out of respect for this author of *Hamlet*, "What is this quintessence of dust." Adam notices an in-progress manuscript near Marlowe's bed, and comments that the writer has still been "scratching" at some lines. "Ah, you know," Marlowe replies, "Here and there, over the centuries." There resides in the exchange the titillating implication that Marlowe may be more than an inspiration for later writers, but in effect an unacknowledged ghost-writer, or vampire-writer. In one interior shot, we see a wall of artists' portraits – Poe, Twain, Wilde, Kafka, Buster Keaton and Iggy Pop – and one suspects this his the director's way of providing his character Marlowe with fitting company, almost certainly others highly regarded by Jarmusch. In the director's wild vision, maybe Marlowe helped some of these fellow "rebel" artists in later centuries.

Then again, there is something savory in Marlowe's clear disdain for the author whose fame he has enabled, referring to a portrait of Shakespeare on the same wall as an "illiterate zombie philistine!" "Zombies" are the vampires' term for vulgar humans; A. O. Scott in his review of *Only Lovers Left Alive* deftly refers to the vampire couple a "a kind of aesthetic aristocracy" and "ideal critics." Despite being a cobbler's son, Marlowe, as Jarmusch presents it, fits their haute, exacting company wonderfully. Despite wishing that Jarmusch might have given screen time to Marlowe's own mighty lines instead of crediting him for overfamiliar lines by Shakespeare, any Marlovian can still take pleasure in Adam's reassuring comment to the finally dying Marlowe: "The game paid off though, Kit. You still got the work out there."

Brett Foster
Wheaton College

2015 MLA Session in Vancouver

276. Marlowe's Queer Futurity

12:00 noon–1:15 p.m., West 120, VCC West

Program arranged by the Marlowe Society of America



MSA Book Reviews · David McInnis, University of Melbourne ·

Book Reviews Editor

Liam E. Semler. *Teaching Shakespeare and Marlowe: Learning vs. the System.* Shakespeare Now! London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2013. Pp vii+153. Paperback [ISBN 9781408185025](#) (\$22.95); eBook [ISBN 9781408185223](#) (\$16.99).

There are no wallabies in the Kentucky bluegrass, where I live and work. I write the obvious here because Liam E. Semler uses his unexpected collision with a wallaby as an analogy for what he aims to accomplish in *Teaching Shakespeare and Marlowe: Learning versus the System*. The wallaby in question slammed into Semler while he was riding his bike through a national park. For him, the cyclist focused on the road, oblivious to the surrounding landscape, represents the academic, teacher, or student naturalized into ever more instrumentalizing and standardizing education systems. The wallaby stressfully but also usefully bucks these systems. In a sometimes irreverent style, Semler offers his understanding of the system logics that permeate academia; he describes his efforts to put productive pressure on them through the literature he teaches and researches; and he encourages readers' efforts to broaden student learning experiences. He encourages us to be the wallaby sometimes. As I've noted, for me this is not the best exemplar. Semler's experiences with Australian education systems don't always align with mine. Beyond these differences, I have questions about some of his terms and want to push back against some of his assertions. But pushing back, against teaching and learning systems and against his ideas, is what Semler invites, and I recommend this book because it provokes thoughtful reconsideration and engagement.

Semler begins Part One, "Schooling Shakespeare," by describing state-imposed secondary and tertiary education systems in Australia, particularly in New South Wales, and the side effects of those systems. The first chapter takes its name from those side effects: "Revenge Effects (How systems eat us for breakfast)." Revenge effects are barriers to the educational

Presiding: Paul Menzer, Mary Baldwin Coll.

1. "Marlowe's Queer Jew," Judith D. Haber, Tufts Univ.
2. "Edward's Futures," Jeffrey Masten, Northwestern Univ.
3. "First Thing We Do, Let's Kill All the Children," Stephen Guy-Bray, Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver

goals of learning systems created by those very systems, as when assessment requirements overwhelm learning experiences so that students learn how to score well on exams above anything else. Students and educators self-discipline to reap the rewards of the system, and the field of vision narrows for all. Semler explains how these revenge effects manifest in the New South Wales English curriculum as it pertains to Shakespeare. In the process, he addresses ways that student proficiency in navigating exam-focused secondary systems result in rocky transitions to undergraduate literature courses demanding argumentation based on close reading.

Chapter Two, "Positive Turbulence (How we fight back)," doesn't take a purely adversarial position. Rather, Semler advocates humanizing systems. To explain this, he relies on the wallaby and *As You Like It*. The courts of the two dukes represent ways of thinking and learning. Frederick offers structure and transmission of set skills, while Ferdinand promotes conversation and discovery, but they are at opposite ends of the same scale. For Semler, the forest of Arden is outside this continuum of educational systems: "An ardenspace is a space of pedagogical exploration beyond the formal systems that promotes complex responsive interactivity in anticipation of emergence" (49). The teaching and learning that occurs there renews us system creatures and feeds positive turbulence back into systems. While I understand the impetus for escape and renewal, one of my persistent questions about Semler's argument is whether new terms like this are necessary or useful.

Semler offers two examples of ardenspace drawn from personal pedagogical projects. The first appears in Chapter Three, "Shakespeare Reloaded (Life at the system edge)." Shakespeare Reloaded was a project conducted by Semler and colleagues at the University of Sydney with Barker College. He summarizes the process of developing Shakespeare Reloaded, acquiring funding through the Australia Research Council's Linkage Project, and the central components that facilitated mutual engagement by academics

and secondary teachers. The project also focused on smoothing student transitions to university. For instance, the Bard Blitz, a secondary school multistep lesson plan focused on developing close reading and argumentation skills, encouraged students to take intellectual risks that might not typically be rewarded.

Part Two, “Learning Marlowe,” focuses on the Marlowe module Semler teaches at the University of Sydney, rather than on collaboration outside and between institutions. He proposes that Marlowe, with his radical reputation, is an ideal conduit for provoking fruitful disruption within university systems. Chapter Four, “Perceived relevance (The state we’re in),” explores revenge effects that plague students and professors. Then, in Chapter Five, “Green light (Altered states of play),” Semler describes a second attempt to create ardenspace. The title of Chapter Four refers to another obstacle created by educational systems: the pressure to be relevant. For instance, the learning experiences of university students condition them to accept what Semler calls a “band of perceived relevance” (89). Students believe they must remain within this conceptual stratum and could feel embarrassed to make comments or ask questions outside it. Having naturalized the kinds of assignments and course materials relevant to an upper level literature course, students might be frustrated by a professor who requires something different. Semler argues that in order to really benefit from disciplinary skills, students need to recognize the strictures of education systems and think critically about their place within them, and that this can only be achieved through creative disruption that they will initially perceive as irrelevant.

In Chapter Five Semler describes revising the Marlowe module. He includes a variety of teaching strategies, such as incorporating contemporary theater and television; discussion points linking Marlowe’s characters and types of learning; and assignment possibilities other than argumentative essays. Semler not only asks his students to write journals but also keeps and circulates his own journal to model seemingly irrelevant exploration and validate their observations. I appreciate his acknowledgement that attempts to provoke and disrupt a familiar system is stressful for his students, and his willingness to regularly question his own techniques and motives. He wants students in his Marlowe module: “to have had an authentic encounter with Marlowe’s texts, to have had that encounter formally validated, to have explored something of the scholarly debates around Marlowe and his work, and to have gained some metacognitive experience that would influence their understanding of their learning in any module they were studying in any discipline” (106). Semler argues that these goals are worth all the stress, the students’ and his own, and based upon this book I agree.

Bethany Packard
Transylvania University

Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen, with Jan Sewell and Will Sharpe, ed.; Peter Kirwan and Sarah Stewart, assoc. ed. *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*. New York and Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 781 pp. Hardback. [ISBN: 978-1-137-27144-0](#) (\$39.95)

With this edition, Jonathan Bate et. al. contribute to the newly popular scholarly conversation on Shakespeare and collaboration by providing the texts of eight plays traditionally assigned to the Shakespeare Apocrypha: *Arden of Faversham*, *Lochrine*, *Edward III*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *Sir Thomas More*, *The London Prodigal*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *Mucedorus* (with additions). The editors also provide *The Spanish Tragedy* (because of recent buzz about Shakespeare’s hand in the additions) and *Double Falsehood* (because of recent re-creations of its putative parent text, the lost play “Cardenio”). The editorial matter includes a general introduction by Bate, an essay by Will Sharpe entitled “Authorship and Attribution,” and a set of interviews by Peter Kirwan with directors and actors who have brought selected ones of the plays to the stage (sadly, no index or bibliography). Eschewing the term “apocrypha” for “others” and “collaborative plays,” the editors omit six plays from the list codified in 1908 by C. F. Tucker Brooke in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha: Sir John Oldcastle and The Puritan* (due to their compelling identification with other authors and/or companies); *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* and *Fair Em* (due to insufficient evidence of Shakespeare’s authorship); *The Birth of Merlin* (due to its post-1616 date of composition); and *Two Noble Kinsman* (due to its admission to the Shakespearean canon).

At first glance, *William Shakespeare and Others* appears to be yet another power grab on the part of the Shakespeare industry to claim partial if not full ownership of plays traditionally considered anonymous. And it is that. However, there is much here to interest Marlovians: four of the ten plays were contemporary with Marlowe’s own stage career (*Arden*, *Lochrine*, *Edward III*, *Spanish Tragedy*); the one of the four most often discussed as having been influenced by Marlowe (*Lochrine*) does not otherwise exist in a classroom-friendly print edition; Sharpe’s essay makes the head-spinning arguments in attribution studies almost intelligible; and Kirwan’s interviews remind us that these plays were once and are again viable commercial properties. Even so, the cheerleading for Shakespeare grows tiresome, especially when coupled with little fresh insight into the significance of these putative collaborations for theater historians.

Understandably, the editorial matter has a Shakespearean bias. Rubbing it in, Bate, who wrote the general introduction as well as the introductions to each play, leans on hyperbole and impressionistic appraisal: the King’s Men were the “most admired acting company” in 1608 (9); three of Shakespeare’s tragedies were the “most famous recent plays” (9); “*Edward III* feels like a Shakespearean history play” (133); a passage from *Sir Thomas More* has “all the features of Shakespeare’s unique poetic intensity” (23), and the role of More is “a magnificent showcase for [the Chamberlain’s Men’s] lead tragedian and Shakespeare’s intimate friend Richard Burbage” (350). Pummeled by this exuberance, Marlowe scholars will be relieved to find Bate comparatively objective in the General

Introduction when he summarizes the history behind the categories of canonical and apocryphal Shakespearean works.

Will Sharpe's essay on attribution studies, which explores internal evidence of authorship, is further ballast to Bate's enthusiasm. Having confessed that the driver of attribution research is "the Grail-like prospect of a new [Shakespearean] work" (641), Sharpe dismisses the likelihood that such works are discoverable and focuses on the efforts of past and present scholars who, "by patiently scouring the lines of texts that do exist" (642), find "a scene or passage that differs markedly in quality from the play around it" (643). He gives credit to the scholars of yesteryear who, without the aid of computers, invented linguistic profiling ("stylometrics") to detect authors' hands. Candid about controversies among current practitioners, Sharpe implies that their "long tradition of wolf-crying" has a modern counterpart (642). Candid also about the elusiveness of "a set of identifiable criteria" for assessing authorship (644), he assembles the case for each play in sections of his essay. Readers will differ in their opinion on the persuasiveness of the evidence, but Sharpe is masterful at summarizing the arguments as they now stand.

Editorial matter aside, the value of *William Shakespeare and Others* has to be its texts. I do not know how to judge editions *qua* editions, so I cannot say whether these are better than the ones available in Tucker Brooke, *The Riverside Shakespeare* (*Edward III*), or separate editions (*Arden*, *More*). However, I do know that there is not a modern edition of *Lochrine*, and that's reason enough to acquire this collection. Even so, for portability, I'd prefer a smaller, lighter, double-columned text without all that **bold** in the textual notes.

I wish, too, that the editors had taken a theater historian on staff. Bate's introductions on each play go beyond authorial bias by contextualizing the plays in terms of Shakespeare's plays. The introduction to *Lochrine*, for example, opens with a narrative summary meant to evoke *King Lear*, but it is *King Lear* (S. R., 14 May 1594) that is the contemporary of *Lochrine*, both in its putative early stage career and its publication in 1595 (S. R. 20 July 1594). Both Bate and Sharpe are less skeptical about the composition history of *Lochrine* than many

theater historians would be. They accept the story that *Lochrine* is a rewrite of a lost play, "Estrild," by Edmund Tilney (who, being a conspirator in the Babington Plot, was executed in 1586); but they seem oblivious to the complications such a provenance raises for the play on the commercial stage. In his section on *Edward III*, Sharpe explores the possible company affiliation of the play, c. 1593-4; but in so doing he repeats the assertion by Andrew Gurr about a 1594 "duopoly" of the Admiral's and Chamberlain's Men, the canard about a stage quarrel between the Alleyns and Burbages (getting the wrong Alleyn brother, as Gurr does), and a garbled history of Pembroke's men (667). Nowhere is there an attempt to follow the plays into print shops and bookstalls. To his credit, Sharpe admits that attribution studies and the historical context are not always easy to reconcile. He calls Jowett's 1604 date for Shakespeare's Hand D a "baffling spanner" thrown into conventional narratives about Shakespeare's writing solo for his company during the middle years of his career (697). Then, wryly, Sharpe observes that "when we remove ... biographical context and perceptions of Shakespeare as an authorial figure," it becomes easier to be persuaded by "the linguistic and paleographic evidence" (691).

Are we ready, fellow Marlovians, for a reprise of arguments from centuries past on the presence of Marlowe's hand in those pre-1594 plays still in search of an author? Even though theories of collaboration are more foreign to narratives of Marlowe's habits of composition than the upstart crow's, the partnerships with Nashe and Kyd are fodder for the attributionists. Part I of *Henry VI*, *The First Part of the Contention*, and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* also beckon. But, if such attention would produce fresh editions of plays not otherwise available in reader-friendly formats, a collection called *Christopher Marlowe and Others: Collaborative Plays* might be welcome.

Roslyn L. Knutson
University of Arkansas at Little Rock (Emerita)



MSA Theater Reviews, USA · Ann Basso, University of South Florida · Performances Editor

**Review of
Tamburlaine, Parts I and II, by Christopher Marlowe, at Theatre for a New Audience, Brooklyn, NY. Dir. Michael Boyd. Nov. 1- Dec. 21, 2014. Saturday, Nov. 8, 7:30 PM**

A self-bleeding crown, paintbrushes for daggers, red rain down translucent Damascus walls, and buckets upon (actual)

buckets of blood. This is the visual impact of Theatre for a New Audience's staggering three-hour production of *Tamburlaine, Parts I and II*, a thoughtful rendition of Marlowe's two-part play that lingers between liquid and substance, thundering words and mute, yet vibrant, objects. In director Michael Boyd's hands, we are less among the "stately tent[s] of war" or "high-astounding terms." We are in a world – not unlike the second decade of an already weary 21st century – where such things have become inert, part of a

repeated, cyclical abuse of physical matter that separates life from non-life.

Mycetes says as much at the beginning of Part One when he curses “he that first invented war,” words spoken in this production by the actor Paul Lazar who ambles about the stage dumb-founded as the play’s clownish naif. He dies and revives again - as the Sultan and later Almeda – though only after Tamburlaine returns to him a crown soaked by a stream of red drops, falling high above the stage. Recent Marlowe productions, like Shakespeare Theatre Company’s 2007 *Tamburlaine*, might have found in Mycetes’ words a provocation to themes of sovereignty or the war on terror. Boyd’s *Tamburlaine* seems to be after something else. Set on a spare thrust stage before a proscenium arch of black metal scaffolding, from which hang floor-to-ceiling industrial PVC stripping, the play becomes a kind of factory or warehouse out of which Scythian warlords, Persians, Turks, Christians, or Babylonians might endlessly be produced. The symbolic effect is to suggest the interchangeability of Tamburlaine’s enemies – raw materials, aided by the tripling and quadrupling of actors’ parts, in which the “fates fast-bound” appear like chains of the repressed, returning again and again (most notably in the doubling of Merritt Janson as Zenocrate and Callapine). The practical purpose of Tom Piper’s set is perhaps even clearer: an easily cleanable stage from which the copious amounts of blood, water, and one dislodged tongue might be swept away for the next victim.

Unlike other 2014 productions, Boyd and his cast find in such liquid flows a more acute, Marlovian aesthetic. In a season that included The Globe’s summer revival of its “splatter-fest” *Titus Andronicus* and the RSC’s playful *Arden of Feversham* – also set on a factory floor, where Arden’s blood-filled coffin drips into wine glasses – *Tamburlaine* stands out for rejecting shock (or schlock) in favor of questions: “What is beauty, saith my sufferings, then?” John Douglas Thompson delivers these lines without sentiment, staring at the audience as the murdered Damascus virgins stare out at him from behind translucent plastic curtains. His Tamburlaine is terrific - weighty, middle-aged, un-self-conscious. We first meet him in Part One displaying his gold to the approaching Theridamas by cobbling together a *tableau vivant* of gold chiffon drapes and scepters out of his retinue and newly captured Zenocrate. He goes on to snap necks and slice arms with ease, but seems unaware, by Part Two, that two of his three sons look conspicuously more like his generals than himself. The notable exception is Calyphas. The “form not meet to give that subject essence / Whose matter is the flesh of Tamburlaine” also happens to be the first character in the three-hour production to get a real stabbing on stage.

What fascinates about form and matter in this *Tamburlaine* is its ability to transmute into something else. When Bajazeth and Zabina brain themselves – punctuated by Patrice Johnson

Chevannes’ (Zabina) wrenching denunciation of Tamburlaine’s atrocities – their deaths are rendered by a child actor who dumps red liquid over their heads, slumped against Bajazeth’s cage. The child returns with the bucket again in Part Two to paint a red wound on Olympia’s husband’s chest, only to become the son whose neck she slices swiftly with the wet brush in turn. These symbolic wounds not only provide a solution to the dreary litany of deaths on stage, particularly for viewers unfamiliar with Marlowe’s play, but lend a larger structure to *Tamburlaine, Parts I and II*. Violence metastasizes, it implies, becoming a more solid substance as the play progresses. The same smoking pit onto which Olympia throws the bodies of her husband and son becomes the smoldering pit onto which Usumcasane drops the “Turkish Alcoran” to burn (unseen) at the end of Part Two. But matter remains, fluttering in scraps of paper from the sky.

In this sense, Boyd’s *Tamburlaine* might be said to offer less an exploration of “aesthetic violence” than the violence of aesthetics. When the wet PVC strips are cut loose from their scaffolding in Part Two following Zenocrate’s death, they slam to the ground to reveal the factory of Tamburlaine’s desire, laid bare. The pictures of his wife he orders hung around the stage are then juxtaposed against a living and breathing Zenocrate who manages to escape the child’s bucket on her deathbed to become Callapine in prison, persuading her jailor to aid in the restoration of the Caliphate. This re-ordering of the play-text works. It is probably too much to find analogies here to the rise of ISIS in 2014, the barely repressed of our own prior decade of war, but the force of Thompson’s *Tamburlaine* lets parallels speak for themselves. He never once regards the picture of Zenocrate or the corpse he has trotted around stage for the rest of the play. He looks only straight ahead, whipping the “pampered jades of Asia” in a beautiful, slow-motion dumb show of gold, black, and mist that forms the high point of Part Two, as Zenocrate - or is it Callapine? – serenading him in his chariot.

This bold grappling with Marlowe’s first major hit makes for an exciting statement in Theatre for a New Audience’s second season at its new Brooklyn home. It is not, to be sure, without its gaps and odd choices. It is unclear, for example, why Boyd excises the Prologues to both parts of the play, or why Tamburlaine, Usumcasane, Techelles, and Theridamas fail ever to appear in white before the siege of Damascus, despite subsequently donning red and black. The audience surely missed this iconic motif, though based on the murmuring I heard at intermission – “nothing like Shakespeare,” “no wonder they thought he was an atheist” – the performance of *Tamburlaine* nevertheless had its effect. Maybe mercy was never an option in the first place.

Joel M. Dodson
Southern Connecticut University



**MSA Theatre Reviews, UK · Eoin Price, University
of Swansea · Performances Editor**

We'd like to welcome Dr. Price as our new Theatre Reviews editor for U.K. productions of Marlowe.

Global & Local Marlowes: A symposium sponsored by the London Shakespeare Centre & the Marlowe Society of America: 6 December 2014

In recent years, the idea of “global and local Shakespeare” has become firmly established in studies of Shakespearean performance and reception. Sonia Massai has influentially written of the need for ‘a model of cultural appropriation which can effectively account of the variety of localities from which Shakespeare is being appropriated, for the range of textual strategies employed by its adapters, and for the impact world-wide Shakespeares have on their target audiences’. What would it mean, this symposium asks, to think not about global and local Shakespeares, but global and local Marlowes?

Marlowe is in many respects a more insistently global writer than Shakespeare, his much smaller canon of works engaging with a broad range of locations and international concerns through dramatic setting, dramaturgy, allusion and translation. Yet he is often viewed in terms of intensely local contexts: recent historical events such as the St Bartholmew's Day

massacre; the performance of his works at the Rose playhouse; his origins in Canterbury, his studies at Cambridge and his sudden death in South London.

This symposium will engage with a range of global and local contexts for Marlowe's work, in both their original and adapted forms. Keynote papers will be given by **Paul Menzer** (Mary Baldwin College) on how Faust became German (again) and **Jane Grogan** (University College Dublin) on ‘Tamburlaine's Social Networks’. Our other speakers include **Sarah Dustagheer, Edward Paleit, Chloe Preedy, Tom Rutter** and **Richard Wilson**; we will also have a roundtable discussion on Marlowe's local performances with **James Wallace**, artistic director of Dolphin's Back theatre company and recent director of a production of *The Massacre at Paris* at the site of the Rose playhouse.

Editor's Note: MSA Book Reviews provide descriptions and evaluations of recent publications on Marlowe and his period. It gives both new and established Marlowe scholars a forum for expressing their views from a variety of critical approaches. Although reviews of books are the norm, appraisals of recent articles on Marlowe are also welcome. The reviews should be no more than 1000 words in length and should cover the book's purpose, contribution, scholarship, format, and success and achieving its purpose. The editor reserves the right to ask for revision and to make appropriate stylistic changes. A review naturally reflects the opinion of the author rather than the MSA. Reviewers should be members of the organization.

